

bipartisan bills that this committee has brought to the floor and acted upon expeditiously.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I have always enjoyed working with him, and we are able to achieve a great deal of bipartisan work because of our respect for one another. I think more of that would be helpful to the whole House.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. This measure will authorize \$100 million in fiscal year 1997 for child abuse prevention and treatment programs.

The bulk of this money will support the State grant program which provides child protective services where they are most effective—at the State level. This grant program helps States screen and investigate reports of child abuse or neglect; provide case management and deliver service to children and their families; improve risk and safety assessment tools and expand training for service providers and those required to report suspected cases of child abuse.

Our children are our most precious resource and we must take steps to root out and eliminate abuse and maltreatment. This bill is a move in that direction. I urge all my colleagues to support these amendments and pass this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in supporting the passage of S. 919, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act Amendments. Child protection is our collective responsibility and the Congressional approval today reinforces our commitment to help our Nation's most vulnerable children and families.

The number of children reported abused and neglected has tripled since 1981. As more and more families encounter pressures, the caseloads at the child protection agencies increase. The steps we take today, in reauthorizing this program for another 5 years, will expand services to strengthen and support families in need.

Guam is currently receiving about \$177,000 in consolidated grants from the Department of Health and Human Services to assist our efforts to combat this problem. Our local child protective agencies have flexibility in designing child protective services, investigations of child abuse and neglect, improvements in risk and safety assessments, and the training of service providers.

The bill will allow Guam the opportunity to apply for family resource grants and adoption opportunities grants authorized in this legislation. We can be more effective if we consolidate a number of broad-based networks of child abuse and prevention programs, family support programs, foster care and adoption initiatives. This bill expands the current program and facilitates the collaboration necessary to maximize resources.

Our children are our most important resources. We need to guarantee them a safe haven when threatened or harmed. We need to reassure children at risk that their safety net is strong and viable. And we need to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect. The bill passed by the Congress today moves us in the right direction.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 919, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act Amendments, better known as CAPTA.

BICAMERAL, BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR REFORMS

This Congress has already adopted CAPTA reforms several times, as part of welfare reform legislation. However, for technical reasons, CAPTA reforms were deleted from the welfare reform package enacted by Congress and signed into law by the President. Thus, the Senate adopted S. 919. We take it up today, having negotiated additional improvements with both parties and both Houses of Congress.

THE NEED FOR BETTER CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

Since 1974, CAPTA has provided States a framework to follow with respect to child protective services. Unfortunately, child abuse continues to increase. The latest studies show reports of child abuse and neglect have doubled in the United States, from 1.4 million cases in 1986 to 2.8 million in 1993.

This is nothing less than a national tragedy. We can and must take action. We do, through this bill. Let me identify just a few improvements we are making in CAPTA to fight the epidemic of child abuse and neglect.

We are providing expanded adoption opportunities for babies who have been abandoned. This follows our previous work in this Congress to expand the adoption tax credit.

We are providing greater protection so that children will not be put back into homes where parents have been convicted of terrible acts against their own children.

We are providing new and expanded roles for private citizens in the area of child abuse and neglect.

In an area we heard a great deal about in my subcommittee hearings, this bill ensures that persons who maliciously file reports of abuse will no longer be protected by CAPTA's immunity for reporting. Under our bill, only goodfaith reports will be protected.

And we are simplifying the administration of the CAPTA program at the State and local levels.

There is much, much more in this bill that is in the best interests of America's children. Every American must take a stand that child abuse is wrong. We must stop this plague of child abuse on our land. Our bipartisan CAPTA reforms cannot stop child abuse; they give help to those people who can.

I thank Chairman GOODLING for his outstanding leadership on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support S. 919 as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 919, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 919, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act Amendments of 1996.

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

There was no objection.

PROFESSIONAL BOXING SAFETY ACT OF 1996

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4167) to provide for the safety of journeymen boxers, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4167

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 "Professional Boxing Safety Act of 1996".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) **BOXER.**—The term "boxer" means an individual who fights in a professional boxing match.

(2) **BOXING COMMISSION.**—(A) The term "boxing commission" means an entity authorized under State law to regulate professional boxing matches.

(3) **BOXER REGISTRY.**—The term "boxer registry" means any entity certified by the Association of Boxing Commissions for the purposes of maintaining records and identification of boxers.

(4) **LICENSEE.**—The term "licensee" means an individual who serves as a trainer, second, or cut man for a boxer.

(5) **MANAGER.**—The term "manager" means a person who receives compensation for service as an agent or representative of a boxer.

(6) **MATCHMAKER.**—The term "matchmaker" means a person that proposes, selects, and arranges the boxers to participate in a professional boxing match.

(7) **PHYSICIAN.**—The term "physician" means a doctor of medicine legally authorized to practice medicine by the State in which the physician performs such function or action.

(8) **PROFESSIONAL BOXING MATCH.**—The term "professional boxing match" means a boxing contest held in the United States between individuals for financial compensation. Such term does not include a boxing contest that is regulated by an amateur sports organization.

(9) **PROMOTER.**—The term "promoter" means the person primarily responsible for organizing, promoting, and producing a professional boxing match.

(10) **STATE.**—The term "State" means each of the 50 States, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to improve and expand the system of safety precautions that protects the welfare of professional boxers; and

(2) to assist State boxing commissions to provide proper oversight for the professional boxing industry in the United States.

SEC. 4. BOXING MATCHES IN STATES WITHOUT BOXING COMMISSIONS.

No person may arrange, promote, organize, produce, or fight in a professional boxing

match held in a State that does not have a boxing commission unless the match is supervised by a boxing commission from another State and subject to the most recent version of the recommended regulatory guidelines certified and published by the Association of Boxing Commissions as well as any additional relevant professional boxing regulations and requirements of such other State.

SEC. 5. SAFETY STANDARDS.

No person may arrange, promote, organize, produce, or fight in a professional boxing match without meeting each of the following requirements or an alternative requirement in effect under regulations of a boxing commission that provides equivalent protection of the health and safety of boxers:

(1) A physical examination of each boxer by a physician certifying whether or not the boxer is physically fit to safely compete, copies of which must be provided to the boxing commission.

(2) Except as otherwise expressly provided under regulation of a boxing commission promulgated subsequent to the enactment of this Act, an ambulance or medical personnel with appropriate resuscitation equipment continuously present on site.

(3) A physician continuously present at ringside.

(4) Health insurance for each boxer to provide medical coverage for any injuries sustained in the match.

SEC. 6. REGISTRATION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Each boxer shall register with—

(1) the boxing commission of the State in which such boxer resides; or

(2) in the case of a boxer who is a resident of a foreign country, or a State in which there is no boxing commission, the boxing commission of any State that has such a commission.

(b) IDENTIFICATION CARD.—

(1) ISSUANCE.—A boxing commission shall issue to each professional boxer who registers in accordance with subsection (a), an identification card that contains each of the following:

(A) A recent photograph of the boxer.

(B) The social security number of the boxer (or, in the case of a foreign boxer, any similar citizen identification number or professional boxer number from the country of residence of the boxer).

(C) A personal identification number assigned to the boxer by a boxing registry.

(2) RENEWAL.—Each professional boxer shall renew his or her identification card at least once every 2 years.

(3) PRESENTATION.—Each professional boxer shall present his or her identification card to the appropriate boxing commission not later than the time of the weigh-in for a professional boxing match.

SEC. 7. REVIEW.

(a) PROCEDURES.—Each boxing commission shall establish each of the following procedures:

(1) Procedures to evaluate the professional records and physician's certification of each boxer participating in a professional boxing match in the State, and to deny authorization for a boxer to fight where appropriate.

(2) Procedures to ensure that, except as provided in subsection (b), no boxer is permitted to box while under suspension from any boxing commission due to—

(A) a recent knockout or series of consecutive losses;

(B) an injury, requirement for a medical procedure, or physician denial of certification;

(C) failure of a drug test; or

(D) the use of false aliases, or falsifying, or attempting to falsify, official identification cards or documents.

(3) Procedures to review a suspension where appealed by a boxer, including an opportunity for a boxer to present contradictory evidence.

(4) Procedures to revoke a suspension where a boxer—

(A) was suspended under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2) of this subsection, and has furnished further proof of a sufficiently improved medical or physical condition; or

(B) furnishes proof under subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (2) that a suspension was not, or is no longer, merited by the facts.

(b) SUSPENSION IN ANOTHER STATE.—A boxing commission may allow a boxer who is under suspension in any State to participate in a professional boxing match—

(1) for any reason other than those listed in subsection (a) if such commission notifies in writing and consults with the designated official of the suspending State's boxing commission prior to the grant of approval for such individual to participate in that professional boxing match; or

(2) if the boxer appeals to the Association of Boxing Commissions, and the Association of Boxing Commissions determines that the suspension of such boxer was without sufficient grounds, for an improper purpose, or not related to the health and safety of the boxer or the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 8. REPORTING.

Not later than 48 business hours after the conclusion of a professional boxing match, the supervising boxing commission shall report the results of such boxing match and any related suspensions to each boxer registry.

SEC. 9. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.

No member or employee of a boxing commission, no person who administers or enforces State boxing laws, and no member of the Association of Boxing Commissions may belong to, contract with, or receive any compensation from, any person who sanctions, arranges, or promotes professional boxing matches or who otherwise has a financial interest in an active boxer currently registered with a boxer registry. For purposes of this section, the term "compensation" does not include funds held in escrow for payment to another person in connection with a professional boxing match. The prohibition set forth in this section shall not apply to any contract entered into, or any reasonable compensation received, by a boxing commission to supervise a professional boxing match in another State as described in section 4.

SEC. 10. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) INJUNCTIONS.—Whenever the Attorney General of the United States has reasonable cause to believe that a person is engaged in a violation of this Act, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate district court of the United States requesting such relief, including a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, against the person, as the Attorney General determines to be necessary to restrain the person from continuing to engage in, sanction, promote, or otherwise participate in a professional boxing match in violation of this Act.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—

(1) MANAGERS, PROMOTERS, MATCHMAKERS, AND LICENSEES.—Any manager, promoter, matchmaker, and licensee who knowingly violates, or coerces or causes any other person to violate, any provision of this Act shall, upon conviction, be imprisoned for not more than 1 year or fined not more than \$20,000, or both.

(2) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—Any member or employee of a boxing commission, any person who administers or enforces State boxing laws, and any member of the Association

of Boxing Commissions who knowingly violates section 9 of this Act shall, upon conviction, be imprisoned for not more than 1 year or fined not more than \$20,000, or both.

(3) BOXERS.—Any boxer who knowingly violates any provision of this Act shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$1,000.

SEC. 11. NOTIFICATION OF SUPERVISING BOXING COMMISSION.

Each promoter who intends to hold a professional boxing match in a State that does not have a boxing commission shall, not later than 14 days before the intended date of that match, provide written notification to the supervising boxing commission designated under section 4. Such notification shall contain each of the following:

(1) Assurances that, with respect to that professional boxing match, all applicable requirements of this Act will be met.

(2) The name of any person who, at the time of the submission of the notification—

(A) is under suspension from a boxing commission; and

(B) will be involved in organizing or participating in the event.

(3) For any individual listed under paragraph (2), the identity of the boxing commission that issued the suspension described in paragraph (2)(A).

SEC. 12. STUDIES.

(a) PENSION.—The Secretary of Labor shall conduct a study on the feasibility and cost of a national pension system for boxers, including potential funding sources.

(b) HEALTH, SAFETY AND EQUIPMENT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study to develop recommendations for health, safety, and equipment standards for boxers and for professional boxing matches.

(c) REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall submit a report to the Congress on the findings of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a). Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report to the Congress on the findings of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (b).

SEC. 13. PROFESSIONAL BOXING MATCHES CONDUCTED ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term "Indian tribe" has the same meaning as in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)).

(2) RESERVATION.—The term "reservation" means the geographically defined area over which a tribal organization exercises governmental jurisdiction.

(3) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term "tribal organization" has the same meaning as in section 4(l) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(l)).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a tribal organization of an Indian tribe may, upon the initiative of the tribal organization—

(A) regulate professional boxing matches held within the reservation under the jurisdiction of that tribal organization; and

(B) carry out that regulation or enter into a contract with a boxing commission to carry out that regulation.

(2) STANDARDS AND LICENSING.—If a tribal organization regulates professional boxing matches pursuant to paragraph (1), the tribal organization shall, by tribal ordinance or resolution, establish and provide for the implementation of health and safety standards, licensing requirements, and other requirements relating to the conduct of professional

boxing matches that are at least as restrictive as—

(A) the otherwise applicable standards and requirements of a State in which the reservation is located; or

(B) the most recently published version of the recommended regulatory guidelines certified and published by the Association of Boxing Commissions.

SEC. 14. RELATIONSHIP WITH STATE LAW.

Nothing in this Act shall prohibit a State from adopting or enforcing supplemental or more stringent laws or regulations not inconsistent with this Act, or criminal, civil, or administrative fines for violations of such laws or regulations.

SEC. 15. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1997, except as follows:

(1) Section 9 shall not apply to an otherwise authorized boxing commission in the Commonwealth of Virginia until July 1, 1998.

(2) Sections 5 through 9 shall take effect on July 1, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

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

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4167, the Professional Boxing Safety Act.

This bill represents months of bipartisan, bi-committee, and bicameral negotiations. Its primary purpose is to establish a State and privately run system for licensing professional boxers.

H.R. 4167 is identical to H.R. 1186, which was marked up by the Committee on Commerce on September 18, and reported to the full House on September 24, 1996. Since the provisions of the bills are identical, it is the intent of the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities that the Committee on Commerce report on H.R. 1186 should serve as the legislative history governing the interpretation of H.R. 4167.

I include for the RECORD a memorandum of understanding between Chairman BLILEY and Chairman GOODLING on this point.

The memorandum referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 25, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are writing regarding the jurisdiction and legislative history of H.R. 4167, the Professional Boxing Safety Act, which has been introduced today by Rep. Pat Williams and Rep. Michael G. Oxley and referred to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and in addition to the Committee on Commerce and H.R. 1186, the Professional Boxing Safety Act, which was referred to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and in addition to the Committee on Commerce. After negotiations between the two

Committees, H.R. 1186 was favorably reported from the Committee on Commerce and agreed to be considered under suspension of the House Rules.

Subsequently and in honor of the retirement of Rep. Pat Williams, our friend and colleague, Rep. Williams introduced H.R. 4167, Professional Boxing Safety Act, which is identical to the Commerce Committee reported bill to H.R. 1186 and we have agreed to consider this bill in lieu of consideration of H.R. 1186. We now agree that the legislative history of H.R. 1186 should be deemed part of the legislative history of H.R. 4167, Professional Boxing Safety Act and that the jurisdiction of the two Committees should not be prejudiced by any of these events.

Sincerely,

BILL GOODLING,
Chairman, Committee
on Economic and
Educational Oppor-
tunities.

THOMAS J. BLILEY,
Chairman, Committee
on Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, when people think of professional boxing they imagine the multi-million dollar fight with Mike Tyson or George Foreman or Tim Witherspoon in the corner. But the vast majority of professional matches are between two little known boxers, fighting for less than \$100 per round, who are often intentionally mismatched to provide the crowd with a spectacle of gore.

Unlike every other major American sport, there is no merit system in boxing for advancing to a title. Sanctioning bodies are controlled by promoters with their own agendas. Even the officials who regulate boxing through the State commissions often have personal financial interest and involvement in their own pet fighters. With fraud and corruption allowed to run rampant in boxing, it's no wonder that we've had so many boxers left penniless, with severe medical injuries, forced to depend for health care and survival on the backs of the Federal taxpayers. Boxing needs reform, and it needs it now.

This bill is not something dreamed up by Washington bureaucrats to be imposed on the States. Rather, these reforms have been specifically requested and actively supported by State boxing commissions around the country.

Commissioner after commissioner has complained to us that State suspensions are flouted by boxers who hop from town to town fighting under different names, ignoring failed drug tests and medical injuries, ultimately leaving Federal health care and welfare programs to pick up the tab after their bodies have broken down.

So long as there are no uniform licensing procedures for reviewing, honoring, and appealing commission authorized suspensions, States will remain powerless to enforce their own health and safety regulations, with the taxpayers losing out as the result.

This bill requires that no professional boxing match be held without the approval of a State authorized commission. The commission may be public or private, and no State is re-

quired under this bill to establish a commission. If a State chooses not to get involved in regulating boxing, then the promoter of a fight is allowed to contract with an authorized boxing commission of any other State to come in and supervise a fight.

This bill is not a cure-all for every problem that boxing faces. But it is a huge step in the right direction. It enacts strict conflict of interest provisions, establishes minimum protections for boxers, and empowers States to enforce their own suspensions.

I recognize that many of my colleagues believe that this compromise goes too far, while others feel it does not go far enough to involve the Federal Government in helping the States regulate professional boxing. But after decades of legislative neglect, professional boxing needs uniform State supervision before it can clean up its act. This is a good bill, a good compromise, and a much needed reform.

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

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] be permitted to control one-half of the time on this side.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of H.R. 4167. This is the same bill that was reported out of the Committee on Commerce last Wednesday, and it is a product of bipartisan cooperation among members of both the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

I would like to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], for their hard work in moving this bill forward.

In addition, negotiations on the bill have included Senators MCCAIN and BRYAN, who demonstrated significant commitment to gaining consensus on the bill, enabling us to bring this legislation to the House floor today. By passing H.R. 4167, the House will take a positive step forward toward correcting some of the most negative aspects associated with the boxing industry.

Mr. Speaker, Members in the House have long considered legislation to improve the sport of boxing. Early hearings and discussions of problems in the industry date back to the 1960's and since that time, various proposals have been promoted in an effort to address some of the more persistent and destructive problems with the sport.

I would like to recognize a number of my colleagues in the House, in particular, Representatives BILL RICHARDSON, RALPH HALL, and MAJOR OWENS, who have dedicated significant time and energy over the years in support of legislation to regulate the boxing industry. Their leadership on this issue has helped educate and motivate members on both sides of the aisle, enabling us to at last reach agreement on legislation at this time. While the bill before us today is perhaps more minimal in scope than my colleagues would prefer, it does include a number of provisions that should satisfy some of their long-term interests in seeing improvements made by the boxing industry.

The purpose of this bill should not surprise many. Numerous problems associated with the sport of boxing are not new, and have proven persistent over many years. Observers of the industry have criticized it for a number of reasons including: inadequate health and safety standards for the athletes; industry corruption; exploitation of the fighters; organized crime influence; and blatant conflict of interest between regulatory and sanctioning bodies. But despite a considerable amount of congressional scrutiny and various legislative proposals, no specific Federal law dealing with professional boxing has been enacted. By passing H.R. 4167 today, the House can improve this record.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, the bill before us was crafted with bipartisan cooperation in both bodies. It is a good bill that addresses many of the most distressing problems in the sport of boxing. In particular, H.R. 4167 includes a provision which will put an end to conflicts of interest between regulatory and sanctioning bodies in the industry. In addition, the bill includes minimum health and safety requirements to better protect boxers and expands the State oversight role of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, we could probably go further in our efforts to regulate the boxing industry and clean up more problems which surely exist in some quarters of the sport. However, I believe this legislation will yield some positive changes in the industry and the House should be proud to adopt it. As a cosponsor of the bill and ranking minority member of the Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee, I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] for his strong work in this area for a number of years, working to get a bill passed. I think we are just about there. We would not have been there without the efforts of the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my

good friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials of the Committee on Commerce, for his kindness in yielding time to me. If he should need more time, and I am controlling 10 minutes, I will yield it back to him, but for now I will use his time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my Republican colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], and over on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], for their kindness in bringing this bill forward and allowing me to be the prime sponsor of it.

Without their generosity, Mr. Speaker, it may have been that I would not have been able to gain this recognition, deserved or not, for 18 years of work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it was not 18 years but 35 years ago that the first proposal to reform the sport of boxing was introduced. It was done so by then Senator Estes Kefauver of Tennessee. That legislation was aimed at trying to prevent what Senator Kefauver then believed was mob control of the sport. His legislation would have set up a commission under the Department of Justice to investigate fights. That legislation was not passed, and since that time there have been many attempts to resurrect the issue and reform the "sweet science."

The issue lay dormant until early in the 1970's, when then Congressman Van Derling wanted to regulate television's influence on the sport under the Federal Communications Commission. Later, former Congressman Ed Beard wanted to establish a Federal boxing commission. None of these efforts were successful.

Then I and some others came on the scene in 1979, and with the House Committee on Labor held several days of hearings on the safety of the sport and possible avenues of reform, and we approached it as a matter of protecting workers in their workplace. The workers are fighters. Their workplace is the ring.

□ 2100

Those hearings opened 18 years of discussion and more than a dozen bills aimed at the setting of minimum health and safety standards for boxing. But even those efforts, until tonight, fell short, primarily for two reasons. One was the difficult job of reassuring folks in the sport of boxing that minimum standards are indeed in the fighter's best interest, and the second reason was in setting just the right balance between State commissions and any Federal assistance.

The bill before us today is the product of all those years of congressional

and public discussion and debate. Because of continual scandal and increasing fan disillusionment—and I am a fan—the sport has long ago, I think, been convinced that minimum health and safety standards are necessary if boxing is to prosper and fighters are to be protected.

This legislation before us tonight leaves the regulation of boxing with the State commissions, and it sets a basic code of conduct and minimum health and safety standards to assist the State commissions in the protection of fighters in their workplace, the ring.

One of the most important provisions in this legislation is the establishment of a boxer passport system. This provision will essentially prevent a fighter who is knocked out in one State and then changes his name and fights under the false name in another State the next night, even though the boxer himself is physically at risk. A passport system will stop that terrible practice.

I must say I think that potentially the weakest provision in the bill is the definition of how a State boxing commission should be organized. The legislation allows States to privatize their commissions. We may find that that move toward privatized commissions is a mistake. However, I also believe that the conflict of interest provisions of the bill will mean that there will be little chance for boxing ranking organizations or promoters to capture control of these privatized commissions.

This legislation gives the States the chance to bring the sport of boxing under control, and I am certain that the existing State commissions are up to the task. The legislation is, in fact, simply an attempt by the Congress of the United States to provide for those athletes who labor in the ring the basic worker protections that the United States provides for all other workers in their workplace. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Finally, I again want to thank Chairman OXLEY and my colleagues and friends on the Republican side for their generosity in allowing H.R. 4167, the bill which I have sponsored along with Chairman OXLEY and Congressman MANTON, to come before us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of H.R. 4167. I have worked on this issue for 18 years and I want to thank my colleagues on the Economic Opportunities and Commerce Committees for their work and assistance on this legislation and I urge your support for my bill.

It was 35 years ago that the first proposal to reform the sport of boxing was introduced by then Senator Estes Kefauver. This legislation was aimed at the stopping of mob control of the sport and set up a commission under the Department of Justice to investigate any illegal fights. That legislation was not passed and since that time there has been many attempts to resurrect this issue and reform the "sweet science."

In the 1970's Congressman Van Derling wanted to regulate television's influence on the sport under the Federal Communication

Commission and Congressman Beard wanted to establish a Federal boxing commission under the Department of Labor. None of these efforts was successful and in 1979 our House Labor Committee held several days of hearings on the safety of the sport and possible avenues of reform. These hearings opened 18 years of discussion and more than a dozen bills aimed at the setting of minimum health and safety standards for boxers. These bills all fell short primarily for two reasons: one was the difficult job of reassuring folks in the sport of boxing that minimum standards are in the sport's best interest, and the second reason was in setting just the right balance between State commissions and any Federal assistance.

The bill before us today is the product of all those years of discussion and debate. Because of continual scandal and increasing fan disillusionment, the sport and its fans have long ago been convinced that minimum health and safety standards were absolutely necessary if the sport was to prosper and fighters be protected, and during those years the State boxing commissions have their own standards and professional organizations. This legislation leaves the regulation of boxing with the State commissions, and it sets a basic code of conduct and minimum health and safety standards to assist those commissions in the protection of fighters in their workplace—the ring.

One of the most important provisions in this legislation is the establishment of the boxer passport system. This provision will essentially stop a fighter from being knocked out in one State and then changing names and fighting in another State even though they are physically at risk. This legislation sets basic safety standards for any fight, and it also carries a provision that will have the appropriate Federal agencies conduct a study of what minimum health and safety provisions should include and also how the sport might provide a basic pension system. This study will be presented to the next Congress to consider strengthening the mandatory requirements of the bill.

The weakest provision in the bill is the definition of how a State boxing commission should be organized. This legislation allows States to privatize their commissions. We may find that the move toward privatized commissions is a mistake. However, I also believe that the conflict of interest provisions of the bill will mean that there will be little chance for boxing ranking organizations or promoters to capture control of key commissions—even under privatization. I want to commend my colleagues on the Commerce Committee for their effort on this provision. I believe that as the State commissions are strengthened then there will be less reason for States to consider privatization.

This legislation gives the States the chance to bring the sport of boxing under control and I am certain that the existing commissions will be up to the task, with our assistance. If we do not take this action today, or if the States do not live up to the challenge, then I believe we will see the continued downward spiral of both the sport and fan confidence.

This legislation is, in fact, simply an attempt to provide for folks who labor in the ring the basic worker protections we provide for almost all other workers. The decentralized nature of the sport has promoted minimum regulation because those States that enforce strict standards simply lose future fights. This flaw has

denied fighters basic protections and the result has been needless injury and death.

The House of Representatives has passed reforms one other time—only to have the bill die in the Senate. Senator MCCAIN has worked tirelessly on this legislation and is in agreement with the House's bipartisan proposal. Let's not deny fighters these reforms; they are long overdue.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me just again thank the gentleman from Montana for his leadership. As all of you know, this is PAT WILLIAMS' last term, he is retiring, will be leaving Congress after a distinguished number of years here. This is in many ways a tribute to PAT WILLIAMS and his dedicated service here in the Congress. I wanted to point that out to the Members and for the record.

Also, to thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. MANTON, my ranking member; also the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BLILEY, the chairman; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, as well, the ranking member; Senator MCCAIN who had worked so feverishly on this bill; and last, the gentleman from New Mexico, BILL RICHARDSON, who has had an interest in this issue and was one of those I had mentioned that wanted to go further with this legislation but was kind enough to work on a compromise with an understanding that we would work together in the next Congress on some other legislation dealing with the boxing issue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a favorable consideration of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would thank our friend and colleague, Senator MCCAIN, who I think, as everyone interested in this bill knows, started the process in this Congress in the Senate and has worked tirelessly, even though a Senator, to help get this bill to the floor of the House tonight. I do not think we would have gotten there without Senator MCCAIN and we are very grateful to him.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Professional Boxing Safety Act of 1996. This legislation establishes minimum health and safety requirements for professional boxers and will improve the ability of State authorized boxing commissions to properly oversee professional boxing matches.

Currently, State athletic commissions have differing policies with regard to boxing. In one State, boxers, promoters, and managers may be required to meet certain standards, while another State may have no requirements or safety and health standards at all. The bill which we are considering today will make it easier for States to share information on suspensions of boxers and will help to ensure that all boxing matches are properly supervised by the appropriate State officials.

I would like to acknowledge the personal interest and hard work of the sponsors of the bill, Representative PAT WILLIAMS and Representative MICHAEL OXLEY. As a colleague of

mine on the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, PAT WILLIAMS' effort over the years with regard to issues in the sport of boxing has helped to focus attention on the seriousness of the problems which exist in the sport and which, hopefully, will be reduced as a result of this legislation. I also appreciate the efforts of the athletic commission in my State of Pennsylvania and their assistance in improving the bill.

H.R. 4167 is identical to H.R. 1186, as reported by the Committee on Commerce on September 18, 1996. H.R. 1186 was introduced by Representative MICHAEL OXLEY on March 9, 1995 and referred to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition, to the Committee on Commerce, which ordered the bill favorably reported by voice vote. Given the impending adjournment and since I support the Commerce Committee reported bill, I saw no reason to slow the legislative process, thus the Committee did not report H.R. 1186 and I intend no prejudice to jurisdiction by these events.

H.R. 4167 is being considered today in lieu of H.R. 1186 and the legislative history which accompanies H.R. 1186 should be deemed to be part of the legislative history of H.R. 4167. The jurisdiction of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Committee on Commerce should not be prejudiced by these events.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4167, the Professional Boxing Safety Act of 1996. But, I want to express some serious reservations that I have with this piece of legislation.

Let me start out by saying thank you to the many people that have worked on professional boxing legislation this year and in the past: Senator MCCAIN; Senators ROTH of Delaware; Bryan of Nevada; DORGAN of North Dakota; PAT WILLIAMS; MAJOR OWENS; TOM MANTON; and Jim Florio.

I would especially like to thank Chairman BLILEY, MIKE OXLEY, and Ranking Member JOHN DINGELL for their work in shepherding this bill through a reluctant Commerce Committee. Finally, I would like to thank Gary Galemore of the Congressional Research Service who has crafted various boxing bill's since 1977.

Since my initial election to the House in 1983, I have associated myself with Congressional efforts to enact meaningful reform that adequately addresses the serious problems that plague the professional boxing world.

Although these efforts were initiated by Senator Estes Kefauver in the 1960s, Congress has been unable to enact meaningful reform. Numerous hearings and investigations have uncovered a world of improprieties that range from the influence of organized crime to atrocious health and safety conditions for professional boxers.

Consider a sport that is heavily influenced by the likes of Don King, a convicted felon who could not testify before congressional committees because he was under a perennial FBI investigation.

The most notable discovery of these investigations is the existence of a haphazard patchwork of state rules governing the sport of boxing. This non-system of health and safety standards endangers the lives of thousands of young men who pursue boxing careers as a form of employment.

Consider a sport that will not allow Tommy Morrison to fight in New York because he has tested HIV positive, yet Morrison can go to another State that has no testing requirements and fight.

Boxing enthusiasts both in Congress and in the industry have agreed that legislation should require some form of Federal oversight to properly implement health and safety standards.

Let me make some points to my colleagues who argue that Congress has no role in the affairs of boxing. The provisions of the McCain-Oxley bill fit comfortably under the broad reach of the Commerce Clause. The interstate character of the industry has been recognized by the Supreme Court in connection with anti-trust regulation. The Court held that "the promotion of professional championship boxing contests on a multistate basis, coupled with sale of rights to televise, broadcast, and film the contests for interstate transmission" constitutes interstate commerce.

RESERVATIONS WITH THE MCCAIN-OXLEY BILL

Because I believe the McCain-Oxley bill is a good first step—particularly the inclusion of the Dingell amendment—I shall support it. However, I believe the bill comes up short in critical areas. I am afraid that without some degree of Federal oversight the unsavory elements of boxing will retain their influence with state boxing commissions and continue to work their will.

Simply put the bill does not address the main problem with boxing standards: lack of enforcement.

The bill's reliance on U.S. Attorneys to enforce the health and safety provisions is an extraordinary leap of faith on the part of this Congress. However, I commend the bill's authors for their efforts to include provisions designed to increase the interaction of state boxing officials and local law enforcement.

Without specific enforcement mechanisms designed to administer the legislation's new standards, we are forced to rely on state boxing commissions to police the sport. If we have learned anything since Estes Kefauver first began investigating boxing, it is that state boxing commissions—with several notable exceptions like New York and Nevada—are incapable, unwilling, or deliberately choosing not to enforce their own rules.

While I recognize the political constraints of enacting boxing legislation, I still feel that we will need to provide some legitimizing entity that allows honorable boxing interests to take the reins and lead the boxing industry to eventual self-regulation. We need to motivate the industry to clean up its own house.

I have maintained all along that this is the bill that Don King supports because it will put to rest the annual congressional review of the boxing industry. But I have retained assurances from Senator McCain that Congress will not abandon this issue. We intend to monitor the effectiveness of this bill and if necessary will craft further legislation to right the wrongs that plague the boxing industry.

I have received assurances that my concerns will receive scrutiny either from a General Accounting Office [GAO] study, a President Commission on boxing, or both.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in issuing a challenge to the State Boxing Commissioners: Clean up the sport, or Congress will.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the McCain-Oxley legislation because it makes headway in two important areas.

First, this bill takes the important step of creating minimal Federal health and safety standards. This will send an important signal to the boxing industry that certain standards have to be met in order to conduct a match. Most importantly, this will set precedent in getting Congress involved in a serious matter that has for too long been overlooked.

Second, the bill includes a provision crafted by Ranking Member Dingell that will prohibit the numerous conflicts of interest that permeate the relationship of regulators and those regulated. I sincerely believe that this provision will go a long way in cleaning up the less-than-reputable business relationships that have damaged the integrity of the sport.

I am supporting this measure because I love the sport of boxing. Let me again say that this is the best bill that Congress can enact. But you can be sure that—unless real reform becomes apparent to Congress—this is not the last round of this fight.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the House Commerce Committee has a long history of investigating problems in professional boxing. Since 1965, the committee has held numerous hearings and considered a broad array of legislation in this area. Over the years, persistent allegations of serious improprieties have plagued professional boxing, including: First, inadequate health and safety protections for boxers; second, organized crime influence; third, boxer exploitation; fourth, fan deception, such as mismatches and fixed contests; fifth, blatant conflicts of interest between regulators and those who promote and arrange matches; sixth, market monopolization; seventh, the industry's inability to police itself; and eighth, the inadequacy of existing regulation at the State and local levels. Despite a variety of efforts, no law has been enacted to date.

During the past few weeks, Representative MANTON and I have worked with Chairmen BLILEY and OXLEY, Representative WILLIAMS, Senators MCCAIN and BRYAN, and with others, to seek a consensus on this legislation. Last week, the Commerce Committee reported the same bill we are considering today by voice vote. I believe this compromise represents a positive step forward in trying to address some of the most egregious problems in the boxing industry.

In particular, I support the bill because it includes a provision that prohibits State boxing regulators from contracting with, belonging to, or receiving compensation from the boxing organizations they are charged with regulating. This should help address conflicts of interest between State regulators and the industry. It will not clean up all problems in the industry. But it is a positive step. It will lend credibility to State regulatory activities and prohibit incestuous relationships that too many State officials have developed with the boxing industry.

There are those who argue the bill does not go far enough and others who argue it goes too far. On balance, I believe the bill represents a sound bipartisan compromise that will strengthen State regulatory activities and promote improved health and safety standards.

I want to single out two Members for their contributions and leadership in this area. First, I commend our colleague, Mr. RICHARDSON. Over the years, he has authored several bills to improve oversight and regulation of the boxing industry. I understand his concerns that this bill does not go as far as he would prefer. Despite his misgivings, Mr. RICHARDSON has

continued to be a constructive force in forging this bipartisan compromise. His efforts are greatly appreciated.

Second, I commend my good friend from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], the sponsor of this legislation. He has made many lasting contributions to the debate in this particular area. Unfortunately, he has announced his retirement at the end of this Congress. All of us will miss the leadership he has exhibited during his distinguished tenure in this body on this bill and, more importantly, on many other issues of national concern.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation and yield back the time of my balance.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4167.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 640, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1996

Mr. BOEHLERT submitted the following conference report and statement on the Senate bill (S. 640) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPORT. 104-843)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 640), to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Development Act of 1996".

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—

Sec. 1. *Short title; table of contents.*

Sec. 2. *Definition.*

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Sec. 101. *Project authorizations.*

Sec. 102. *Small flood control projects.*

Sec. 103. *Small bank stabilization projects.*

Sec. 104. *Small navigation projects.*

Sec. 105. *Small shoreline protection projects.*

Sec. 106. *Small snagging and sediment removal project, Mississippi River, Little Falls, Minnesota.*