By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. BOND):

S. 1715. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for adoption expenses, to allow penalty-free IRA withdrawals for adoption expenses, and to allow tax-free treatment for employer provided adoption assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. COATS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BOND, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 1716. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the adolescent family life program, provide for abstinence education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S.J. Res. 53. A joint resolution making corrections to Public Law 104-134; read twice.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 1711. A bill to establish a commission to evaluate the programs of the Federal Government that assist members of the Armed Forces and veterans in readjusting to civilian life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE LEGISLATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce legislation establishing a commission to review the various programs administered by the Federal Government to assist service members transitioning from military to civilian life.

CURRENT SYSTEM LACKS COORDINATION

Currently, several Federal departments and agencies offer programs to assist military men and women, veterans and reserve component members in their transition back to civilian life. Offices in the Departments of Defense, Veterans Affairs, Labor, and others, sponsor programs offering such services as education assistance, job-training, job placement, and home loans. These are all useful and valuable services. However, changes in the labor market are challenging today's veteran readjustment programs. Unemployment rates for recently separated veterans may be as high as 17 percent, compared with a national average of about 5.7 percent. This is extremely troubling when one stops to think about the experience, discipline, and work ethic veterans bring to the workplace.

By better focusing these resources, we can make the existing programs more accessible to a greater number of veterans; we can streamline programs and make them more user-friendly; we can minimize overlap and improve cost-effectiveness. That would be a big improvement over the current situation, and would ultimately better serve our service men and women.

Let me emphasize, the purpose of this commission is not to create new programs and make a large bureaucracy. Rather it is to review the range of existing programs and determine how we can better coordinate our efforts on behalf of veterans. Both the House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees, as well as several veterans service organizations support this concept and agree that such a review is both appropriate and timely. There is real opportunity here to repeat the success of General Bradley's 1955 commission, which make significant improvements in transition programs with fresh concepts and approaches.

IMPROVED SERVICE TO VETERANS

In my view, establishing this commission is the first step toward providing more accessible and more practical assistance to service members who are facing fundamental changes in their personal and professional lives. These are brave men and women who committed precious years of their lives to defending their Nation. Now they are ready and willing to become productive members of their civilian communities. It is my hope that this legislation will help these very deserving individuals make better use of the opportunities and resources available to them.

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. 1711

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

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission to be known as the Commission on Service Members and Veterans Transition Assistance (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Commission'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members appointed from among private United States citizens with appropriate and diverse veterans, military, organizational, and management experiences and historical perspectives, of whom—

(A) four shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate, in consultation with the Ranking Member of that committee;

(B) four shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Ranking Member of that committee;

(C) two shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, in consultation with the Ranking Member of that committee; and

(D) two shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Ranking Member of that committee.

(2) VSO MEMBERS.—One member of the Commission appointed under each of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall be a representative of a veterans service organization.

(3) DATE.—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold its first meeting.

(e) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(f) CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN.—The Commission shall select a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members.

(g) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

(h) PANELS.—The Commission may establish panels composed of less than the full membership of the Commission for the purpose of carrying out the Commission's duties under this Act. The actions of such panels shall be subject to the review and control of the Commission. Any findings and determinations made by such a panel shall not be considered the findings and determinations of the Commission unless approved by the Commission.

(i) AUTHORITY OF INDIVIDUALS TO ACT FOR COMMISSION.—Any member or agent of the Commission may, if authorized by the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take under this Act.

SEC. 2. DUTIES OF COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall—

(1) review the efficacy and appropriateness of veterans transition and assistance programs in providing assistance to members of the Armed Forces in making the transition and adjustment to civilian life upon their separation from the Armed Forces and in providing assistance to veterans in adjusting to civilian life;

(2) evaluate proposals for improving such programs, including proposals to consolidate, streamline, and enhance the provision of such assistance and proposals for alternative means of providing such assistance; and

(3) make recommendations to Congress regarding means of ensuring the continuing utility of such programs and assistance and of otherwise improving such programs and the provision of such assistance.

(b) REVIEW OF PROGRAMS TO ASSIST MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AT SEPARATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—While carrying out the general duties specified in subsection (a), the members of the Commission appointed under subparagraphs (C) and (D) of section 1(b)(1) shall review primarily programs intended to assist members of the Armed Forces at the time of their separation from service in the Armed Forces, including programs designed to assist families of such members in preparing for the transition of such members from military life to civilian life and to facilitate that transition.

(2) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the review, such members of the Commission shall determine—

(A) the adequacy of the programs referred to in paragraph (1) for their purposes;

(B) the adequacy of the support of the Armed Forces for such programs;

(C) the effect, if any, of the existence of such programs on combat readiness;

(D) the extent to which such programs provide members of the Armed Forces with job-search skills;

(E) the extent to which such programs prepare such members for employment in the private sector and in the public sector;

(F) the effectiveness of such programs in assisting such members in finding employment in the public sector; and

(G) the means by which such programs could be improved in order to assist such members in securing meaningful employment in the private sector upon their separation from service.

(c) REVIEW OF PROGRAMS TO ASSIST VETERANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—While carrying out the general duties specified in subsection (a), the members of the Commission appointed under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1(b)(1) shall review primarily the adequacy of programs intended to assist veterans (including disabled veterans, homeless veterans, and economically disadvantaged veterans), including the programs referred to in paragraph (2).

(2) COVERED PROGRAMS.—The programs referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) Educational assistance programs.

(B) Job counseling, job training, and job placement services programs.

(C) Rehabilitation and training programs.

(D) Housing loan programs.

(E) Small business loan and small business assistance programs.

(F) Employment and employment training programs for employment in the public sector and the private sector.

(G) Federal Government personnel policies (including veterans' preference policies) and the enforcement of such policies.

(H) Programs that prepare the families of veterans for their transition from military life to civilian life and facilitate that transition.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) IMPLEMENTING PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services of the Senate and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and National Security of the House of Representatives a report setting forth a plan for the work of the Commission. The Commission shall develop the plan in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the heads of other appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the first meeting of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the committees referred to in paragraph (1), and to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Education, a report setting forth the activities, findings, and recommendations of the Commission, including any recommendations for legislative action and administrative action as the Commission considers appropriate.

(B) EXECUTIVE COMMENT.—Not later than 90 days after receiving the report referred to in subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report setting forth the comments of such Secretaries with respect to the report.

SEC. 3. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

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

(b) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and any other department or agency of the Federal Government such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out its duties under this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information expeditiously to the Commission.

SEC. 4. MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(b) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(c) MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, upon the request of the Chairman of the Commission, furnish the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, any administrative and support services as the Commission may require.

SEC. 5. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in performing the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.—

(1) TRAVEL.—Members and personnel of the Commission may travel on military aircraft, military vehicles, or other military conveyances when travel is necessary in the performance of a responsibility of the Commission except when the cost of commercial transportation is less expensive.

(2) EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Commission may, without regard to civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. In appointing an individual as executive director, the Chairman shall, to the maximum extent practicable, attempt to appoint an individual who is a veteran. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The Chairman of the Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(d) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of any department or agency of the Federal Government may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any personnel of the department or agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties.

(e) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Chairman of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

SEC. 6. TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the Commission submits its report under section 2(d)(2).

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term ''veterans transition and assistance program'' means any program of the Federal Government, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Education, the purpose of which is—

(A) to assist, by rehabilitation or other means, members of the Armed Forces in readjusting or otherwise making the transition to civilian life upon their separation from service in the Armed Forces; or

(B) to assist veterans in civilian life.

(2) The term ''members of the Armed Forces'' includes individuals serving in the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(3) The term ''veteran'' has the meaning given such term in section 101(2) of title 38, United States Code.

(4) The term ''veterans service organization'' means any organization covered by section 5902(a) of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 8. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, upon the request of the Chairman of the Commission, make available to the Commission such amounts as the Commission may require to carry out its duties under this Act. The Secretary shall make such amounts available from amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Any sums made available to the Commission under subsection (a) shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until the termination of the Commission.

By Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 1712. A bill to provide incentives to encourage stronger truth in sentencing of violent offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE STOP ALLOWING FELONS EARLY RELEASE ACT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am here today to join with the Senator from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, in introducing a piece of legislation that we call the SAFER Act, the Stop Allowing Felons Early Release Act. I am very pleased to work with Senator CRAIG from Idaho on this piece of legislation. I would like to describe briefly for my colleagues what we intend to do.

Mr. President, many Americans will remember the story that they have read and reread in recent weeks about a child molester in Texas who was convicted after confessing he had sexually abused a 6-year-old boy. This man, who describes himself as a demon, claims he has molested 240 other children and he says to prison authorities that he will continue to do so when he is on the street.

Despite his repeated statements that he will continue to assault children, this prisoner was released recently

after serving 6 years of an 8-year sentence under a mandatory good-time release program. Under Texas law, authorities had no discretion to refuse to grant good-time credits to reduce this particular person's prison sentence. In fact, he is 1 of 1,000 child molesters who will be released from prison early this year.

Some of my colleagues will remember the story of Jonathan Hall, a young boy who was murdered this winter. Jonathan was a 13-year-old boy from Fairfax County, VA, who was stabbed 58 times and thrown into a pond and, apparently, left for dead. When the police discovered him, they found dirt and grass between his fingers. He did not die immediately after having been stabbed 58 times, and he tried to crawl out of this pond. He did not make it, and he died.

The person who allegedly killed Jonathan Hall has a long criminal record. In 1970, he murdered a cab driver. He was put in prison and then released on a work-release program. He kidnaped a woman while on work release and received an additional sentence. He then was convicted of murdering another prisoner. Two murders and a kidnaping, and he was set free on early release to live on the street where a 13-year-old boy named Jonathan Hall was living. Jonathan is dead because a man twice convicted of murder and kidnaping was let out of prison early.

Bettina Pruckmayr, whom I have spoken about before, was a 26-year-old attorney who was beginning her career in Washington, DC. She was abducted in a carjacking, driven to an ATM machine, and fatally stabbed over 30 times by a man who had been convicted previously of rape, armed robbery, and murder. He was on the streets of the District of Columbia legally because he was let out of prison early.

It does not take Sherlock Holmes to know who is going to commit the next violent crime. It is all-too-often someone who has committed a previous violent crime and who has been put in prison and let out early. My colleague from Idaho and I believe that those who commit violent crimes in our country ought to understand one thing: If you commit a violent crime, you are going to finish your entire sentence in a place of incarceration. No more good time, no more early release, no more parole. If you commit a violent crime, this country is determined not to turn murderers, child molesters, rapists and armed robbers back on the streets of our country.

Despite all of the talk about getting tough on crime, we still have an epidemic of violent crime in our country. I would like to use a couple of charts to demonstrate this fact.

There is one violent crime every 17 seconds in our country; one murder every 23 minutes; one forcible rape every 5 minutes; one robbery every 51 seconds; one aggravated assault every 28 seconds. That is what the time clock shows for 1994.

One in three offenders is rearrested for a violent crime within 3 years of being let out of prison. The Justice Department estimates that almost all violent criminals in State prisons are now released early before their term is up, before their sentences are completed.

I have a list of what the States do. Some States say that, if you serve a day, you get a day and a half off. That is why we have a circumstance in our country today where the average time served for murder is just slightly less than 6 years. I am not talking about the sentence; the sentence is longer than that. But we say we cannot afford to keep people locked up, so we put them back on the streets, where they commit more murder, when, in fact, they should not have been in a position to commit another murder. They should still have been in prison.

In 1991, the Bureau of Justice Statistics did a study of State prisons, and they found that 156,000 people were in jail for offenses they had committed while they were on early release from prison for a prior conviction.

Let me say that again because it is important: 156,000 people were in prison for offenses they had committed while they were on parole from a previous conviction.

They should never have been in a position to commit these new offenses, and a good number of which were murders. But we decided as a country to let them out early because we somehow cannot afford to keep them locked up. That does not add up. We have half the people in prison who are nonviolent. We can incarcerate them much less expensively than we now do.

The Senator from Ohio, Senator GLENN, talks about Quonset huts. He said he lived in one for 6 to 8 years while in the Marine Corps. We can use abandoned military facilities to incarcerate, much less expensively, nonviolent offenders and open up tens of thousands of prison cells for violent prisoners. We can put violent prisoners in those cells and say to them, ''You are going to stay in those cells until the end of your term. You are not going to be out raping and murdering other Americans.''

This piece of legislation affects those States that are going to access money from the Federal Government to build new prisons. We say to those States that affirmatively decide as a matter of policy, ''We're going to keep violent criminals locked up for their entire term,'' we want you to be advantaged when it comes to grants. All States will be eligible for this program, but we are saying that we want more money to be available to those States that say, ''It is our policy that violent criminals will spend their entire time in prison.''

The real cost of early release of violent offenders is this: There are 4,820 people in prison who committed murders while they were out on early release.

In other words, we knew who they were. We knew what they did. But we let them out early. When we say ''we,'' I am talking about the State and local justice systems that let them out early because they said, ''We can't afford to keep you in.'' As a result, 4,820 people were murdered, and they should not have lost their lies. Bettina Pruckmayr is one, 13-year-old Jonathan Hall is one. We can read all their names. Every one of these cases is a tragedy because we knew who the perpetrators were. We let them out of prison early. There were 3,899 rapes, 6,238 assaults. That is the real cost of early release.

What is happening to murderers in this country? The average person sentenced for murder in the criminal justice system in this country now, in the State and local court systems, is 34 percent of the sentence and then early release—34 percent of a sentence for murder, and then early release. For kidnaping, offenders have served 40 percent of their time. For robbery, they have served 39 percent of their time. For assault, 37 percent of their time.

My point is, we can do better than that. We can say to people, clearly and deliberately, that if you commit a violent crime, understand this: Society is not going to put you back on the street to murder Jonathan Hall, to murder Bettina Pruckmayr or another person, another innocent person who relies on Governments to prosecute those who commit violent crimes, put them in jail, and keep them in jail.

The Federal system is somewhat different, I am pleased to say. I have been involved in some of that with respect to the crime bill. The Federal Government abolished parole for Federal prisoners in 1984. The 1994 crime bill included a provision that I authored that eliminated automatic good time credits for violent offenders.

But, as you know, 95 percent of the crimes are committed under the State and local jurisdictions. The State and local jurisdictions are involved in almost all of what I have been talking about. In order to do what the American people would expect us to do, we must encourage State and local governments to decide that when they find violent offenders who are committing murders and rapes, and violent assaults, and they sentence them to prison, they must be kept in prison.

We were told that the reason that you have to have good time —and some States give a day, some States nearly 2 days of good time for every day a prisoner serves; so you serve a year and get 2 years off of your sentence—the reason they say you must have good time off for good behavior is to be able to manage violent prisoners.

A Justice Department official told us at a meeting some while ago, he said, ''Well, these young gang-related offenders in prison are so violent that they can't be controlled without incentives.'' The incentive is, ''Look, either you behave and we will give you good time, or you misbehave and we'll take

good time away, and, therefore, you must stay here longer.'' They say these people are so violent they cannot be controlled without the incentive of giving them a reduced sentence.

I guess the question is this: If prisoners are so violent that prison guards and strict prison rules cannot control them—and that is what the Justice Department says—if that is the case, why on Earth would you construct a system that says to those people, ''Behave here, and we'll turn you back to the streets somewhere?'' Why on Earth would we think that advances the criminal justice system in this country?

Senator CRAIG and I are not saying that we ought to run the criminal justice system. It is not what this legislation is about. We are saying, as a Federal Government, we have made some money available for new prison construction and, as a matter of policy, we should use this money as an incentive so those States who will get the most will be those States who decide to construct a policy in which those who commit violent crimes will stay in prison for their entire sentence.

That is our hope. Our hope is that we will advance that kind of public policy. Our hope is that we will save lives. So we will introduce this piece of legislation today in the memory of so many people who have been the victims of violent crimes that should never ever have occurred.

We will introduce this bill in the memory of Bettina Pruckmayr, this young woman who should not have been murdered, because the person who allegedly murdered her was a person we knew was violent, and in the memory of Jonathan Hall, a 13-year-old who happened to live on the street of person who had committed two previous murders and a kidnaping and who was released early from prison.

I hope, Mr. President, that one day soon we will be able to decide that the sentence for murder is the time served for murder. I hope we will no longer tell criminals, ''You get good time off for good behavior. You get early parole if you behave. By the way, we will let you out early.'' I hope that is not the message we will continue to send to those who commit violent crimes in our country.

Again, I am delighted to join my colleague from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, in advancing what I think is a very important policy initiative in asking State and local governments to consider this as a method of achieving the access to Federal funds, and with the maximum capability they can, to build additional prisons and keep violent criminals in jail.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me say how blessed I am to be a cosponsor of the Stop Allowing Felons Early Release Act, known as the SAFER Act. Let me, in a very sincere way, congratulate my colleague from North Dakota for what is a very sensible approach to crimefighting and for his outspoken leadership on this issue.

This bill that he has just outlined for us all this morning would help stop one of the most significant causes of crime in America. It is amazing to me, but it is true by fact and statistic, that the way our criminal justice system is operated today, Mr. President, results in increased crime. We know that a relatively small percentage of our population is responsible for a relatively large percentage of violent crimes.

Study after study has shown that a vast number of violent crimes are State crimes committed by repeat offenders—repeat offenders.

Although there are many causes of violent crime and many factors contributing to our crime rate, it appears that the most immediate and significant is the career criminal. Since that is the cause, we clearly have an opportunity to save lives and prevent crime-related losses by getting the hard-core criminals off the streets and out of our communities.

Even though crime-fighting is primarily a State and local responsibility, as my colleague has referenced, Congress has had endless debates over the best way to protect our citizenry from these dangerous predators. We have explored how crime can be prevented or deterred and how it should be punished. We have looked at better tools to help law enforcement stop criminals. We have provided significant resources for State and local governments to attack crime at its roots.

Many of those efforts have produced success at some level, but what we are finding, however, is all this good work can be undermined by programs of early release and parole that send violent felons back out into our communities to prey again and again on our citizenry.

Senator DORGAN has spoken here in the Senate on the horrifying consequences, citing example after example of these policies. The impact reaches far beyond the victims of repeat criminals, their families and communities. Justice itself is imperiled when punishment is uncertain and unpredictable. We can argue about the value of imprisonment in terms of rehabilitating criminals.

Some even argue about the value of imprisonment in terms of deterring crime. But there can be no serious argument that any rehabilitation or deterrent value is reduced in prison—if prisoners are subject to the revolving door and, as a result of that, become the repeat offenders.

More important, there can be no serious argument that early release programs destroy the most effective outcome of imprisonment: incapacitating the violent criminal by separating him or her from society and the opportunity to commit additional crimes. All too often early release and parole programs are being driven by financial considerations at the State and the local level rather than solid evidence of rehabilitation.

I understand those concerns in my own State of Idaho. Our inmate population is estimated to be increasing at about 27 inmates per month. We will need to double prison space in the next 6 years in my State. It is not necessarily bad for Government to innovate or find cost-conscious alternatives in this area.

Again, my colleague from North Dakota cited some of those for the nonviolent-type criminal or the nonviolent offender. We can find alternative methods of incarceration for them in facilities that are oftentimes already built, that can simply be modified for a new purpose. Clearly, these programs cross the line when they send hard-core violent offenders back to the streets before serving their full sentences.

Congress has established programs at the Federal level that help State and local governments with financial and human resource needs in fighting crime. Among other initiatives, we have provided financial incentive grants to States, to enact truth-in-sentencing laws to ensure that the time actually served by convicted felons reflects the sentences they were given. It just does not make sense to me, and I know it does not make any sense to the taxpayer if we support policies and provide taxpayers dollars that actually increase crime.

The SAFER bill provides an important incentive for States to get rid of the early release program for violent offenders we know will only push the crime rate higher, and the statistics prove it. As long as those programs are on the books, States will only have access to 75 percent of the funds available to them under the truth-in-sentencing programs.

Again, my colleague from North Dakota has outlined how this bill would affect those States. It is important to let those States know that these kinds of policies are no longer acceptable when the Federal tax dollars are involved. Access to full grant amounts would be available to States that eliminate those programs, only dealing with it in the way that we have outlined. If approved by a Governor after a public hearing in which the victims and other members of the public have an opportunity to be heard, then you might look at some consequences for an early release program. There are ways to deal with it in the legislation as set forth. These States would also have access to a portion of the remaining undistributed grant funds.

The SAFER bill is a measured response, strategy, to reducing one of the most significant causes of crime in our society today. I hope my colleagues would join with me and the Senator from North Dakota in what we believe is a very important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, it is not complicated. It is straightforward. It is just a heck of a lot of common sense when you look at the facts and you look at the statistics—hardened criminals are oftentimes repeat offenders. They ought

to stay and do the time. That is what our legislation would require.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has made a compelling statement on this issue. I wanted to make a couple of other observations.

Some have said to me, what about rehabilitation? Should not someone be able to be rehabilitated while in prison? I say that is fine. I am for rehabilitation. But I do not want a circumstance to continue to exist where we know that about 6 percent to 8 percent of the criminals in America commit two-thirds of all the violent criminal acts, and they go through that revolving door to commit new crimes.

We should rehabilitate them, but we should not be in a circumstance in this country where the amount of time served for murder is 5.9 years. What on Earth are we thinking of? We should decide that those people who are career criminals and who kill the people I have described today will go to prison and spend their time in prison until their sentence is complete. That is what this bill is about.

I know people say, ''You are talking tough.'' The fact is, if we do not get tough with that 8 percent of the criminal element who commit most of the violent crimes in this country, the American people are not safe. We make victims of the American people by turning murderers out of prison years and years before their sentences are complete. It is time for us to decide that does not make sense.

We are simply shifting the costs. We shift the costs from those who would be required to pay for a prison cell to those victims and their families who now suffer the consequences of murder, rape, assault, and more.

This is not a regional issue. This is an issue that is national. A woman named Donna Martz, bless her soul, used to bring a tour bus every year to the State capitol. They came to the front steps and we would take a picture. On a quiet Sunday morning, coming out of a hotel in Bismarck, ND, a man and a woman from Pennsylvania on the run from the law, having left jail in Pennsylvania, abducted poor Donna Martz and put her in a trunk. They eventually killed her some days later out in the desert of Nevada.

Violent crime does not respect State boundaries. Victims of violent crime—the violence that is committed by people who have been in prison who we know are violent and who are let out early—are strewn across this country. That is why I am delighted the Senator from Idaho has joined in this legislation. I hope we can make some progress in advancing this in this Congress. I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG. My colleague from North Dakota is right. We are not talking tough. We are not even beginning to talk tough on behalf of the victims. The families that have been destroyed, torn apart by acts of violence of the type that this legislation will be directed toward.

I think the American public expect us to talk tough. If Federal tax dollars are going to be used under the assumption that the communities of our Nation will be safer when those dollars are appropriately spent, then it is our responsibility as Senators that those dollars get well spent.

What we are saying to the States in this instance, if you have a revolving door in your criminal justice system where known hardened criminal repeat offenders are back on the streets, then you are not going to get as much of the Federal dollar as is now available. You have to examine the way you handle these criminals and keep them in and let them do their time. Only under special circumstances where it is clearly evident that rehabilitation has worked and this person can return to society and live a safe and law-abiding life, can they or should they be returned.

I hope that all Senators would take a look at this legislation as we introduce it today. We would certainly hope that all would become cosponsors of it. We think it is responsible and tough when it comes to dealing with the criminal element of our society.

It just does not make sense to use U.S. taxpayer dollars to support policies that might actually increase crime. The SAFER bill provides an important incentive for States to get rid of the early release programs for violent offenders we know will only push the crime rate higher. As long as those programs are on the books, States would only have access to 75 percent of the funds available to them under the Truth in Sentencing Grant Program. Access to full grant amounts would be available to States that eliminate those programs and only allow early release if approved by the Governor after a public hearing in which the victims and other members of the public have an opportunity to be heard. These States would also have access to a portion of the remaining undistributed grant funds.

The SAFER bill is a measured, responsible strategy for reducing one of the most significant causes of crime in our society today. I hope all of our colleagues will join in supporting this bill.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. DORGAN):

S. 1713. A bill to establish a congressional commemorative medal for organ donors and their families; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

THE GIFT OF LIFE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL ACT OF 1996

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I take great pleasure today in introducing the Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act of 1995. I am joined by my colleague Mr. LEVIN in introducing the Senate companion version to Representative STARK's bill. With this legislation, which doesn't cost taxpayers a penny, Congress has the opportunity to recognize and encourage potential donors, and give hope to the 45,120 Americans who have end stage organ disease. As a heart and lung transplant surgeon, I saw one in four of my patients die because of the lack of available donors. Public awareness simply has not kept up with the relatively new science of transplantation. As public servants, we need to do all we can to raise awareness about the gift of life.

Under this bill, each donor or donor family will be eligible to receive a commemorative congressional medal. It is not expected that all families, many of whom wish to remain anonymous, will take advantage of this opportunity. The program will be coordinated by the regional organ procurement organizations [OPOs] and managed by the entity administering the organ procurement and transplantation network. Upon request of the family or individual, a public official will present the medal to the donor or the family. This creates a wonderful opportunity to honor those sharing life through donation and increase public awareness. Some researchers have estimated that it may be possible to increase the number of organ donations by 80 percent through incentive programs and public education.

As several recent experiences have proved, any one of us, or any member of our families, could need a life saving transplant tomorrow. We would then be placed on a waiting list to anxiously await our turn, or our death. The number of people on the list has doubled since 1990 and a new name is added to the list every 18 minutes. However, this official waiting list reflects only those who have been lucky enough to make it into the medical care system and to pass the financial hurdles. If you include all those reaching end stage disease, the number of people potentially needing organs or bone marrow, very likely over 100,000, becomes staggering. Only a small fraction of that number would ever receive transplants, even if they had adequate insurance. There simply are not enough organ and tissue donors, even to meet present demand.

Federal policies surrounding the issue of organ transplantation are difficult. Whenever you deal with whether someone lives or dies, there are no easy answers. There are close to 15,000 and 20,000 potential donors each year, yet inexcusably, there are only some 5,100 actual donors. That is why we need you to help us educate others about the facts surrounding tissue and organ donation.

This year, Mr. President, there has been unprecedented cooperation, on both sides of the aisle, and a growing commitment to awaken public compassion on behalf of those who need organ transplants. It is my very great pleasure to introduce this bill on behalf of a

group of Senators who have already contributed in extremely significant ways to the cause of organ transplantation. And we are proud to ask you to join us, in encouraging people to give life to others.

Mr. DOLE (for Mr. BURNS):

S. 1714. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure the ability of utility providers to establish, improve, operate and maintain utility structures, facilities, and equipment for the benefit, safety, and well-being of consumers, by removing limitations on maximum driving and on-duty time pertaining to utility vehicle operators and drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE UTILITY CONSUMER SERVICE IMPROVEMENT AND PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Utility Consumer Service Improvement and Protection Act of 1996. This legislation would modify a Federal regulation which is unnecessary, burdensome, and which costs millions of dollars each year in return for negligible benefits.

This regulation costs the Government itself hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for the personnel and overhead needed to implement, track, and enforce it. More importantly, it imposes unnecessary costs upon almost every family and business in the United States, due to higher rates imposed on consumers' utilities—electric, telephone, natural gas, water, sewer, garbage disposal, and even cable television. The regulation in question is the Department of Transportation's hours-of-service truck-driving rules as they are applied to the utility industry.

When we examine the hours-of-service truck-driving regulations as applied to public utility service vehicles, there is no evidence that these costly regulations improve public safety or provide any other tangible benefits whatsoever to the American public.

To the contrary, there is significant evidence that these regulations needlessly increase costs and threaten the reliability of basic utility services for average American consumers. By imposing higher costs and reducing the reliability of basic utility services, the DOT regulations themselves pose an increased risk to the health and safety of the public.

In regard to utility vehicles, this hours-of-service regulation is a classic example of a well-intended regulation which simply does far more harm than good—the costs greatly outweigh any potential benefits, and it should be immediately modified to the extent that it applies to the utility service vehicles which are vital to the installation and the maintenance of utility facilities across our country.

DOT over-reacted in issuing its regulations, which limit the number of hours drivers can be on duty at his or her job, and still operate a heavy vehicle. The DOT regulation makes no distinction in the manner in which a vehicle is operated, neither does it recognize and accommodate the purposes for which different kinds of vehicles are operated.

The hours-of-service regulations apply to virtually all drivers of all vehicles which exceed a certain weight, regardless of how the vehicle is actually used. Almost of utility service vehicle owners and drivers are subjected to the regulation, even though they are only driven an average of 50 miles per day.

Many thousands of trucks and motorized heavy equipment units owned by public utility providers exceed the DOT regulatory weight threshold, and are thus subject to the regulations. This directly increases the cost to consumers for basic utility services, and interferes with utility providers in their job of maintaining reliable service.

When the electricity goes out, persons who are dependent upon various kinds of mechanical equipment are suddenly faced with a life-threatening situation. When the phone lines are down, people with emergency situations cannot call for the ambulance, or the fire department, or the sheriff's office for help. A regulation which makes it more difficult and expensive to rapidly restore or maintain vital utility service becomes in and of itself a much greater threat to public health and safety than the very limited highway operation.

This same bill, H.R. 2144, was introduced in the House of Representatives last year. It would simply have exempted utility service vehicles and their owners and drivers from the DOT hour of service regulations.

While some portions of H.R. 2144 were incorporated into Public Law 104–59, the National Highway System Act, much of the costly and restrictive DOT hours of service truck driving regulation still applies to utility service vehicles, costing consumers unwarranted regulatory expense and still interfering with utilities' ability to ensure reliable service and repairs.

The legislation I am introducing today will complete the job started last year. My bill will exempt utility service vehicles and their drivers from the DOT hours of service regulations effective only for those vehicles and drivers while they are actively engaged in legitimate and necessary utility activities.

I want to point out that this exemption does not relieve owners from any established equipment mechanical safety standards or inspections, nor does it weaken in any way the licensing standards and testing required of drivers. It does not interfere with or pre-empt any state-imposed regulations which may affect driving-time hours.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort by cosponsoring this legislation and working for its passage. I also ask unanimous consent that a letter written by the Montana Electric Cooperatives' Association be printed in the RECORD.

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

MONTANA ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVES' ASSOCIATION,
Great Falls, MT, March 6, 1996.

Hon. CONRAD BURNS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BURNS: Montana's rural electric cooperatives are writing to ask for your help in obtaining a much needed reform of specific federal regulations which are unnecessary, unwieldy, and which cost far more to comply with than any possible benefits that might theoretically be derived. The current Department of Transportation ''Hours of Service'' (HOS) truck driving regulations, as they apply to public utility providers, impose an entirely unreasonable cost on consumers, and compound other difficulties faced by providers in reliably maintaining vital utility services.

The HOS regulations were originally intended to address public safety concerns arising from practices in the long-haul, transcontinental trucking industry where vehicles are utilized in an entirely different manner than those in the utility business.

Citizens and legislators alike became alarmed at the frequency and severity of highway accidents caused when long-haul truckers would operate their vehicles for days at a time without getting proper rest. Operators suffering from driving fatigue and ''white line fever'' often exceeded their physical and mental limits, resulting in some truly horrible accidents and the tragic deaths of many innocent motorists.

However, it is important to note that utility service vehicles simply are not operated in the same fashion as the long-haul equipment, and there is no evidence that our industry's vehicles were ever a part of the problem the regulations were designed to resolve. This is especially true for utilities serving rural Montana. Clearly, the HOS rules are but one more example of a ''one-size-fits-all'' federal mandate that is costly, unrealistic and unnecessary.

Disregarding these distinctions, DOT crafted regulations which apply as equally to utility vehicles as to long-haul vehicles. This has resulted in a situation whereby enforcement of existing rules will require consumers to pay significantly higher utility rates to help fix a problem that didn't exist in the first place.

We also believe public safety is actually placed in far greater imminent danger by imposition of the DOT's arbitrary and restrictive Hours of Service rules.

That is because these rules hamper the ability of our cooperatives to rapidly maintain and restore electric and telephone service to the approximately 300,000 Montanans we serve. The result is that customers' lives may be in far greater danger from lack of electric or telephone service than by the possibility of a utility service vehicle accident.

Cooperative managers have called us to emphasize that the HOS rules ignore reality: When the power is out, those on life support equipment, for example, are at great risk. When phone lines are shut down, people can't call for medical, fire, or law enforcement emergency assistance.

As one western Montana cooperative manager put it, ''It is our overall responsibility to ascertain the circumstances of each individual work period and draw the line between safe working/driving practices, balanced against the urgency of electric service restoration. Service restoration work can be

critical and/or lifesaving by nature—much more so than the negligible risk of driving—after even 15 hours or more of work. We have prescribed rest periods in relation to hours worked which also require common sense supervisor interpretation.''

An eastern Montana cooperative director described the situation this way: ''Because of the great distances involved in our service area, exceeding the restriction on service hours could be a high probability. Because of the dependency on the power we supply for heat, water heaters, and communication within our service area, it is imperative to the welfare of our consumers that the restoration of power occur as quickly as possible.''

As applied to utility service vehicles and drivers, the DOT regulations are totally unwarranted, extremely expensive (in the aggregate) to consumers, and pose a potentially dangerous obstacle to our ability to maintain electric and telephone lifelines.

MECA applauds your consideration of legislation which would exempt utility service vehicles from the HOS regulations. We also appreciate your well-crafted draft language because it is written in a manner which would exempt our vehicles only when they are being used for legitimate utility purposes (including emergencies arising from storms and other acts of nature).

We sincerely urge your speedy introduction of such legislation and we will work to help build the support needed for congressional passage of the measure.

Sincerely,

JAY T. DOWNEN,
Executive Vice President.●

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. BOND):

S. 1715. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for adoption expenses, to allow penalty-free IRA withdrawals for adoption expenses, and to allow tax-free treatment for employer provided adoption assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

THE ADOPTION PROMOTION ACT OF 1996

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. COATS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BOND, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 1716. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act reauthorize the adolescent family life program, provide for abstinence education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE ADOLESCENT FAMILY LIFE AND ABSTINENCE EDUCATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to introduce, on behalf of 14 Senators, the Adolescent Family Life and Abstinence Education Act of 1996 and, on behalf of 12 Senators, the Adoption Promotion Act of 1996. I am pleased to be introducing these bills with many colleagues from both parties, which I shall describe shortly.

TOWARD A ''GOOD'' SOCIETY

Mr. President, I am introducing two bills designed to bring Americans together on one of the most controversial, if not the most controversial matter facing the United States domestically today, and that is the question of abortion, pro-choice, pro-life. While we cannot achieve agreement on all aspects of that underlying controversy, I believe it is possible to make enormous steps forward on the issue of abstinence; that is, to try to curtail premarital sex, especially among teenagers, which results in unintended pregnancies, and to promote adoption through tax credits, to try to encourage those who are in the situation of unintended pregnancy to carry through to term.

At the outset, let me provide my colleagues with a brief summary of the legislation. This legislation would support an authorization for $75 million annually to have abstinence education. While there is great concern about education dealing with matters of sex generally, there appears to be an exception when you talk about abstinence. Within the past several weeks, I have had the opportunity to visit the Carrick High School in Pittsburgh, where I met with students who are involved in an abstinence program and with officials of Mercy Hospital which has been the recipient of a $250,000 federal grant for abstinence education. The results there have been very profound. Later, I visited a program in Lancaster, PA, where young people are taking the abstinence pledge and are being counseled in how to respond to peer pressure with counter peer pressure. As I say, while we cannot agree on all aspects of the issue of abortion, pro-choice, pro-life, I believe when we talk about abstinence, that is an area of agreement.

Similarly, on adoption, there have been many efforts to give tax breaks. This legislation is another effort, with up to a $5,000 tax credit for adoption, and up to $7,500 for adopting children with special needs. These two bills will supplement legislation which I have already pushed on prenatal care for pregnancies, again involving many youngsters in their teens. I saw my first one-pound baby more than a decade ago. It is really a startling sight, a child no bigger than my hand, carrying medical problems for a lifetime and costing up to $200,000 in medical care per child for just the first year. I believe this abstinence legislation, in conjunction with adequate prenatal care and the Healthy Start program, will go a long way toward avoiding teenage pregnancies and the complications that can arise, such as low-birth-weight babies.

Mr. President, on March 28, 1996, I spoke on the Senate floor in support of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Teen Pregnancy Prevention Week. During that week, communities throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania conducted special activities to promote pre-marital abstinence as the best, healthiest way to prevent teen pregnancy and the many other physical, emotional, and relational consequences of early sexual activity. On Friday, March 15, 1996, I had the opportunity to kick-off this important week at Central High School in Philadelphia, and during my remarks, I stated that I would be introducing two legislative proposals that deal with the important issue of teen pregnancy, one on abstinence education and one on promoting adoption.

By way of background, nearly 200 years ago, the French writer Alexis de Tocqueville is said to have observed that ''America is great because she is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.'' Although de Tocqueville is long gone, his analysis is timeless. It is impossible to be a public official today, to travel throughout States such as Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the United States, without recognizing that America's problems are more moral than material. The news media offer us a monthly snapshot of leading economic indicators, but it may be that our leading moral indicators are more telling, such as the staggering number of teenage pregnancies, the national divorce rate, and the rapid rise in juvenile crime.

As we have tried to steer towards a growing economy and a balanced budget, there has been a growing consensus that all our goals—personal, economic, and national security—must rest on a restored ethic of personal responsibility. There has been an increased recognition that a crisis of values underlies the many public policy problems the Senate addresses on a daily basis. This has impressed upon me the need for people of strong moral commitments to enter public service and public debate, so that we may confront the underlying problems.

On the critical question of the health of America's families, the grim statistics are well known, but worth repeating. These leading moral indicators suggest that the erosion of the American family continues unabated. For example, more than 50 percent of American marriages now end in divorce, meaning that millions of American children face at least some instability in their home environment. Then, there is the alarming number of teenagers getting pregnant in the United States. According to statistics released by the Centers for Disease Control in 1995, there were an estimated 835,000 teenage pregnancies in 1990. Further, the National Center for Health Statistics reports that in 1993, 12,000 girls under 15 years of age gave birth to a child. To me, this necessitates a strong response from public officials, the clergy, and concerned citizens.

A leading moral indicator is the rapid increase in the number of unwed mothers. The percentage of teen births that occurred outside of marriage has risen from 48 percent in 1980 to 72 percent of all teenage births in 1993. According to my distinguished colleague,

Senator MOYNIHAN, within 10 years, unless we reverse current trends, more than half our children will be born to unmarried women. By comparison, the United States teenage birth rate—60 births per 1,000 females aged 15 to 19—is double the rate in other industrialized societies such as Australia and the United Kingdom. France and Japan report some of the lowest teenage birth rates, at nine and four births per 1,000 females, respectively.

It is worth pausing to reflect on the enormous significance of these statistics regarding out-of-wedlock births. Marriage is obviously important as it relates to the benefits for children to have a strong family structure based on a commitment of mutual support and respect.

On the subject of family values, I speak with considerable pride about the institution of marriage with my parents and my siblings. In addition to my parents' marriage of 45 years, my brother, Morton, and his wife, Joyce, were married for 51 years until his death in 1993. My sister, Hilda, and her husband, Arthur Morgenstern, celebrated their 53rd wedding anniversary in April. My sister, Shirley, was married to Edward Kety for 46 years until his death last summer. My son, Shanin, and his wife, Tracey, will celebrate their 10th wedding anniversary on June 29, 1996. So our family totals 248 years of marriage.

In considering the troubling statistics on out-of-wedlock births, I believe there is much we can do to reduce the likelihood that an unmarried teenager will become pregnant in the first place.

While I am personally opposed to abortion, I do not believe it can be controlled by the Government. I believe it is a matter for the woman and family, with appropriate guidance by ministers, priests, and rabbis. I do believe the government has a significant role in promoting alternatives to abortion. In my view, there is no reason why people on both sides of the abortion debate cannot work together to promote those alternatives. We can reduce teenage pregnancies by encouraging abstinence and personal responsibility. If a teen pregnancy does occur, we should promote adoption as a socially beneficial alternative.

We can, and we must, confront our leading moral indicators head-on. We must press harder in the fight to reduce the alarming number of teenage pregnancies. And, when a child comes into the world as the result of an unintended pregnancy, we must do all that we can to ensure that it is raised in a loving, stable family environment.

It is the American family, of course, to which these responsibilities chiefly belong. Nonetheless, I believe that the Government can play a role and that we in the Congress must seek out appropriate legislative means to advance this cause. Accordingly, I am today introducing these two bills which will strengthen the social fabric and family stability of our Nation.

Before I go into greater detail on these two bills, I want to point out that I have benefited from thoughtful review and comments by a number of individuals with expertise on the issues of teen pregnancy, abstinence, and adoption, including Bill Pierce of the National Council on Adoption; H. Woodruff Turner and Katrina Schulhof of the Pittsburgh Adoptive Family Rights Council; David Keene of the American Conservative Union; Ms. Molly Kelly of Philadelphia; Larry Breitenstein of the Westmoreland County Childrens Bureau; Dr. Carol Jean Vale, President of Chestnut Hill College; Sister Roseanne Bonfini of Immaculata College; James Stark of the Fayette County Community Action Agency; Danelle Stone and Melissa Mizner of Catholic Charities Counseling and Adoption Services—Erie Diocese; Washington County Commissioner Diana Irey; Reverend Horace Strand, Sr. of the Faith Temple Holy Church and Christian School; Rev. Msgr. Philip Cribben of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia; and Ted Meehan of the Mainstream Republicans.

ADOLESCENT FAMILY LIFE AND ABSTINENCE EDUCATION ACT OF 1996

My first legislative proposal provides for the continued funding of programs that are designed to reduce teenage pregnancy and to increase abstinence education. The existing Adolescent Family Life Program, known as the title XX program, is a worthwhile program which focuses directly on the issues of abstinence, adolescent sexuality, adoption alternatives, pregnancy and parenting. If you want to reduce the number of abortions performed in the United States, teaching children to say no to negative peer pressure is a starting place.

In 1981, Congress established the Adolescent Family Life Program as the only Federal program of its kind. Through demonstration grants and contracts, Adolescent Family Life focuses on a comprehensive range of health, educational, and social services needed to improve the health of adolescents, including the complex issues of early adolescent sexuality, pregnancy, and parenting.

This legislation had bipartisan support when originally enacted in 1981 and when it was reauthorized in 1984. Authority for title XX expired in 1985 and since then, the program has been operating under funding provided in the annual Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill. For fiscal year 1996, the Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, which I chair, provided $7.7 million for the Adolescent Family Life program.

Now, more than 10 years after the authority for this valuable program expired, it is important that Congress reauthorize it to demonstrate our commitment to this important Adolescent Family Life Program. As I stated at the outset, my legislation, the Adolescent Family Life and Abstinence Education Act of 1996, would provide authority for $75 million annually between now and fiscal year 2000, substantially higher than the $30 million authorized in 1985. My legislation would also amend title XX to state expressly that the education services provided by the recipients of federal funds should include information about abstinence. I have also proposed amending the law to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that approved grants have a geographic diversity that shows adequate representation of both urban and rural areas. Further, to address concerns raised by Pennsylvania constituents, my legislation would establish a simplified, expedited application process for groups seeking Title XX demonstration project funding of less than $15,000.

As I noted at the beginning of my remarks, teenage pregnancies exact a substantial emotional and financial toll on our society and deserve priority consideration by Congress. Adolescent pregnancy threatens the health of both the young mother and child. Teenage mothers are more likely to lack adequate prenatal care and to give birth to a low birthweight baby. When I refer to the problem of low birthweight babies, I am talking about babies weighing as little as 12 ounces who when born are no larger than my hand. It is tragic that these babies are not born more healthy, for low birthweight babies will carry scars for a lifetime and often do not live very long.

The Adolescent Family Life Program, in addressing early sexual relations among teenagers, can also protect their health with respect to sexually transmitted diseases. Early sexual activity, particularly with multiple partners, increases the chance that a teenager will contract such a disease. The Title XX program is designed to get teenagers to focus on the potential consequences of early sexual activity, and these health concerns certainly provide additional justification for Federal support of abstinence education.

In making the case for funding programs to address the teen pregnancy problem it is important to focus primarily on the physical, emotional, and spiritual costs associated with a young girl becoming pregnant. At a time when Federal, State, and local governments face difficult budgetary constraints, I should also note that in 1990, an estimated 51 percent of Aid to Families with Dependent Children payments went to recipients who were 19 or younger when they first became mothers. Billions of dollars could be saved by preventing unwanted teenage births to unwed mothers.

Reauthorizing the Adolescent Family Life Program at $75 million will demonstrate that Congress recognizes the serious emotional and financial impact of teenage pregnancy. Updating federal law to advocate abstinence education

expressly is also necessary to provide guidance to the Department of Health and Human Services. I urge my colleagues and others to making America a ''good'' society to support this legislation and join me in the effort to reduce teenage pregnancies.

THE ADOPTION PROMOTION ACT OF 1996

My second legislative proposal, the ''Adoption Promotion Act of 1996,'' is intended to provide appropriate tax incentives to encourage adoption, a policy which serves as a compassionate response to children whose own parents are unable or unwilling to care for them. This is particularly important in an era when so many teenagers are having babies and are unable to care for them.

Based upon my own strong sense of family, I firmly believe that the family is the primary building block of our society. To reinforce the important role families play in our society, the Senate and the House of Representatives recently passed balanced budget legislation which contained provisions to benefit families. For instance, the agreement provided a $500 per child tax credit to help cover the rising costs of raising children. That legislation also provided a $5,000 nonrefundable tax credit for families who follow the long and arduous, but rewarding, process of adopting a child. Although this legislation was vetoed by the President, I believe it made a very strong statement in support of the American family.

I have spent the past year advocating scrapping our current Tax Code and replacing it with a flat tax that would encourage saving, stimulate growth, and promote fundamental simplicity. In March 1995 I introduced S. 488, the Flat Tax Act of 1995, which would increase economic growth by $2 trillion and reduce interest rates by 2 full percentage points. Further, S. 488 would provide much more generous personal exemptions and deductions for children. However, as the Congress debates the merits and necessity of fundamental tax reform, and until such legislation is enacted, I believe we need to move forward with specialized tax legislation that promotes adoption.

As I stated earlier, today I am introducing the Adoption Promotion Act of 1996, which would encourage the adoption of children into healthy and stable existing families. Far too many children are left to grow up in foster care without ever experiencing the rewards of being a permanent family member. Many other couples, unable to conceive their own child, turn to infant adoption to start a family. Recognizing the cost hurdles that may discourage many American families from adopting a child, my legislation would provide a nonrefundable adoption tax credit for up to $5,000 in qualified adoption expenses for families earning up to $65,000 in annual adjusted gross income. The credit is available at a gradually reduced percentage to families with adjusted gross income between $65,000 and $95,000. The credit is available during the year of the legal, finalized adoption, but may cover expenses incurred in previous years toward the adoption.

As I will explain in greater detail later, my legislation also would allow all families to make penalty free withdrawals of up to $2,000 from Individual Retirement Accounts to pay adoption expenses. In addition, the bill allows employers to offer their employees tax-free benefits for adoption. To address the particular problem of placing children with special needs in adoptive families, my legislation would provide a $7,500 nonrefundable tax credit for such adoptions.

Mr. President, when couples realize that they are not able to conceive their own children or that it is not medically advisable, many consider adoption. Many other couples blessed with their own children consider adopting a child out of a sense of love and community, particularly where a child has been in foster care. These couples quickly learn that the costs associated with adoption can be prohibitive. It is not uncommon for the adopting family to pay thousands of dollars in legal expenses, prenatal care for the birth mother, and the cost of the adopted child's hospital delivery. In fact, according to information from congressional testimony by the National Council on Adoption, adoption costs range between zero and $30,000, averaging $15,000 for infants born in the United States.

My bill includes a provision to encourage in particular the placement of special needs children because there is good reason to provide a particular incentive for their adoption. This legislation adopts the definition contained in the balanced budget legislation and states that a child with a special need is one who has a mental, physical or emotional handicap or who may fall into a specific age, gender or minority group. However, this clinical explanation belies the frustrating condition of these children. According to the Ways and Means Committee, in fiscal year 1990, 71 percent of children with one or more special needs were waiting for adoptive placement. In cases where children have medical conditions, most through no fault of their own, costs of care can be prohibitive. It then becomes even more difficult to place such children in adoptive families because of these tragic circumstances. I am hopeful that the $7,500 tax credit will ease the financial burden on families considering adopting a special needs child. I would note that the credit is not tied solely to the actual costs of the adoption, because such adoptions are often less expensive than a typical infant adoption. Therefore, this credit is available to defray additional expenses of having a special needs child join one's family.

Under current law, if an employer helps to pay an employee's pregnancy expenses by funding an insurance policy or paying the fees for an employee to join an health maintenance organization, these expenses are treated as tax-free fringe benefits. But if an employer helps his or her employees with adoption expenses, it has to pay these expenses in after-tax dollars. That is why my legislation provides that employer-provided adoption assistance is tax free for up to $5,000 in benefits for each child (up to $7,500 for special needs children). This tax provision is also phased out based on income, but at a higher level than the tax credit, in order to allow more families to take full advantage of employee fringe benefits. I am proud to mention that several companies in Pennsylvania, including First Pennsylvania Bank, Rohm and Haas, and Wyeth-Ayerst already provide adoption assistance to their employees. Other companies offering such benefits include General Motors, DuPont and PepsiCo.

Finally, I have included provisions in my legislation to allow the penalty-free withdrawal from Individual Retirement Accounts [IRA] to help cover the costs of adoption expenses. I understand the fact that a tax credit is simply not enough to cover all the expenses associated with adoption. I believe the federal tax code must encourage savings and reward taxpayers not penalize them for the wise uses of their hard-earned money. I have supported other efforts in the past that would allow the use of IRA funds for personal capital expenses such as purchase of a family home, investment in college education, or payment of medical expenses. In my judgment, using IRA funds for adoption expenses is equally meritorious.

Given prior support in both the Senate and House for some type of tax incentives to promote adoption, I am hopeful that my colleagues will favorably consider the mix of incentives contained in the Adoption Promotion Act of 1996 and enact this legislation in the near future. By reducing the financial hurdles to adoption, I hope we will be able to give new hope to the thousands of children who live in foster care awaiting the chance to be brought into a loving family environment permanently. In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a ''Dear Colleague'' letter, dated March 25, together with a summary of the legislative provisions, together with the bills themselves, which identify the 14 sponsors of the abstinence bill and the 12 sponsors of the adoption bill, together with seven letters: one from David Keene of the American Conservative Union; the second from Danelle Stone and Melissa Mizner of the Catholic Charities (Erie Diocese); the third from Pastor Horace W. Strand of the Faith Temple Holy Church and Christian School; the fourth from Commissioner Colin A. Hanna of Chester County; the fifth from Commissioner Joseph A. Ford of Washington County; the sixth from Commissioner Jim Beckwith of Mifflin County; and the seventh from President Carol Jean Vale of Chestnut Hill College.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, March 25, 1996.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am writing to urge you to cosponsor two bills I intend to introduce shortly: the Adolescent Family Life and Abstinence Education Act of 1966 and the Adoption Promotion Act of 1996.

While there are obviously great differences of opinion on the pro-life-pro-choice issue, there is a consensus that all efforts should be made to prevent unwanted teen pregnancies through abstinence. The first bill does just that.

Where tax breaks for adoption would encourage carrying to term, we should act on that as well. The second bill does just that.

The following describes the essence of the two bills:

Adolescent Family Life and Abstinence Education Act of 1966—Reauthorizes the Adolescent Family Life (Title XX) program, which funds demonstration projects focusing on abstinence, adolescent sexuality, adoption alternatives, pregnancy and parenting. This program had bipartisan support when originally enacted in 1981 and when it was reauthorized in 1984. Authority for Title XX expired in 1985 and since then, the program has been operating under funding provided in the annual Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations bill. For FY 1996, the Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, which I chair, has provided $7.7 million for the Adolescent Family Life program. Congress should reauthorize Title XX to demonstrate our commitment to abstinence education and the physical and emotional health of adolescents.

The Adoption Promotion Act of 1996—Provides tax incentives to encourage adoption, a policy which serves as a compassionate response to children whose own parents are unable or unwilling to care for them. This is particularly important in an era when so many teenagers are having babies and are unable to care for them. This proposal is based substantially on the provisions contained in the balanced budget legislation which Congress passed in 1995 but was vetoed by the President.

I hope you will cosponsor one or both of these bills. If you are interested, please contact me or have your staff contact Dan Renberg at 224–4254.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.

P.S. A more detailed statement of the bills is enclosed. My office and I would be glad to provide additional information upon request.

SPECTER PROPOSALS TO DEAL WITH TEENAGE PREGNANCY

ADOLESCENT FAMILY LIFE AND ABSTINENCE EDUCATION ACT OF 1996

Reauthorizes Adolescent Family Life program (Title XX) for the first time since 1984, and at a higher ($75,000,000) level than before. It has been funded annually in Labor, HHS appropriations, but without authorization or reform.

This HHS program provides demonstration grants and contracts for initiatives focusing directly on issues of abstinence, adolescent sexuality, adoption alternatives, pregnancy and parenting.

The bill adds ''abstinence'' expressly into the statutory definition of educational services that can be provided under the program. (Such education is already available, but the statute wasn't explicit in this regard.)

The bill requires the Secretary of HHS to establish an expedited, simplified process for consideration of grant applications for less than $15,000. (Some organizations that wish to implement small teen pregnancy programs are unable to cope with the current process.)

Requires the Secretary to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that approved grant applications adequately represent both urban and rural areas.

ADOPTION PROMOTION ACT OF 1996

Builds on adoption tax incentives contained in Section 11003 of Balanced Budget Act of 1995 (budget reconciliation) conference report.

For qualified adoption expenses, provides up to a $5,000 adoption tax credit ($7,500 for children with special needs—age, ethnic group, physical/mental/emotional handicap). Credit is phased out beginning at $65,000 adjusted gross income and is eliminated at $95,000.

Provides for penalty-free IRA withdrawals of up to $2,000 for qualified adoption expenses.

Tax-free treatment of employer-provided adoption assistance, to level the playing field with tax-free treatment of employer-provided pregnancy expenses. Exclusion from gross income of up to $5,000 in benefits ($7,500 for special needs children), phasing out from $75,000 to $115,000.

THE AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE UNION,
Alexandria, VA, March 27, 1996.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Bldg.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: Your recent introduction of legislation to provide tax incentives designed to promote adoption is to be commended.

On behalf of the more than one million members and supporters of the American Conservative Union, I can say without reservation that your approach to helping parents seeking adoptive children *and* those children who in our society are too often shunted aside deserves wide public support.

It is my hope that it will also enjoy widespread Congressional support.

Sincerely Yours,

DAVID A. KEENE,
Chairman, ACU.

CATHOLIC CHARITIES,
COUNSELING AND ADOPTION SERVICES,
Erie, PA, March 11, 1996.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER, Thank you for sending a copy of the draft of the bills and a draft of the floor statement concerning the Adolescent Family Life and Abstinence Education Act and the Adoption Promotion Act.

A tax credit for adoption would be highly favored by prospective adoptive couples and would certainly benefit those children waiting for permanent families.

For the past four years, Melissa Mizner, therapist, and myself have presented a program to school students promoting sexual abstinence. We have conducted 95 presentations in over 25 schools both public and private for approximately 4,400 students in grades six to twelve. Catholic Charities Counseling and Adoption Services has assumed the financial burden of presenting this program despite our numerous attempts to secure outside funding. The agency recognizes the importance of this message and feels prevention services is money well spent.

We have not applied for money from Title XX because the process for application is so difficult for the small amount of $3,000 to $5,000 we would require each year to provide this program. I wish this process could be simplified for agencies requesting smaller grants from the Adolescent Family Life program. If it were, other agencies in Pennsylvania might consider providing a similar program such as ours.

We are in full favor of your two proposed bills. If we can be of any assistance in providing support for these proposals, please do not hesitate to contact the agency.

Thank you for taking the time to keep us informed and aware.

Sincerely,

DANELLE STONE, BSSW,
Adoption Coordinator.
MELISSA MIZNER, MS, NCC,
Marriage and Family Therapist.

FAITH TEMPLE HOLY CHURCH,
AND CHRISTIAN SCHOOL,
March 8, 1996.

SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPECTER, Thank you for giving; me the opportunity to review your statement to the Senate on the need to amend Title XX to include the teaching of Abstinence, and the promotion of the 1996 Adoption Act. First I want to say how much I appreciated hearing of the value your parents placed on the Institution of Marriage. The personal example of you and your siblings demonstrate that their value was not lost with them. I was also pleased to hear of your personal position on Abortion, and I can appreciate your position on Choice; even though I strongly believe in the protection of Life from the moment of conception. I think that more of your constituents should know you are not an advocate of Abortion; but a advocate of personal rights.

This amendment to Title XX can be the instrument to bring both sides together, and stop the need for most abortions by decreasing the growing rate of un-intended pregnancies. The additional funding, and the promotion of the Adoption Act of 1996 will help tremendously. Please be advised that as a Pastor, and school Administrator, I can see the need for resources being allocated for this purpose. If I can be of any help to you in promoting this worthy endeavor; please feel free to call on me.

Yours in His Service,

DR. HORACE W. STRAND,
Pastor.

THE COUNTY OF CHESTER,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS,
West Chester, PA, March 14, 1996.

The Hon. ARLEN SPECTER
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ARLEN: It was great to see you again at the Conservative Political Action Conference last month, and to learn from your letter of March 7 of your support of such a bedrock conservative cause as abstinence education. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to help advance that agenda here in Chester County.

With warmest regards, I am

COLIN A. HANNA,
Commissioner.

COUNTY OF WASHINGTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Washington, PA, March 19, 1996.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: This is in response to your letter of March 7, 1996, regarding your proposed legislation under the titles of the Adolescent Family Life and Abstinence Education Act of 1996 and the Adoption Promotion Act of 1996.

First of all, abstinence education is very important if provided in an educational forum. Since many of our young adults are members of one parent families whose family time is limited by being the sole provider and, therefore, unable to provide the ongoing moral and family stability. Because of changes in society, our children can no longer be guaranteed to receive the educational and moral values found in a stable family unit. As professionals responsible for educating our children, we have to go beyond the traditional reading, writing and arithmetic in preparing them for adult life. With this in mind, the need to continue with abstinence education is vital to the development of a moral society.

Secondly, the idea of tax incentives for adoptive parents would help ease the burden for those families who are more than willing to adopt but are not financially able to do so. This would also reduce the cost and the tragedy of long term foster care. The long term financial benefits of such an incentive plan can only benefit those children today and society tomorrow.

In conclusion, I would like to offer Washington County's support on your proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. FORD, SR., *Chairman.*
Washington County Board of Commissioners,

CHESTNUT HILL COLLEGE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
March 12, 1996.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: I am writing to ask you to consider introducing a bi-partisan amendment to restore targeted programs to the Omnibus Appropriations Bill (H.R. 3019). Central to such an amendment is the restoration of the Perkins Loan and SSIG. As you know, thousands of Pennsylvania college students will be affected by decisions governing the future of such financial assistance.

As in the past, I know I can count on your support of private higher education in the Commonwealth and throughout the nation.

I applaud your plan to introduce legislation titled Adolescent Family Life and Abstinence Education Act of 1996 and the Adoption Promotion Act of 1996. I agree wholeheartedly that people on both sides of the abortion issue can work together to promote mutually agreeable alternatives to abortion. Moreover, your observation that the country needs to assess and respond to ''leading moral indicators'' is cogent, insightful, and timely.

As always, Senator, I respect your ability to cut to the core of issues, to name the problems, and to offer solutions. In addition, I appreciate your balanced approach to public policy. Different viewpoints do not have to divide, rather, they can be starting points for discussions that empower people with varying perspectives to meet on common ground and thereby establish a common agenda that will benefit the citizens of this country.

Thank you for sending me your proposed legislation and for championing causes that I, as a citizen, deeply value.

May God bless you Joan, and your family.

Cordially,

CAROL JEAN VALE, SSJ, PH.D.
President.

COSPONSORS TO SPECTER ABSTINENCE/ADOPTION BILLS AS OF APRIL 29, 1996

ADOLESCENT FAMILY LIFE AND ABSTINENCE EDUCATION ACT OF 1996

Santorum, Jeffords, Lugar, Inouye, Leahy, Simpson, Hatfield, Coats, Stevens, Pryor, Bond, Conrad and DeWine.

ADOPTION PROMOTION ACT OF 1996

Santorum, Jeffords, Lugar, Harkin, Inouye, Leahy, Campbell, Cochran, Hatfield, Stevens and Bond.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
MIFFLIN COUNTY,
Lewistown, PA, March 28, 1996.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: Thank you for providing me with a copy of the Bill you are planning to introduce under titles of the Adolescent Family Life and Abstinence Education Act of 1996 and the Adoption Promotion Act of 1996.

Adoption Reform is long overdue and perhaps this could be the first step of a change.

It is appalling how many children are raised without loving, caring parents because of our archaic laws. I firmly believe, less costly, more accessible adoption could go a long way in cutting the abortion rates.

I commend you on taking the initiative to address this important issue.

Sincerely,

JIM BECKWITH,
Mifflin County Commissioner.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 684

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 1189

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1189, a bill to provide procedures for claims for compassionate payments with regard to individuals with blood-clotting disorders, such as hemophilia, who contracted human immunodeficiency virus due to contaminated blood products.

S. 1483

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1483, a bill to control crime, and for other purposes.

S. 1493

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1493, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain interstate conduct relating to exotic animals.

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1493, supra.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the names of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] were added as cosponsors of S. 1578, a bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1997 through 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 1592

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1592, a bill to strike the prohibition on the transmission of abortion-related matters, and for other purposes.

S. 1629

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the names of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1629, a bill to protect the rights of the States and the people from abuse by the Federal Government; to strengthen the partnership and the intergovernmental relationship between State and Federal governments; to restrain Federal agencies from exceeding their authority; to enforce the tenth amendment to the Constitution; and for other purposes.

S. 1652

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1652, a bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to establish a national resource center and clearinghouse to carry out training of State and local law enforcement personnel to more effectively respond to cases involving missing or exploited children, and for other purposes.

S. 1675

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] were added as cosponsors of S. 1675, a bill to provide for the nationwide tracking of convicted sexual predators, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 41, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that The George Washington University is important to the Nation and urging that the importance of the University be recognized and celebrated through regular ceremonies.

SENATE RESOLUTION 226

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 226, a resolution to proclaim the week of October 13 through October 19, 1996, as ''National Character Counts Week.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 250

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 250, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding tactile currency for the blind and visually impaired.