

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 275. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate concerning Afghanistan.

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 276. A resolution congratulating the people of Mongolia on embracing democracy in Mongolia through their participation in the parliamentary elections held on June 30, 1996.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

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

S. 1984. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to require a 10 percent reduction in certain assistance to a State under such title unless public safety officers who retire as a result of injuries sustained in the line of duty continue to receive health insurance benefits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 1985. A bill to increase penalties for sex offenses against children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 1986. A bill to provide for the completion of the Umatilla Basin Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FAIRCLOTH:

S. 1987. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit the use of social security and medicare trust funds for certain expenditures relating to union representatives at the Social Security Administration and the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. HATCH, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 1988. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for individuals who are residents of the District of Columbia a maximum rate of tax of 15 percent on income from sources within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BRADLEY (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FRIST, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. GLENN, Mr. REID, Mr. SIMON, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DODD, Mr. CHAFFEE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COATS, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BURNS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. COHEN,

Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. GORTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ROBB, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. MACK, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. FORD, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GREGG, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HATFIELD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. KERREY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. NUNN, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HELMS, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. PELL):

S. Res. 282. A resolution to designate October 10, 1996, as the "Day of National Concern About Young People and Gun Violence"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

S. 1984. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to require a 10 percent reduction in certain assistance to a State under such title unless public safety officers who retire as a result of injuries sustained in the line of duty continue to receive health insurance benefits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE ALU-O'HARA PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS HEALTH BENEFITS ACT

• Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, almost 1 year ago today, Officer Joseph Alu and Detective James O'Hara responded to an emergency hostage situation.

When the officers had arrived at the scene—they found that the assailant had cordoned himself off in a bedroom of a house and had taken two teenaged girls for hostages.

The officers broke down the bedroom door, only to discover that the assailant had doused himself, the hostages, and the entire house in gasoline.

At that moment, the assailant dropped a lighter on the floor, setting the room ablaze, killing himself and the two hostages. Officers Alu and O'Hara were critically wounded—receiving severe burns over most of their bodies.

Both officers remained in the hospital for the better part of a year fighting for their lives.

Officer O'Hara was so badly burned that while he struggled for his life in the intensive care unit for over 6 months, his wife was told to expect and prepare for his imminent death.

Miraculously, Officer Alu and Officer O'Hara survived. But, while still in the hospital, the city of Plantation Police Department notified the officers that since they would not be physically able to return to work—they and their families would lose their health insurance benefits.

Imagine fighting for your life in a hospital, in excruciating pain, knowing that your family is going to be left unprotected.

When these heroes returned home—that is exactly what they found: no job, disability payments of approximately

\$1,200 a month, prohibitively expensive COBRA insurance which would run out in 18 months, and no private health insurance for them and their families.

For over 5 months, Officer Alu's wife, Sheila, stayed home to care for her husband during his rehabilitation—herself unable to work to bring in badly needed extra income.

Further complicating their situation was their 5-year-old daughter Christina, who was battling chronic asthma without health insurance.

Detective O'Hara's family was in a similar situation. In fact, his wife still must care for his everyday needs almost 1 year later.

But instead of giving up hope, officers Alu and O'Hara fought hard. They brought their case to the Florida Legislature—and won.

The legislature, with a Republican Senate and a Democratic House, unanimously passed this legislation at the State level—requiring that localities continue whatever health insurance benefits the officer had prior to the injury.

Mr. President, although they have won personal victories, officers Alu and O'Hara have continued their fight—taking their case to Congress—asking us to make sure that other officers not go through the same pain, uncertainty, and feelings of shame as they did when they were unable to provide for their families.

Across the Nation, unlike veterans who have risked their lives to protect our national security, those who protect our homes and streets have their insurance canceled by municipalities or States when they can no longer do the job.

Mr. President, my legislation, endorsed by all major police and firefighter organizations, would create a safety net for injured officers by requiring municipalities that receive Federal crime dollars to continue to maintain the same level of benefits that an officer had prior to being injured in the line of duty.

If a locality chooses not to offer health insurance to these public safety officers, it would only be able to receive 90 percent of its full complement of community-oriented policing services funding.

Mr. President, the scope of this bill is extremely narrow. It would apply only to a handful of public safety officers, estimated at approximately 100 nationwide per year.

And it is not costly. CBO has already stated that this bill is not an unfunded mandate.

But its message is unmistakably clear.

We need laws which protect our valiant men and women on the front lines. When they go down in the line of duty protecting us, we have a corresponding duty to care for them.

Mr. President, this bill would provide only the most basic package of benefits. It does not grant any enhanced or increased benefits over what the officer had at the time of the injury.

The bill requires State and local governments to offer only the minimum level of health insurance necessary to maintain the health coverage the officer had prior to the disabling injury.

For instance, if an officer or firefighter did not have family coverage prior to the injury, he would not be entitled to family coverage after the injury.

Mr. President, I am proud of my State of Florida. But it should not take a terrible incident like this to make sure that our public safety officers are protected.

We can prevent this situation from ever happening to officers like Alu and O'Hara by passing this legislation this year, in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. President, allow me to conclude by commending both Officer Alu and Detective O'Hara and their families for their bravery, sacrifice, and dedication to public service.

Without their perseverance we would not be here today discussing this most critical issue.

I know that police officers and firefighters across the Nation share my gratitude for their courage and selflessness.

Mr. President, in passing this bill, we will honor our commitment to all of our public safety officers: to protect and care for them after they have done so much to protect and care for us.●

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 1985. A bill to increase penalties for sex offenses against children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE AMBER HAGERMAN CHILD PROTECTION ACT
OF 1996

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today for two reasons. First, I want to talk about two little girls whose short lives have had an impact far beyond their youthful imaginings. Unlike their families and friends, we do not know them for the love they gave, nor do we know of them for their academic ability or artistic talents. Sadly, unlike their families and friends, we did not know them while they were alive—we know them only because of their tragic deaths.

The second reason I rise today is to introduce legislation with Senator HUTCHISON which is designed to prevent other children from suffering their fate, the Amber Hagerman Child Protection Act of 1996. I ask that a copy of the bill be printed in full following my remarks. An earlier version of this bill was introduced in the House by Representative MARTIN FROST of Texas.

The first little girl I want to tell you about is Polly Klaas. Many people throughout our Nation have come to know about this 12-year-old girl from Petaluma, CA, a small, close-knit community north of San Francisco, and the tragic circumstances of her death.

Polly was kidnaped from her bedroom on October 1, 1993, by a bearded, knife-wielding man who tied her up and threatened to slit her friends' throats

as her mother slept in a nearby room. Polly and her friends—who were over for a slumber party—were playing a board game at the time of the abduction.

Immediately after the assailant had fled with Polly, her two friends awakened her mother, Eve Nichols, and she called 911: "Apparently, a man just broke into our house," she said, her voice rising in panic, "and they say he took my daughter."

Richard Allen Davis, a 41-year old parolee with two previous kidnaping convictions and a history of psychotic behavior, was arrested on November 30, 1993, and 4 days later, police say, he led them to her body, dumped beside a highway. Next to Polly's body, police found a specialty condom identical to one Davis had bought at the adult novelty store Seductions a day or two before the kidnaping, according to the store's former owner. Polly's clothes were pushed up to her waist.

At Davis' trial, prosecutors presented expert testimony that Davis' abduction of Polly was motivated by a desire to gratify his sexual tastes for bondage.

Last month, Davis was convicted of all ten counts against him, including attempting a lewd act with a minor.

The second little girl I want to tell you about, Amber Hagerman, was visiting her grandparents on January 13 of this year, the day she was kidnaped. An eyewitness later told police that he saw a white or Hispanic man pull the child from her pink tricycle and drag her into a black pickup truck.

She was found dead 4 days later—her clothes stolen from her lifeless little body—in a creek behind an apartment complex. Police have made no arrests for the murder of Amber Hagerman, but are continuing to follow every lead.

Amber's killer is still free and her family continues to feel the pain caused by the loss of their beloved daughter. Just a few weeks ago, Amber's grief stricken mother, Donna Whitson, released an open letter to her daughter's unknown assailant. In it, she said:

[I]t has now been 122 days since I last saw my daughter alive. One hundred twenty-two days since I felt her happiness in my life. One hundred and twenty-two days ago, you tore my baby girl from her family's love * * * [Y]ou destroyed forever the happiness, harmony and dreams that my children and I had been working so hard to bring to fruition. Our plans for the future altered because of you."

Imagine if you can, trying to comprehend what your own child's last moments of life were like, or trying to fathom the pain and fear felt by your own flesh and blood as they lived them. Donna Whitson has probably done so every day since the loss of her daughter. In her open letter, she asked her daughter's killer:

At what point between the time you stole my baby and the time she was returned did you murder my child? Why had you drained the life from her body? How could you steal the clothes from her lifeless body and dump her like trash thrown along the wayside?

Mr. President, it is for these two children and their families that we must join with Donna Whitson to say loud and clear that the abduction of children and child sexual abuse will not be tolerated by this society.

THE CRIME BILL

Two years ago, Congress acknowledged that action must be taken to stop child sexual abuse when it passed the President's crime bill.

The Violent Crime Control Act contained several tough provisions to combat child sexual abuse. More specifically, the crime bill:

Established guidelines for State programs that require persons convicted of crimes against children, including sexual misconduct with a minor, to register their addresses with an appropriate State law enforcement agency for 10 years after their release from prison;

Sexually violent predators must remain registered until a court determines that they no longer suffer from a mental abnormality that would make a predatory sexually violent offense likely.

The crime bill also doubled the maximum prison term for offenders who commit a sexual abuse or sexual contact offense under Federal law after one or more prior convictions for a Federal or State sexual abuse or sexual contact offense.

I strongly believe that this landmark legislation will go a long way toward protecting our Nation's children.

Earlier this year, the President signed Megan's Law, which requires that State law enforcement agencies release information that is necessary to protect the public from convicted sex offenders in their midst. This change in the law was part of the Amber Hagerman Child Protection Act as it was introduced in the House.

Yet, much more needs to be done.

THE AMBER HAGERMAN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Clearly, too many children suffer the physical and emotional impact of kidnaping and it must be stopped before more kids like Polly Klaas and Amber Hagerman fall victim to its tragic effects.

Child sexual abuse must be stopped by taking sexual predators off our streets. Swift, sure action must be taken to stop child sexual abuse, and penalties must be increased for those who commit this heinous crime.

The Amber Hagerman Child Protection Act will help accomplish this goal in several ways:

The heart of the bill is a tough "two strikes and you're out" provision for child sex offenders. First, the bill adds life imprisonment for a second offense where the second offense is a Federal one. Second, this legislation also reduces Byrne grant funding by 10 percent to States which do not pass a similar two strikes provision to ensure that all States take this important step to help save our children from sexual abuse.

This legislation expands Federal child sexual abuse statutes to cover instances when the perpetrator crosses State lines with the intent to commit the offense, or commits the offense in interstate or foreign commerce.

Lastly, the bill establishes a national database for sex offenders and child kidnappers to be maintained by the FBI; and makes that database accessible to appropriate State law enforcement officials.

The bill that we are introducing today differs from the House bill in two ways. First, because enhanced community notification has, fortunately, been enacted into law as Megan's Law, that provision is no longer necessary. Second, the House bill contains an explicit death penalty for killing a child in the course of a Federal sex offense. I agree that such an evil and perverted act deserves the death penalty; however, I believe that the death penalty which already exists in Federal law, and which would apply to this heinous act under our bill, is preferable, as it is slightly broader than the penalty in the House bill.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, the sick, tragic deaths of Polly Klaas and Amber Hagerman serve as stark reminders that from tragedy and grief can come constructive action and effective solutions, such as the crime bill's three strikes initiative to incarcerate for life the most dangerous criminals in our society.

We have much work to do to ensure the safety of our children from abduction and sexual abuse; passing this bipartisan legislation is a vital part of that effort. As a banner across the building in which the Polly Klaas Foundation is headquartered says: "We ache. We grieve. We're angry. We're not done."

I urge all of my colleagues to give their support to the Amber Hagerman Child Protection Act.

Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HUTCHISON and myself, I send the bill to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and referred to the appropriate committee.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HUTCHISON and myself, I have just sent to the desk the Amber Hagerman Child Protection Act. The purpose is to try to provide a Federal response to those who molest children.

Recently, a study showed about 40 percent of the child molesters are recidivists. I, frankly, think that could well be even higher than that.

In virtually every community throughout the United States, there is a story to tell. Senator HUTCHISON will speak in a moment about a story from Texas. I can speak about a story from California. I can speak of Polly Klaas, and the person who was just convicted of abducting, kidnaping, raping and killing her had a prior record.

The bill we are proposing today attacks the problem of sex offenders on

both the State and Federal level. The purpose of the bill is to require life imprisonment for a repeat, two-time child sex offender and to provide an opportunity for the second offense to be heard in a Federal court.

The purpose of this bill is that if an individual is convicted of child molestation and repeats that felony, either on Federal land or in the crossing of State lines, that it will become a Federal offense and subject to life imprisonment.

This is a harsh bill. It is a tough bill. It has been introduced in the House by Representative FROST. It is my hope, and I believe Senator HUTCHISON's hope, that tomorrow in the Judiciary Committee I will offer it as an amendment to the child pornography bill. If it fails there, we will try at a later time to offer it as an amendment on the floor to a bill.

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

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

S. 1985

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Amber Hagerman Child Protection Act of 1996".

SEC. 2. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR FEDERAL SEX OFFENSES AGAINST CHILDREN.

(a) AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ABUSE OF A MINOR.—Section 2241(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "whoever in interstate or foreign commerce or" before "in the special";

(2) by inserting "crosses a State line with intent to engage in a sexual act with a person who has not attained the age of 12 years, or" after "Whoever"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: "If the defendant has previously been convicted of another Federal offense under this subsection or under section 2243(a), or of a State offense that would have been an offense under either such provision had the offense occurred in a Federal prison, unless the death penalty is imposed, the defendant shall be sentenced to life in prison."

(b) SEXUAL ABUSE OF A MINOR.—Section 2243(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "whoever in interstate or foreign commerce or" before "in the special";

(2) by inserting "crosses a State line with intent to engage in a sexual act with a person who, or" after "Whoever"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: "If the defendant has previously been convicted of another Federal offense under this subsection or under section 2241(c), or of a State offense that would have been an offense under either such provision had the offense occurred in a Federal prison, unless the death penalty is imposed, the defendant shall be sentenced to life in prison."

SEC. 3. CONDITION FOR BYRNE GRANTS.

Section 170101(f) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(2) inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

"(B) In order not to reduce the funds available under part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 by 10 percent, a State shall, on the first day of each fiscal year beginning 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Amber Hagerman Child Protection Act of 1996, have in effect throughout the State in such fiscal year a law which requires a court to sentence a defendant in a State prosecution who is convicted of an offense that would have been an offense if such offense occurred in a Federal prison under section 2241(c) or 2243(a) of title 18, United States Code, and who has previously been convicted for such an offense to life in prison without the possibility of parole."

SEC. 4. RELEASE OF REGISTRATION INFORMATION.

Section 170101 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) SEPARATE DATA BASE.—The Federal Bureau of Investigation shall maintain a separate data base for information submitted to the Bureau under this section and make that data base accessible to appropriate State law enforcement officials. The Bureau shall inform appropriate local law enforcement officials on each occasion that a person registered under this section changes registration to that locality."

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield to my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank Senator FEINSTEIN for working on this bill, for putting it together, for carrying it through the Judiciary Committee on which she serves, because this is something that we can truly do in a bipartisan fashion.

I know that when our Dear Colleague letter goes out to all of the Senators that we will have probably 75 or 80 cosponsors, because this is a bill that I think everyone will see the need for and want to support.

In fact, as Senator FEINSTEIN mentioned, this bill is named for the 9-year-old victim of a tragic killing that was so unnecessary and, unfortunately, is still unsolved. Nine-year-old Amber Hagerman was abducted while riding her bicycle outside her grandparents' home in Arlington, TX, earlier this year. She was kept alive for at least 48 hours before being murdered. Her nude, slashed body was found in a creek bed behind an Arlington apartment complex on January 17, 4 days after she was snatched away from her friends and family by a man driving a truck.

The killer of this much-beloved and innocent child has never been identified. Her family and friends still are not comprehending why this could have happened to such a child. The entire community remains stunned, saddened and enraged. They have the chilling certainty that there is a child killer on the loose in their community, in our State, in our country.

Although we do not know the name of this monster who kidnaped, molested, and murdered this 9-year-old child, we do know several unpleasant

facts about sexual predators who prey on children, like Amber, in communities across this country.

Twenty percent of those in State prisons convicted of violent crimes—65,000 people—report having victimized a child. More than half of these victims were 12 years old or younger, 75 percent of them were female.

Thirty percent of these sexual predators report having committed their crimes against multiple victims. Sixty-six percent of prisoners convicted of sexual assaults committed their crime against a child.

The repeat crime rate for sex offenders is estimated to be as much as 10 times higher than the recidivism rate of other criminals.

Mr. President, we know that more than 40 percent of convicted sex offenders will repeat their crimes. We must begin to act on the information that we have. The revolving doors of our criminal justice system have to stop sending violent criminals out on the streets and back into our neighborhoods to prey on those least able to take care of themselves—our children.

Justice must be made to serve the young and most vulnerable among us, as well as those who repeatedly violate the law. So it is in Amber Hagerman's memory that I am cosponsoring Senator FEINSTEIN's legislation today to protect this Nation's children from sex offenders.

As Senator FEINSTEIN said, the purpose of the bill is tough. It is to require life imprisonment for two-time child sex offenders when their cases are heard in Federal court, and it encourages States to do likewise.

It provides for a nationwide system of tracking sex offenders to be administered by the FBI.

This legislation would establish new Federal jurisdiction over sexual offenses against children when a person commits a crime after crossing State lines with the intent of committing a sex offense.

So, Mr. President, I think Senator FEINSTEIN told us what is in the bill. I will not go into it any further. But I do want to say that it is a primary responsibility of our Government to protect our citizens, and especially the youngest and most vulnerable citizens.

We are going to send a message today to the monsters in our society who would murder children that there is going to be a price to pay. Hopefully, we will get these people off the streets, out of our neighborhoods, out of our parks and begin to get serious about personal security in this country, especially for our children. Thank you.

I thank Senator FEINSTEIN for working on this bill and for allowing me to be the cosponsor of it in honor and memory of my constituent, 9-year-old Amber Hagerman, so that her legacy will be that she will be a part of protecting children like her from meeting her fate. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank Senator FEINSTEIN. I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, if I may, I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas. It is a great pleasure to work with her. I hope we have success in this measure. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 1986. A bill to provide for the completion of the Umatilla Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT COMPLETION ACT

• Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, almost 20 years ago, I traveled to Pendleton, OR, to hold a hearing on longstanding water disputes in the Umatilla River Basin. These disputes were somewhat typical of other water conflicts throughout the western United States, in that, I was lucky to get out of that hearing room alive. The tension between all sides at that 1977 hearing was so high, I was almost certain that a small war would break out right there in the room. Fortunately, that meeting was the low point in the effort to resolve water conflicts in that northeast Oregon river basin. Since that time, we have experienced many high points.

In the ensuing 11 years since that fateful meeting of 1977, local leaders were successful in bringing irrigators, Indian tribes, environmentalists, elected officials and government bureaucrats together on one of the most successful fishery restoration projects this Nation has ever seen, the Umatilla Basin project. In 1988, Congress enacted the Umatilla Basin Project Act in an effort to develop a pragmatic, least-cost approach to meeting the Federal Government's treaty obligations in the basin without devastating the area's valuable agricultural economy. This project has truly been a model of cooperation between those seeking to utilize water for agricultural purposes and those whose historical way of life and culture hinged on the restoration of healthy fish runs in the Umatilla River.

The Umatilla Basin project has been a product of years of debate and grassroots consensus building. Its two main purposes have been to restore a healthy anadromous fishery to the Umatilla River and to provide irrigated agriculture with a predictable water supply. On both counts, the project has been a tremendous success.

Under the 1988 act, new pumping facilities were authorized to allow three irrigation districts, which previously withdrew their water from the Umatilla River, to leave the water instream for fish. In exchange, the irrigation districts received an equal volume of water from the adjacent Columbia River to irrigate their crop lands. The project has had no impact on Columbia River flows and has restored strong, healthy fish runs to the

Umatilla River for the first time in decades. In fact, in the first 6 months of 1996 already, over 4,000 fish have returned to a river that in the 1960's lost its native salmon. In fact, prior to the authorization of the Umatilla Basin project, irrigation withdrawals from the Umatilla River literally dried the river up during the summer months.

While the Umatilla Basin project has been a huge success for all parties involved, the 1988 act provided Columbia River exchanges for only half of the Umatilla River irrigation withdrawals. In order to make the project whole and satisfy the Federal Government's treaty fishery obligations to the Umatilla Tribes, the remainder of the project must be built. Today, I am introducing legislation which achieves this goal, while at the same time, resolves a longstanding dispute regarding the delivery of water to lands not officially within Bureau of Reclamation project boundaries.

The bill I am introducing today, entitled the "Umatilla Basin Project Completion Act," incorporates the key components of a general agreement reached last April in meetings between the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla, irrigation districts, State water resources department, locally elected officials and Federal agencies. My bill has three major provisions. First, it calls for the construction of the third and final phase of the Umatilla project, which will exchange Columbia River water for an equivalent amount of irrigation water now taken out of the Umatilla River. This final phase, known as phase 3, will cost \$71 million and will fully satisfy all obligations of the Federal Government to provide the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation with water for fishery needs in the Umatilla River below the mouth of McKay Creek, as recognized by their 1855 treaty with the United States. The 1988 Umatilla Basin Project Act authorized the construction of phases 1 and 2. Phase 3 alone will provide almost as much water to the fishery resources of the Umatilla River as did the previous two phases.

Second, my bill adjusts the boundaries of three of the four irrigation districts in the Umatilla project to include lands irrigated with project water prior to 1988. The three districts for which these boundary adjustments will be legislatively granted, are already exchanging Umatilla River for Columbia River water, as authorized under phases 1 and 2. The fourth district, Westland Irrigation District, was not included in phases 1 and 2 of the 1988 Act and is still withdrawing water from the Umatilla River. My bill does not grant a boundary adjustment for Westland until the phase 3 Columbia River water exchange is fully up and running.

Finally, my legislation calls for the preparation of a comprehensive water management plan for the Umatilla River Basin. As a followup to last

April's meetings, all of the affected parties—the State, Federal and local Governments, the tribes, and the irrigation districts—agreed to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive water management plan for the Umatilla Basin. The Plan would serve as a guide in allocating water to maximize the fishery benefits while recognizing valid existing uses. My bill authorizes \$500,000 to assist this most promising and valuable effort.

It should be noted at this time that not all of the items identified in last April's consensus process were included in my legislation. While I felt that each of these items had merit, fiscal realities and the short time frame remaining prior to sine die adjournment of the 104th Congress precluded me from including them in this bill.

Mr. President, I recognize that large authorizations for new construction projects are not particularly popular at this time. This bill, however, is far preferable to the traditional mode of meeting our Nation's treaty fishery obligations to Indian tribes. To date, the standard mode of operation has been protracted litigation and adjudication of rights, followed by construction of costly projects. In the Yakima River Basin, for example, the Federal Government and irrigators spent nearly 20 years and \$50 million just adjudicating the tribe's treaty fishery rights. During that time, the Yakima River salmon runs continued to decline, and Congress passed legislation authorizing another \$150 million to restore the Yakima River fishery. Unfortunately, similar sad tales reverberate throughout the Pacific Northwest. Our experience in the Umatilla River Basin, to date, has been more positive and successful.

The bill I am introducing today reflects the general consensus reached by Tribes, irrigation districts, local communities, environmentalists, and State, local, and Federal governments. These groups came together in the same cooperative spirit that characterized the 1988 Umatilla Basin Project Act to reach agreement that the final phase of the Umatilla Basin Project should be completed and that, once and for all, the longstanding debate over authorized water deliveries for irrigation purposes should be resolved. I am proud of the work these groups have done and look forward to working with them to resolve their remaining issues and concerns with this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy 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. 1986

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

SECTION 1. This Act may be referred to as the "Umatilla Basin Project Completion Act."

SEC. 2. Title II of Public Law 100-557 is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"SEC. 214. AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECT COMPLETION.

"For purposes of completing the Columbia River water exchanges and other mitigation efforts necessary to restore the Umatilla River Basin fishery, and to provide for the expansion of Umatilla Basin Project district boundaries, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary), acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto), is authorized to complete construction and to operate and maintain the integrated Umatilla River Basin Project, including pump exchange projects known as Phases I, II, and III.

"SEC. 215. UMATILLA RIVER PHASE III EXCHANGE

"(a)(1) The Secretary is hereby authorized to construct a third and final phase of the Umatilla River Basin Project to provide additional flows in the Umatilla River for anadromous fish through a water exchange with Westland Irrigation District.

"(2) Prior to construction, the Secretary shall complete a feasibility study to identify alternatives within the authorized ceiling to provide Westland Irrigation District exchange flows of approximately 220 cubic feet per second, or greater.

"(3) The feasibility study for the Phase III exchange facilities shall include an analysis of inclusion of other irrigators in the exchange, appropriate backup systems, water conservation opportunities, and such other analyses as the Secretary may deem appropriate to improve the exchange project for fishery restoration purposes.

"(4) Prior to completion of Phase III facilities, the Secretary shall negotiate and execute an exchange agreement with the Westland Irrigation District and any other participating irrigators to allow the use of Columbia River water in exchange for an equal amount of Umatilla River or McKay Reservoir water: *Provided*, that the irrigation districts shall continue to be eligible to receive the same volume of water as they received under their respective contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation dated July 6, 1954 for Hermiston Irrigation District, November 18, 1949 for Stanfield Irrigation District, July 6, 1954 for West Extension Irrigation District, and November 18, 1949 for Westland Irrigation District.

"(5) Phase III facilities may pump Columbia River water for exchange purposes only, and not for conjunctive use.

"(b) OPERATION OF MCKAY RESERVOIR.—The Secretary shall operate McKay Reservoir in accordance with Federal and State law and water rights filed pursuant to State law. The Secretary is authorized to continue to designate and deliver McKay Reservoir water for Umatilla River fishery purposes. This Title shall not alter any party's rights or obligations under existing contracts for McKay Reservoir water.

"(c) Operation and Maintenance Costs.—All exchange system operation and maintenance costs and any increased operation and maintenance costs to the Project caused by the Phase III Exchange shall be the responsibility of the Federal Government and shall be non-reimbursable.

"(d) POWER FOR PROJECT PUMPING.—The Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, consistent with provisions of the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program established pursuant to the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (94 Stat. 2697), shall provide for project power needed to effect the Phase III water exchange for purposes of mitigating anadromous fishery resources. The cost of power shall be credited to fishery restoration goals of the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

"SEC. 216. UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

"(a) Upon enactment of the Umatilla Basin Project Completion Act, the boundaries of the three irrigation districts with functioning Columbia River water exchange facilities are adjusted by operation of law as follows:

"(1) Hermiston Irrigation District's boundaries are adjusted to include the 1,091 acres identified in its 1993 request to the Bureau of Reclamation;

"(2) Stanfield Irrigation District's boundaries are adjusted to include the 230.99 acres receiving water under 1995 and 1996 temporary contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation; and

"(3) West Extension Irrigation District's boundaries are adjusted to include the 2,436.8 acres identified in its 1993 request to the Bureau of Reclamation and are classified as irrigable in the Bureau of Reclamation's Land Classification Report.

"(b)(1) When the Umatilla Basin Project's Phase III Exchange is completed and fully functional, the Westland Irrigation District's boundaries shall be adjusted to include the 7,023 acres receiving water under 1995 and 1996 temporary contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation: *Provided*, That any analysis required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 on the boundary expansion request shall be accomplished in conjunction with similar analysis on the Phase III exchange facilities. The Westland Irrigation District shall pay analysis costs associated with boundary adjustment, not to exceed \$300,000, and any additional costs shall be non-reimbursable.

"(2) The Westland Irrigation District's temporary contract with the Bureau of Reclamation is hereby extended for an additional ten-year period. All other terms of the temporary contract, including the payment, water delivery, and mitigation provisions, shall remain the same. A riparian project, as described in the 1996 temporary contract, will be designed and completed by the Westland Irrigation District. If Phase III is not fully functional when this temporary contract, as extended, expires, the Secretary is authorized to enter into additional extensions on such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreeable.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no parcel may receive Project water unless it has a valid existing State water right and is classified as irrigable in the Bureau of Reclamation's Land Classification Report.

"(d) Upon approval of each irrigation district's boundary adjustment request and adjustment of the boundary, a legal description of the new district boundaries, including land classification and project boundary maps, shall be provided as an attachment to all four Irrigation District's existing contracts.

"(e) No alteration in the ability to pay determination for the Umatilla River Basin Project districts may be made as a result of the Project boundary expansions authorized by this Title.

"SEC. 217. TREATY OBLIGATIONS.

"The Federal Government and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation jointly recognize that completion of Phase III and perpetual operation of the integrated Project, including Phases I, II, and III, meets all obligations of the Federal Government to provide the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation with water for fishery needs in the Umatilla River below the mouth of McKay Creek, as recognized by their 1855 Treaty with the United States.

"SEC. 218. WATER PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT.

"(a) The Secretary shall continue working in cooperation with the State of Oregon, the

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the irrigation districts, and the affected public toward developing a Comprehensive Water Management Plan to assist in restoring the Umatilla River Basin's anadromous fishery. The Secretary shall develop an integrated groundwater/surface water model of the Upper Umatilla River Basin for use in developing the Comprehensive Water Management Plan.

"(b) Project facilities and features authorized by this title shall be integrated and coordinated, from an operational standpoint, into existing features of the Umatilla Basin Project.

"(c) The Secretary shall enter into appropriate agreements with the State of Oregon, the relevant irrigation districts, and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, as appropriate, to provide funding for monitoring and administration, including regulation, of project-related water supplies for the purposes herein identified.

SEC. 219. AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION.

"(a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations of applicable cost indexes, the following sums, without fiscal year limitation:

"(1) not to exceed \$71,000,000 for feasibility studies, environmental studies, and construction of the Phase III Exchange: *Provided*, That all costs of Phase III planning and construction, including operation and maintenance costs allocated to the mitigation of anadromous fish species and the study authorized in Section 215 of this Act, shall be non-reimbursable, *Provided further*, That not less than 80 per centum of such funds shall be used for actual construction;

"(2) not to exceed \$500,000 for the development of a Comprehensive Water Management Plan and integrated groundwater/surface water model, as provided for in §218(a) of this title; and

"(3) not to exceed \$400,000 annually for enforcement and protection of Phases I, II, and III exchange water for instream uses, as provided for in §218(c) of this title."

SEC. 3. WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act shall:

(a) Impair the validity of or preempt any provision of State law with respect to water or water rights, or of any interstate compact governing water or water rights;

(b) Create a right to the diversion or use of water other than as established pursuant to the substantive and procedural requirements of State law and as recognized under State law;

(c) Impair or affect any valid water right; or

(d) Establish or create any water rights for any party, nor may any provision be construed to create directly or indirectly an express or implied federal reserved water right for any purpose.●

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 1988. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for individuals who are residents of the District of Columbia a maximum rate of tax of 15 percent on income from sources within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce with my col-

leagues Senators LIEBERMAN, ABRAHAM, LOTT, and HATCH the District of Columbia Economic Recovery Act. The social, administrative, and fiscal problems of our Nation's Capital are well documented: High crime rates, poor schools, deteriorating infrastructure, and inadequate delivery of basic public services, just to name a few. The District of Columbia is facing its greatest economic crisis since it was established in 1790. Congress has taken major steps, including the creation of a financial control board, to assist the city during this current financial crisis. But despite these efforts, the city has a long way to go to achieve economic self-sufficiency.

The root of the District's problems is an ever-eroding middle class. Since 1950, Washington's population has declined by nearly 250,000 residents: In fact, 68,000 people left between 1988 and 1993 alone. The vast majority were middle-class families whose taxes funded the city's operations. So far, D.C.'s response to this decline has been misguided: even-higher taxes. But this has only led to even more residents leaving the city in search of lower tax rates, better schools, and safer streets.

We believe that the best way to help the District is to promote economic growth, and the best way to promote economic growth is to significantly reduce the tax burden on its residents. Economic growth will mean more jobs, more opportunity, greater private sector investment, and ultimately a better quality of life in the Nation's Capital.

There is a large and growing consensus that our current income tax system has become a tremendous obstacle to economic growth and an improved standard of living. After eight decades of misuse by lawmakers, lobbyists, and special interests, today's tax system is unfair, complex, costly, and punishes work, savings, and investment.

Therefore, we as a nation need to fundamentally rethink the manner in which income is taxed in order to construct a system that is equitable, efficient, and can support economic growth. This effort, which perhaps appropriately begins in the Nation's Capital, is an important first step.

In order to achieve genuine tax reform, we must take the blinkers off, special interests must give way to the overriding national concerns, partisan class warfare must end, and the defenders of the status quo must step aside to make way for positive change. Mere tinkering with the Tax Code, or simply reshuffling the existing tax burden is not genuine tax reform. We must create a new tax structure that allows everyone to benefit from economic growth. The flat tax encompasses this new thinking and fundamental change needed to create a fair, simple, and pro-growth tax system.

The D.C. Economic Recovery Act is an important step in luring middle-class taxpayers back to the District of Columbia. It provides tax incentives,

including a 15-percent flat income tax rate for all District residents and deductions of \$15,000 for individual filers; \$25,000 for head of household filers; and \$30,000 for married filers.

This will benefit everyone, especially the poor and middle class. Our bill includes a \$5,000 first-time home buyers provision designed to assist middle-class families in purchasing homes within the District of Columbia. Second, we have established a zero capital gains tax rate on investments within the District, to help spur investment in the District, so middle-class residents won't be hurt by onerous capital gains taxes when they decide to sell their homes. In addition to these incentives, we have included a brown-fields provision that is sure to improve the city's quality of life by encouraging companies to clean up environmentally damaged District land.

This bill also provides the opportunity for all Americans to participate in the economic revitalization of the District of Columbia by extending to everyone a zero capital gains rate for all investments made within the District. We believe the American people want to take pride in this city, and want it to represent all the best this Nation has to offer. For too long, the city's economy has been locked into the growth and declines of the Federal Government. Our bill offers the chance to spur nongovernmental economic investment in the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia is not only home to the people who live here, it is truly the Nation's city. Historically, Congress has recognized this fact, and assured the financial integrity of the District. However, we now realize that simply throwing money at the problem is not the answer. We must find a way to fundamentally improve the city without demanding additional financial commitments from American taxpayers.

We believe that these incentives, along with responsible and sensible financial management, are just what the District needs to become self-sufficient.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with Senator MACK as an original cosponsor of this important legislation, the District of Columbia Economic Recovery Act of 1996 [DCERA].

The District of Columbia belongs to each and every one of us. As citizens of the United States, we have a stake in the successes, and a stake in the failures, of Washington, DC. It is America's city.

For a variety of reasons, not all of them easily explained, Washington is in desperate financial straits. The here and now financial prospects are grim for the city and the future gets grimmer. This is largely because middle-class families, the backbone of any successful community, are fleeing the District in alarming numbers.

The legislation we are introducing today would instantly transform our

Nation's capital, making it a more appealing place to live, to invest, to build, to buy, and to work. This bill is designed to reverse the flow of middle-class residents and businesses, who are currently fleeing the city for the suburbs. Those still in the District would have new incentives to stay. And many others now living elsewhere would have a very strong incentive to move into the District with their families and with their businesses.

We cannot make the schools better in the District overnight. We cannot promise crime-free streets overnight. What we can do is provide middle-class tax relief in the District, as a way to lure these middle-class taxpayers to the District as a way to reestablish a tax base in the District. And once we bring these people back, safer streets and better schools can follow.

Surely we can wait. We can wait until the situation in the district is so dire, when nearly all of the tax base in the District has fled and we will be asked to take over the city altogether. Waiting strikes me as penny wise and pound foolish.

Instead of waiting, we should consider the merits of the DCERA which we are introducing today. This legislation is modeled on legislation which has been introduced in the House with broad, bipartisan support, by Representative ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. Both the House and the Senate version of the DCERA establish a maximum Federal tax rate of 15 percent. Both bills double the personal exemption which would eliminate Federal income taxes for single residents who make up to \$15,000 a year and married couples filing jointly who make up to \$30,000 a year. At the same time, the bill retains the mortgage and charitable deductions and would allow a taxpayer to file under the old system, if preferred.

In contrast to Representative NORTON's bill, our legislation establishes a zero capital gains rate for D.C. investments held by D.C. or non-D.C. residents for 3 years. Representative NORTON's bill restricts this capital gains treatment to investments held by D.C. residents only. In crafting our version of this legislation, we were concerned this would limit potential investment in the District. For this reason, the Senate treatment is broader.

Also in contrast to the House DCERA, our bill includes a \$5,000 credit for first time District home purchases and includes a provision to clean-up abandoned brownfields within the District. Members of Congress not representing the District could not take advantage of the tax incentives in the bill and we are working toward an explicit understanding that the District would not take advantage of the Federal tax incentives in this bill by raising local taxes.

I very much see this bill as a first step. Some of the urban problems Washington faces are unique to Washington because Washington has no State, no broader tax base, to draw on.

At the same time, many of Washington's problems are problems that are faced by cities all across this country. If this approach works in Washington, I hope we can try it in Bridgeport, New Haven, and Hartford as well.

I should note that, unlike some proponents of this legislation, I am at best an agnostic on a flat tax. I believe progressivity in our tax rates is inherently fair and am pleased that the legislation we are introducing today has elements of that progressivity by providing such a generous personal exemption. At the same time, a good number of our cities are facing the loss of their middle-class population and the only way to rebuild that base may be through bold measures like a flat tax which has clear and compelling benefits for the middle class. The people we are really anxious to bring back to our cities are the 28 percenters. Under the current Tax Code a typical family in the 28-percent bracket would be a couple with two children who make roughly between \$39,000 and \$95,000 after deductions. Our bill would create a very favorable tax incentive for these people to stay in, or move to, the District.

Mr. President, the most important thing there is to say about urban policy in this country is that we really do not have an urban policy. We know what has not worked; today we are introducing legislation that we believe will work and there is no better place to start than in Washington, DC, a city that belongs to all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this important legislation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senators MACK and LIEBERMAN in sponsoring legislation designed to spur economic growth in the District of Columbia. The economic circumstances in the District have eroded so significantly that they can no longer be casually dismissed. Failure to act now with investment incentives would cost the District even more in lost financial opportunities—financial opportunities the District, and indeed our entire Nation, cannot afford to miss.

Opponents of this legislation may be critical of the special treatment given to the District of Columbia as opposed to other areas of the country. Yet, this should be the greatest city in the world—east of Salt Lake City.

In all seriousness, however, I believe that it is imperative that the Capital of our Nation stand for democracy, economic development, and security. It is difficult for the District of Columbia to represent these qualities when it has become nearly unmanageable and is on the brink of financial ruin. Something must be done to breathe new life into Washington, DC. Otherwise, I've got some ghost towns in Utah I can show you.

And, I want to emphasize that we are not talking about an infusion of Federal funds. We are talking about encouraging private sector investment in the city. We are talking about incen-

tives for people to live here. This legislation provides a way to bring both the capital and stability needed to start the healing process.

The components included in this bill are specifically designed to revitalize our Nation's Capital. First, the bill would tax all D.C. residents at a flat rate of 15 percent and significantly increase their standard deductions, yet retain both the charitable contribution deduction and the home mortgage deduction. This provision would give the middle class who left because of rising taxes a new incentive to return to the District and once again call it home. In fact, this recovery plan also establishes a \$5,000 tax credit for first-time home buyers for residences purchased within the District of Columbia. These types of incentives would have a real and immediate impact on the District and would help replace the middle-class base that has slowly been eroding.

In addition to these provisions, Mr. President, this legislation eliminates the capital gains tax on any investment made within the District of Columbia by residents and greatly reduces it for nonresidents. This part of the bill provides the District access to a tremendous source of capital, otherwise unavailable.

Not only would this proposal begin to restore the financial viability of our Nation's capital city, it would also provide a testing ground for studying the effects of the basic principles of fundamental tax reform. Our current system of taxation has been much criticized over the past year and a half, and I agree that steps should be taken toward a fairer, simpler, and more efficient tax system. However, while change may be necessary, it must also be done carefully and deliberately. Initiating a flat tax system in the District of Columbia could give legislators much-needed insight into tax reform on a national scale. Success in the District would result in ideas that could be applied nationwide. Thus, this legislation would benefit the District of Columbia, as well as every citizen of America.

Mr. President, this bill is far from perfect. It is a bold idea designed to reverse the fall of a once-great city. Legitimate concerns about the impact of this bill have been raised in recent days by members of the House Ways and Means Committee and other. For one thing, skeptics of this idea worry that the provisions of this bill would give current residents of the District of Columbia a windfall. Other concerns that have been expressed include taxpayers moving into the District for only a short period to take advantage of the benefits of this proposal, then moving out again. Other critics contend that the root of the District's problems is not the lack of money, but poor management of the resources already present and that therefore, an infusion of new money and new residents would not change things significantly.

I agree that the bill we are sponsoring today will not, by itself, solve all of

the problems of the District of Columbia. I also agree that much work needs to be done in further crafting this bill as it goes through the legislative process to ensure that concerns about loopholes and unintended benefits are met. And, I also completely agree that the citizens of the District of Columbia must hold its elected leaders accountable for waste and mismanagement.

It is important, however, that the general concepts of this bill are put before the Congress. This bill is certainly not set in stone, and I would anticipate that many Members of Congress and outside groups will have a number of good ideas on how it can be improved. My goal is that Congress start taking a serious look at ways to solve the problems of our Nation's capital. One of these ways must include expanding the local economy and, therefore, the local tax base. And, serious problems often require bold solutions.

Washington, DC is the capital of the United States of America. Every day there are buses of people who come to view the monuments, study the historical treasures, and participate in their Federal Government. Every day there are people from foreign nations who may get their first and, in some cases, only taste of America from visiting our capital. Unfortunately, a city rife with pot holes, dilapidated police cars, and drug dealers and prostitutes openly offering their wares is not the impression of our country most Americans wish to leave with visitors from foreign countries, let alone tolerate themselves.

I quote Washington Post columnist James Glassman when I say that it is time to act courageously and adopt a proposal that could help save this city. I urge my colleagues to become actively involved in the debate and in searching for ways to revitalize and reinvigorate a city that is as important to Floridians as it is to Utahns, as important to Californians as to Pennsylvanians.

I urge my colleagues to join us in this bold effort to jump start both the economy and civic pride of the District of Columbia.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 684

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] were added as cosponsors 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. 864

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 864, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for increased medicare reimbursement for nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists to increase the delivery of health services in health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes.

S. 949

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 949, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the death of George Washington.

S. 1675

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1675, a bill to provide for the nationwide tracking of convicted sexual predators, and for other purposes.

S. 1965

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1965, a bill to prevent the illegal manufacturing and use of methamphetamine.

SENATE RESOLUTION 282 RELATIVE TO THE DAY OF NATIONAL CONCERN ABOUT YOUNG PEOPLE AND GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. BRADLEY (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FRIST, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. GLENN, Mr. REID, Mr. SIMON, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DODD, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COATS, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BURNS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. GORTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ROBB, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. MACK, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. HEFLIN, Mrs. FRAHM, Mr. EXON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. FORD, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GREGG, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HATFIELD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. KERREY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. NUNN, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HELMS, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. PELL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 282

Whereas violent crime among juveniles in American society has dramatically escalated in recent years;

Whereas between 1989 and 1994, juvenile arrest rates for murder in this country skyrocketed 42 percent;

Whereas in 1993, more than 10 children were murdered each day in America;

Whereas America's young people are this country's most important resource, and Americans have a vested interest in helping children survive, free from fear and violence, to become healthy adults;

Whereas America's young people can, by taking individual and collective responsibility for their own decisions and actions, help

chart a new and less violent direction for the entire country;

Whereas American school children will be invited to participate in a national observance involving millions of their fellow students and will thereby be empowered to see themselves as the agents of positive social change; and

Whereas this observance will give American school children the opportunity to make a solemn decision about their future and control their destiny by voluntarily signing a pledge promising that they will never take a gun to school, will never use a gun to resolve a dispute, and will use their influence to prevent friends from using guns to settle disputes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates October 10, 1996, as the "Day of National Concern About Young People and Gun Violence". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the school children of the United States to observe such day with appropriate activities.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today, along with my colleagues, Senator SPECTER and Senator WELLSTONE, who initially joined me to serve as original cosponsors, to submit a resolution designating October 10, 1996, as a day of national concern about young people and gun violence.

This resolution has enjoyed broad bipartisan support over the last several days. I have been asking other Members of the Senate if they would like to join as original cosponsors of this resolution. As of today, the date of its introduction, there are 81 additional cosponsors of this resolution to declare October 10 as a national day of concern about young people and gun violence.

Mr. President, we are in a crisis in this country. America is losing a generation of young people to crime and violence. Last July, Cindy Villalba, a 20-year-old Rutgers University student, was slain in Paterson, NJ, when a bullet from a .25-caliber semiautomatic pistol careened into her chest. The assailant, Corie Miller, was 17 years old.

The murder was a senseless tragedy. Ms. Villalba was sitting in a car talking to a friend, Julissa Vargas. Miller, along with two other teenagers, aged 19 and 18, approached the vehicle and demanded money. When the two women insisted they did not have any money and began screaming, Miller cocked the pistol and struck Vargas in the back of the head. The pistol then discharged, and a bullet struck Villalba in the chest, killing her instantly. Villalba, a catechism teacher at St. John the Baptist Cathedral, had just returned from Costa Rica, where she was teaching English to schoolchildren as a part of a Rutgers University program.

A few months after the murder of Ms. Villalba, Desmond Carberry, then 12 years old, took a loaded gun and pointed it at his 10-year-old neighborhood playmate's head. He squeezed the trigger, killing Noel DaRojá. The children were playing unsupervised with a .22-caliber handgun at a third friend's house in Berkeley Township, NJ, on a day when school was let out early because of teacher conferences. They had