

defense of liberty in times of war and peace. And on this Veteran's Day, we honor those especially courageous patriots who—on that gray, windy and fateful morning on the coast of Normandy—valiantly began the eradication from Europe of the hateful plague of Nazism, fascism and totalitarian dictatorship.

It is highly appropriate that this National D-Day Memorial should find its home here in Bedford, Virginia.

As vividly described by Colonel Doughty, United States and Allied soldiers stormed Omaha Beach at dawn June 6, 1944. And brave men from Bedford County spearheaded the first wave in one of the greatest military feats in the annals of world history.

Virginia remembers with pride the noble legacy of the 29th Division, especially the citizen-soldiers of the imperishable "Stone-wall Brigade" who waded, scrambled, fought and overcame entrenched forces on high, formidable bluffs.

While Time has washed away the blood of our fallen heroes from the beaches and cliffs of Normandy, Time has not washed away, and must not dim, our memories of those horrific and heroic events—how they fought; how they died; and how they won freedom for the people of Europe and the world.

Whether by hard-fought victory or through steadfast vigilance, each generation passes on to the next lessons: lessons in the sometimes high price of freedom.

This Memorial will be a thoughtful, magnificent tribute to the Americans and Allies who began the liberation of the European continent during that "Longest Day."

Right here in Bedford, Virginia, people from around the world can—and will—come to visit, learn and pay their respects to heroes of unselfish character and undaunted courage.

This Memorial will add meaning to the strong, silent testimony of those men who lost their own future in making secure for others the responsibilities and opportunities that come from freedom.

By breaking ground for this National D-Day Memorial, each of us is helping to ensure that the eternal flame of freedom will never be extinguished by force from without or by neglect from within.

Through the hard work of so many, we are bequeathing to our children a greater appreciation and respect for the many blessings of liberty, and a better understanding of their responsibility to nurture and protect it.

In closing, I pray God will continue to bless Virginia and the United States with people of such honor and character as those we remember this Veteran's Day, so that our United States will always be a beacon of hope, opportunity and freedom.

Veterans: we gratefully salute you in our minds and in our hearts!•

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FRANCISCAN FRIARS AND SISTERS OF THE ATONEMENT

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, December 15, 1997 will mark the 100th anniversary of the Order of the Franciscan Friars and Sisters of the Atonement. The Order was founded by Father Lewis T. Watson and Mother Lurana White in Garrison, New York with the goal of promoting Christian unity. The Friars and Sisters continue their mission work through the promotion of the Week of Christian Unity and the operation of ecumenical centers and libraries.

Through the years, the Friars and Sisters of the Atonement have re-

mained in Garrison where they now operate the Graymoor Ecumenical and Religious Institute. At Graymoor they publish a monthly magazine, Ecumenical Trends, and operate St. Christopher's Inn, a temporary shelter for homeless men, whom they refer to as "Brothers Christopher" or Christ Bearers.

The influence and the good work of the Friars and Sisters extends well beyond the Hudson Highlands region of New York, reaching throughout the United States, Canada, Europe and Asia. They operate day care centers, Retreat Houses, Head Start programs, and shelters for battered wives and children. They minister to the poor, feed the hungry, and embrace the marginalized worldwide. Not only do they seek unity of the Christian community, but also unity of the human spirit and unity of the human community.

True to their cause of Christian unity, they have dedicated their lives to the hope "that all may be one. . . that the world may believe." I commend their single-heartedness and congratulate them on the occasion of their 100th anniversary.•

CHILD EXPLOITATION SENTENCING ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1997

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my disappointment that in the final hours of this legislative session, a piece of legislation sponsored by my colleague, Senator DEWINE and I, S. 900 has apparently been stopped from passing the Senate because of an objection from the other side of the aisle.

S. 900 is a bi-partisan effort to address the growing problem of criminals using the Internet to contact and target young children that they ultimately sexually abuse and exploit. This bill requires the United States Sentencing Commission to create a sentencing enhancement for criminals who use the Internet to facilitate sexual crimes against young people. The legislation also increases penalties for repeat sexual offenders.

S. 900 has, on two occasions, received the unanimous support of the Senate Judiciary Committee. It has passed the Committee as a free-standing measure and was adopted as an amendment to juvenile justice legislation considered by the Committee earlier this year. Yet, we are now told that the bill has been held. I find it troubling that someone would object to legislation designed to help protect young children from being sexual abused and molested and that such objection would be made, without providing Senator DEWINE or myself an opportunity to address whatever concerns might exist.

Mr. President, the misuse of the Internet is a growing problem. FBI Director Freeh has testified to this fact and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children—which sup-

ports the DeWine/Feingold legislation—agrees that the situation is a growing concern. S. 900 is a straightforward, bipartisan effort to send the message that pedophiles and child molesters will not be allowed to exploit the Internet to commit their illicit crimes against children. While I regret that someone has chosen to slow this effort to protect children, I fully intend to return to this issue next year and will continue to push for the adoption of this legislation.•

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2267

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the conference report to accompany H.R. 2267, the appropriations bill for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies is received, if it is identical to the document filed earlier today, it be deemed agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without further action or debate.

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

THE COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes at this time to especially thank my staff, headed by Jim Morhard, and so many other members of the staff on both the Democratic and Republican side, who have spent literally hours, including all the hours of last night and many other evenings, but the entire night, getting this bill into a position where it could be passed. It is, as it appears to be, the last appropriations bill to be passed by the Senate and the House and, as such, it has had more than its fair share of issues attached to it. But as a result of the diligent and extraordinary work of the staff, both the Democratic and Republican staff, it is now, I believe, close to successful conclusion, and I anticipate that the House will soon be passing it, and it will be, as we have just agreed to here in the Senate, deemed passed.

The bill itself is a very strong piece of legislation. It makes an extraordinarily aggressive commitment to supporting and expanding our efforts in the area of law enforcement, in the area of trying to stop the drugs that are flowing into this country, in protecting our borders and expanding our efforts to make sure that people who are convicted, especially of violent crimes, are incarcerated and kept in prison.

It has a very strong commitment also to prevention activities in the area of our justice system. Special emphasis has been put on the violence-against-women initiatives, which are funded at \$270.7 million in this bill, an increase of almost 55 percent in this category since I became chairman in 1995.

Also, we have put a special emphasis on attempting to address the problems of the Internet relative to child pornography and, unfortunately, the fact that many pedophiles—people who wish to harm our children—are using the Internet for purposes of stalking children. We have continued, supported, and expanded the FBI's initiatives in things like "Innocent Images" which is a sting program to try to catch pedophiles and child pornographers. We expanded it so that local and State law enforcement communities will have experience in this area and can take advantage of the protocols set up by the FBI.

Further, we recognize that juvenile crime is one of the greatest problems in the country today, and we have attempted to address that through the expansion of the juvenile justice programs, especially the preventive programs. I see Senator COATS here on the floor, who has been a force of immense energy in the area of trying to address juvenile prevention programs, such as Big Sister/Big Brother, and Boys and Girls Clubs, which is funded under this program. We have also created a new block grant, the purpose of which will be to help local communities in the area of juvenile justice. This block grant is aggressively funded with \$250 million.

There is, in addition, a comprehensive effort—it is a continuing effort—to address terrorism activities and to pursue an aggressive policy of counterterrorism. We all recognize, especially with the events of the last few days that have occurred in Pakistan, that Americans are at risk overseas. They are also, regrettably, at risk in our own country. We have seen two trials just recently completed, one involving the New York Trade Center, the other involving a shooting outside the CIA. Counterterrorism requires that we have a coordinated effort and that we have a strong law enforcement element in that coordinated effort, and this bill pursues both those activities.

Senators who represent States along our border, our southern border especially, have found very serious problems in the area of drug enforcement and in the area of illegal immigrants coming across the border, so we are dramatically expanding the number of INS border patrols in this bill, increasing them by 1,000; including \$250 million in new initiatives to try to restore the integrity of the naturalization process, which unfortunately has fallen on hard times, to say the least. That may not be the best description of it, in fact, because the system has so collapsed. This bill puts the dollars necessary to give adequate support to the INS, and also it dramatically expands the Border Patrol efforts so that States like, especially, Texas and Arizona, which need additional border patrols, will be able to obtain them.

It significantly expands our efforts in the area of NOAA activities. This is one of our premier national treasures

in the area of research and technology, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. It is an organization which has cutting-edge knowledge in a variety of areas, but especially in the prediction of our weather. We aggressively pursue the expansion of our efforts in weather research and information areas.

We give our judges a cost-of-living increase, something they deserve. This bill covers a lot of different jurisdictions, as is known by most of the Senators. One that doesn't get too much attention is the fact that it covers the judicial branch of our Government. We are going to try to help the Supreme Court out and renovate the Supreme Court building, but at the same time we are going to give our judges a reasonable cost-of-living adjustment.

In the area of the State Department, we concentrate aggressively in trying to get their physical house in order. It is really a national disgrace, the type of equipment that some of our overseas personnel are asked to use. We still have dial phones in some embassies that we fund around the world. Many of our facilities are simply decrepit and rundown. We have made a major commitment to rehabilitate our facilities and to expand the communication and technology attributes of the State Department.

In addition, we are making a major commitment to the personnel of the State Department. I believe they and their families deserve our support, especially in the area of giving them adequate security. We aggressively pursued that.

Other agencies, the Small Business Administration, FCC, FTC, all of which are covered by this bill, are also aggressively addressed. We do all this in the context of a bill that, although it spends a considerable amount of money, over \$31 billion, spends less than what the President requested and is clearly within the budget, which is a balanced budget, I would note, as a result of the budget passed by this Congress.

So, again, I thank the staff for their extraordinary work in this area. I appreciate especially the assistance of the leader in allowing us to get this bill finally resolved. Without his intervention at a number of critical stages, it would not have been pulled together. I very much thank him for his assistance in this effort.

I also especially want to thank my ranking member, Senator HOLLINGS, who is really a great fellow to work with. He has a tremendous institutional history of how this committee works, and where the funding comes from, and what has happened in the past. His counsel has always been extraordinarily useful to me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I extend my congratulations to the Senator from New Hampshire for his work on

this very important appropriations bill. I should note it is the 13th and final appropriations conference report, the last one across the line, but a big one and an important one—Commerce, State, and Justice and related agencies. It also became a vehicle for a number of Senators to attempt to address problems, as it was the last conference report to go through the Congress. It was quite a struggle, but an important one. I commend the Senator from New Hampshire for his good work. I should also note the cooperation he received from the ranking member, the Senator from South Carolina. I thank the Senator for his work. I am glad we had our colleagues from the other side of the Capitol also work with us on this effort, which was a very interesting experience.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I come to floor today to discuss the new juvenile justice grant program contained in the appropriations bill for the Commerce, Justice, and State Departments. Of course, I would have preferred the appropriators to defer to the Judiciary Committee, which considered juvenile crime legislation for over a month and reported a bill to the Senate floor, so we could have a full debate and develop effective, comprehensive juvenile crime legislation.

That said, I am pleased that the conference report addresses one of my primary concerns by relaxing the mandates contained in earlier proposals that would have required States to try more juveniles as adults to qualify for federal funding.

Recall that the juvenile crime bill passed by the House of Representatives last spring would have disqualified States from receiving federal funds unless prosecutors had complete discretion to try certain 15-year-olds as adults. Similarly, as originally introduced, the Senate Republican's youth crime bill—S. 10—would have required States to give prosecutors unfettered discretion to try 14-year-olds as adults, even for minor crimes, to qualify for funding. S. 10 as passed by the Committee loosened this restriction substantially, by enabling States to qualify for funding so long as 14-year-olds were eligible to be tried as adults for serious violent crimes, which they already are in almost every State.

Similarly, the new program contained in the appropriations bill passed by Congress today does not require States to change their laws on trying juveniles as adults. All a State must do to participate in the new program is to certify that it is "actively considering" such changes in policy. So, a State can say, "we're going to think about it," introduce legislation but not enact it, or even reject legislative changes and still qualify for the new federal youth crime fighting funds.

I support this relaxation from the earlier proposals because trying more juveniles as adults is likely to be counterproductive. The research shows that juveniles tried in the adult system are

more likely to be released on bail, less likely to be convicted, punished more slowly, and incarcerated less frequently than in the juvenile justice system. If we want to get tough on juvenile crime, trying kids as adults is the wrong answer.

What is more, placing juveniles in adult jails—where they have exposure to hardened criminals—will only make them more likely to commit crimes once they get out. So despite popular opinion, trying more kids as adults may make our crime problem worse, not better.

Instead of imposing unproven, Washington-based solutions on the States, the best thing the federal government can do is provide local law enforcement, prosecutors, juvenile courts, and community based organizations additional funds to develop creative, comprehensive strategies to address juvenile crime. Such strategies are beginning to bear fruit across the country as juvenile crime has fallen significantly in the past two years.

The new juvenile crime block grant takes a partial step in the right direction by providing \$250 million for juvenile justice system improvements. But this new program is deeply flawed by failing to permit State and localities to use any of these funds for juvenile crime prevention programs. Police chiefs and prosecutors around the country are emphatic that to be effective in combating juvenile crime, we have to combine tough enforcement with effective prevention programs. The new block grant sends the wrong message to our States and localities by requiring that all the funds be spent on enforcement and juvenile justice system improvements.

I am also concerned that the new program will not result in sufficient funding for juvenile prosecutors. Past experience has shown that block grants that flow through local governments do not result in very much funding for prosecutors offices. In the Senate youth crime bill, we have established a grant program—albeit an underfunded one—that would provide federal funding directly to prosecutors specifically for juvenile crime fighting efforts. I will work to fix these and other flaws in the new program when we consider youth violence legislation next year.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to let my colleagues know that tucked in the hundreds of pages of provisions on appropriating federal funds on existing programs in this conference report is legislative language to create a new \$250 million grant program, called the "Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant." This newly authorized program is based on the block grant program in H.R. 3, the "Juvenile Crime Control Act of 1997," although that bill have not passed or even been considered by the Senate.

This new program sounds great until you look at the proverbial fine print. Because of all the new requirements on the States this is just a tease—many

States won't qualify for a penny of this money under H.R. 3 as passed by the House of Representatives on May 8, 1997.

For instance, H.R. 3 mandates that a state must set up a new system of record keeping relating to juveniles that is equivalent to the record keeping system for adults for similar conduct under state and Federal law to be eligible for this block grant. Many states would be forced to make considerable changes to their laws to comply with this mandate. And the cost of complying with this mandate, which would require capturing records for minor juvenile offenses too, is totally unknown.

My home state of Vermont, for example, would not qualify for the block grant in H.R. 3, even though my State has some of the toughest juvenile crime laws in the country, and has the lowest juvenile violent crime rates in the country. Massachusetts will not qualify either, even though that State has made enormous progress in reducing its violent crime problem. Our two States must be doing something right.

I ask why we are being forced to take up the ill-considered H.R. 3 block grant on an appropriations bill. The answer is because the Republican leadership says so. Otherwise, they might miss out on claiming credit in connection with fighting juvenile crime before Congress adjourns. I guess in their minds nothing happens that does not involve their political agenda. Fighting juvenile crime should not be about politics. Unfortunately, this heavy-handed effort is purely partisan. For a group that preaches states' rights, the Republican Leadership has no trouble trampling the hard work and insight of 50 state legislatures who have enacted juvenile crime legislation. H.R. 3 is a presumptuous attempt to have the heavy hand of the federal government dictate state criminal justice policy. This is the wrong way to craft serious legislation.

The Senate Judiciary Committee spent eight mark-ups over two months earlier this year in crafting its juvenile crime bill, the "Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Act of 1997," S. 10. Why did Chairman HATCH and the other members of the Judiciary Committee work so hard to try to craft a bill if the Republican leadership is just going to slip parts of the House bill into a spending bill at the last minute before Congress adjourns for the year? Every Member of the Judiciary Committee worked many hours to revise S. 10 before it was reported by the Committee to the full Senate. This bill still has major problems, but is much improved because of that deliberative legislative process and much better than its House companion, H.R. 3. I am hopeful that S. 10 can be further improved on the Senate floor.

This juvenile block grant approach is flawed and would benefit from attention through the normal legislative process of hearing, public comment, re-

view, Committee consideration, amendment and report, Senate action and House-Senate conference. Instead, the Republican leadership is trying to force this flawed block grant through the Senate.

Fortunately, we in the Senate have been able to modify the flawed block grant program in H.R. 3 to make it tolerable before it was included in this appropriations bill. I want to thank the Ranking Member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary, Senator HOLLINGS, and the Subcommittee's Chairman, Senator GREGG, for working with me, Senator BIDEN, and other Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Our modifications make it clear that every state is eligible for the juvenile crime block grant program in this conference report. To qualify for the block grant program in this conference report, the Governor of a State may certify to the Attorney General that the State will consider legislation, policies and practices which if enacted would qualify the State for a grant under H.R. 3. Governor Dean of my home State has indicated to me that he is willing to make such a certification for Vermont to be eligible for this block grant. We have also limited this program to the 1998 Fiscal Year and made it subject to future authorization legislation.

Mr. President, I stand ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both houses of Congress to enact carefully considered legislation to reduce and prevent juvenile crime. But this hastily conceived block grant approach as part of this appropriations bill is the wrong way to achieve those goals.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I'm pleased to join our Subcommittee Chairman, Senator GREGG, in presenting this Fiscal Year 1998 Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Conference Agreement to the Senate. This is a good agreement that has been worked out in a bipartisan fashion. It has taken us over six weeks of negotiations with the House to reach consensus. I should note that the Senate passed our version of the bill back on July 29 by a vote of 99 to 0.

In the Commerce, Justice, and State appropriations bill we fund programs ranging from the FBI to our State Department embassies overseas, to fisheries research and the National Weather Service, to the Supreme Court and the Federal Communications Commission. It requires a balancing act of the priorities of the Nation, of the sometimes shared and, as we have seen in this conference, more often competing interests of our colleagues here in the Congress, and the priorities of the Administration—all within the confines of our 302(b) allocation. I think Chairman GREGG and his able staff—Jim Morhard, Kevin Linskey, Paddy Link, Dana Quam, Carl Truscott and Vasiliki

Alexopoulos—have done an outstanding job in balancing these interests in their work with our counterparts on the House Appropriations Committee. In the face of a very involved House Republican leadership and an administration that tried to give away the store in an effort to buy fast-track votes, we have held our own—and I fully support the agreement that we are considering today.

In total, this bill provides \$31.777 billion in budget authority, \$158 million more than the Senate-passed bill. We have \$1.881 billion more than was appropriated last year, and the bill is \$275 million below the President's request.

Once again, the CJS appropriations bill makes it clear that Congress is intent on funding Justice and law enforcement as a top priority. This bill provides appropriations totaling \$17.5 billion for Justice—an increase of \$1 billion above last year for the Justice Department. Including fees we provide the Department through appropriations action, the total Justice Department budget is \$19.5 billion.

Within the Justice Department, the FBI is provided \$2.9 billion. Included in this is a large increase of \$143 million for the FBI to enhance its counterterrorism activities. This amount includes \$54 million to acquire counterterrorism readiness capabilities for responding to and managing incidents involving improvised explosive devices, chemical and biological agents, and cyber attacks. Also, \$10 million is provided to stop child exploitation on the Internet, a new issue affecting our youth that this Committee held a special hearing on earlier this year. We have provided enhanced funding to reinvigorate our battle against organized crime and to combat the La Cosa Nostra's efforts to penetrate the securities industry. Finally, we have provided \$44.5 million which will complete the new FBI laboratory at Quantico, Virginia.

The Drug Enforcement Administration is funded at \$1.1 billion. Included in this amount is \$34 million for 60 new agents, \$30 million for counter-drug efforts along the Southwest border, \$11 million targeted for methamphetamine production and trafficking, and \$10 million and 120 positions for efforts to reduce heroin trafficking—all priorities of the Senate.

Also in Justice, the bill enhances INS border control by recommending 1,000 new Border Patrol agents, restoring the integrity of the naturalization process, and expanding revocation, incarceration, and deportation activities. The INS is funded at \$3.8 billion. A program that most members have been hearing about from their constituents is the extension of 245(i). The conferees have adopted a "grandfathering" clause that would allow 245(i) processing for anyone who has filed with the Attorney General or for labor certification with the Department of Labor by January 14, 1998.

The CJS bill also provides funds to accelerate and expand efforts by U.S.

Attorneys to collect the estimated \$34 billion in unpaid child support. I'm especially pleased to note that an increase of \$8.3 million is provided to activate the new National Advocacy Center in my home state. This center will provide training in litigation and advocacy to our Assistant U.S. Attorneys and State and Local Prosecutors. It will be to the U.S. Attorneys what Quantico is to the FBI and DEA. Finally, we have included \$1 million for our U.S. Attorney Rene Josey to continue his outstanding violent crime task force efforts with our state and local law enforcement personnel.

The conference agreement provides \$1.4 billion for the Community Policy program and continues our commitment to put 100,000 cops on the beat. I'm especially pleased to note that we have included \$100 million for an innovative program that addresses COPS retention issues in smaller communities with populations below 50,000. In these small rural communities the COPS program has been especially effective. I've seen it first hand in communities across South Carolina, and I'm pleased that the House and Senate conferees were willing to support my initiative.

Additional programs to note with Justice include: \$25 million for the Regional Information Sharing System [RISS]; \$505 million for the Edward Byrne Memorial Formula Grant Program and \$523 for the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program; \$30 million for Drug Courts; \$238.6 million for juvenile justice prevention programs including \$25 million to combat underage drinking of alcoholic beverages. This last program was offered as an amendment to the bill by Senator BYRD, Senator HATCH and myself last summer. \$271 million provided for Violence Against Women Programs. \$556 million is provided for State Prison or "Truth in Sentencing" grants and \$585 million is provided for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.

Finally, let me point out that this agreement includes \$250 million for a new Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant. I know that there is some controversy among my colleagues because we have provided this funding even though the House and Senate have not collectively completed action on an authorization bill. This program provides for such programs as: building, expanding or operating juvenile detention and corrections facilities; hiring additional juvenile judges, probation officers and court appointed defenders; drug courts; and hiring prosecutors. We have provided that these funds are available to states and local governments that consider the reforms provided for the House-passed bill. We have also provided that no state receive less than .5 percent. Everyone should be clear, that we are providing this as a stop-gap measure until the Senate is able to pass a juvenile justice bill. The bill language in this con-

ference agreement makes it clear that these conditions are only for fiscal year 1998, and will cease upon enactment of a new Juvenile Justice authorization bill.

In funding the Commerce Department, our bill provides \$4.3 billion, an increase of \$422 million over this year's enacted amounts. There are a number of accounts in Commerce that are worth noting.

The International Trade Administration has been allocated \$283 million this year, and it's four program activities are funded at the following levels: Trade Development is at \$59 million; Market Access and Compliance has a total of \$17.3 million, which is an increase from last year; the Import Administration ends up at \$28.7 million; and the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service is given \$171 million, an increase of almost \$8 million from last year.

The Bureau of Export Administration is given \$43.9 million this year. Our agreement on BXA has some components that should be of no surprise to those familiar with this program. We've funded BXA to continue their counterterrorism activities, to address their new export control responsibilities that were transferred to them from the Department of State, and to begin activities related to their responsibilities under the Chemical weapons Convention Treaty.

The Economic Development Administration, a favorite of many of my colleagues, is at the higher house level of \$340 million, including \$178 million for Title I Public Works program, \$30 million for Title IX Economic Adjustment Assistance, \$9.1 million for technical assistance, and \$9.5 million for trade adjustment assistance.

The bill funded the largest account in the Department of Commerce, NOAA, at \$2 billion, slightly below the higher Senate number. This includes \$241 million for the National Ocean Service, \$346 million for the National Marine Fisheries Service, \$277 million for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research activities, and \$520 million for the National Weather Service. One thing NOAA isn't lacking is in the number of programs it funds. To mention a few, it should be noted that we've provided NOAA with \$3.5 million for pfiesteria and algal bloom research, a new problem that we became all too aware of over the last few months here on the East Coast. We also gave the National Ocean Service \$44 million for mapping and charting so it can meet its long-term mission requirements to examine ocean activities. The popular Sea Grant program has been continued at \$56 million, funds have been allocated to study that omnipresent El Nino, and continued support is given to our National Weather satellites.

I am especially pleased that we have included \$1 million for our new Ocean Policy Commission, the first serious look at our ocean policy and NOAA since the Stratton Commission in the

late 1960's. I've talked with Dr. Baker at NOAA, Admiral Watkins, and Dr. Ballard—and we all believe that it is time to reinvigorate our ocean programs and put the “O back in NOAA.” You know, we all spend so much time looking to space and a little mechanical robot on Mars, Yet 75% of our planet is ocean, and our exploration of it is woefully lacking.

The hot topic of the Commerce Department this year and the political issue that consumed our bill, the Census Bureau, is provided with \$550 million, which is an increase of \$326 million. But funding wasn't the issue of controversy. Rather, we had a sticky situation to work out regarding the fate of the 2000 Decennial Census in terms of whether statistical sampling could be used for the last 10 percent of the population. The Census language that was finally agreed upon over the last few days is a compromise agreement between the White House and GOP leadership in the House which allows the Commerce Department to move forward with its efforts to plan for and conduct the year 2000 decennial census. The agreement seeks to ensure that the Federal Courts will rule on the constitutionality of using statistical sampling prior to the next census by creating expedited judicial review proceedings, and it establishes a Census Monitoring Board that will observe and monitor all aspects of the preparation of the 2000 census, including dress rehearsals.

Now for the remaining programs in Commerce—the Patent and Trademark Office was provided with \$716 million, including fees; we have been hearing from the Inspector General of Commerce about poor management over there and we are going to take a close look at PTO programs next fiscal year. With respect to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, it is funded at \$677 million, slightly lower than enacted levels; I'm pleased that Manufacturing Extension Centers are funded at \$113 million and the Advanced Technology Program [ATP] is funded at \$193 million. I'm pleased that we seem to finally be getting to a sane policy on our Commerce technology programs. They are out lead edge in the trade war. This year the rhetoric subsided, and we started to get back to normalcy and “adult supervision” around here, as Senator Dole would say. No one is seriously considering unilaterally disarming in the trade war and disestablishing the Department of Commerce and our technology programs.

Now to discuss the Judiciary—the total Judiciary account is funded at \$3.463 billion, \$200 million above enacted levels. We have provided the Federal Judges with a cost of living adjustment. And, with respect to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, we have agreed on a Commission to study judicial organization. So we have avoided a veto issue and will look to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to pick qualified, fair experts to review the situation.

In the State Department and international programs title, we have included \$4 billion for the Department of State and have supported the consolidation of our international affairs agencies. Within this amount we've provided \$91 million to State and USIA to accelerate the replacement of obsolete computers and communications gear, and \$19.6 million to renovate projects worldwide such as our facilities in Beijing, China. \$9.5 million is provided for architectural and engineering work necessary to move our Embassy to Jerusalem, the capital of Israel. I can't think of any other nation where we refuse to recognize its capital. It is time for us to put our Embassy in the capital of Israel.

The bill has funded Contributions to International Organizations at \$955 million to pay the costs assessed to the United States for membership in international organizations. Within this amount, \$54 million is for payment of United Nations arrearages. Additionally, Contributions of International Peacekeeping Activities is funded at \$256 million, including \$46 million for payment of arrearages. So we have met our commitments under the budget agreement. I only hope that Chairman HELMS and Senator BIDEN can get a State Department Authorization bill through the Congress so we can make meaningful changes in New York, and we can reorganize our international affairs into a more rational structure.

I'm especially pleased that the conference adopted language that I proposed that requests the State Department to send a reprogramming to ensure that the United States maintains its vote in international organizations. With respect to organizations like the International Rubber Organization [INRO] we are hurting U.S. business and prestige by maintaining shortfalls. We are letting other third world nations dominate and have put the creditworthiness of the United States in a position along with the Ivory Coast and Nigeria. We need to keep current and keep our seat at the table.

Other programs to note within this Title of the bill include \$1.1 billion for United States Information Administration [USIA]. Under the USIA account, the National Endowment for Democracy is funded at \$30 million, the East-West Center is provided with \$12 million, the North-South Center is \$1.5 million, International Broadcasting is \$364 million, and Educational and Cultural Exchange programs are \$198 million without the Senate-passed overhead certification requirements. Additionally, \$41.5 million is provided for Arms Control and Disarmament Agency [ACDA].

Finally, in the Related Agencies Title of our bill, it should be noted that the Maritime Administration was funded at \$138 million, with a level of \$35.5 million for the Maritime Security Program; the Small Business Administration is funded at \$705 million and for its non-credit programs, the bill provides \$500,000 minimum level for all Small Business Development Centers;

the Federal Trade Commission is funded at \$106.5 million; and Legal Services Corporation is at \$283 million, including Senator WELLSTONE's floor amendment which ensure that income eligibility determinations in cases of domestic violence are made only on the basis of the assets and income of the individual.

Finally, on a separate but related note, I would like to take a moment to address a matter of importance regarding the Federal Communications Commission, which is provided for this Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill. On July 1, the interstate access fees paid by long distance companies to connect their customers to the local telephone companies' networks were reduced by over \$1.5 billion annually. AT&T and MCI responded to these reductions by announcing plans to pass these savings to their customers.

AT&T committed to reduce its day and evening rates by 5 and 15 percent, respectively, on July 15. One of the news services reported that AT&T's residential customers would save \$600 million and business customers would save \$300 million annually. Similarly, MCI announced it will pass along these savings to customers as well.

In the past, AT&T was regulated as a dominant carrier and regularly filed its tariffs with the Federal Communications Commission thereby providing the necessary verification of these types of savings for consumers. With AT&T now being a non-dominant carrier, it no longer has to file data with the Commission to justify its rates. There is some concern that the tariffs that AT&T and MCI have filed with the Commission do not contain a sufficient analysis to demonstrate the amount of the long distance price reductions have been passed on to consumers. At a minimum, the Commission should verify that amount of access charge reductions pledged by these carriers are passed on to consumers.

The Commission should take whatever steps it deems necessary to ensure that these carriers furnish sufficient data to verify that consumers have indeed benefited from access charge reductions. The Commission should also monitor long distance rates to insure that the benefits of these reductions are not reversed by subsequent increases.

Ensuring that the long distance carriers make good on their commitment to flow through access charge reductions to consumers in the form of lower long distance rates is an important issue that should not be overlooked by the Commission.

Mr. President, this is a good bill and I support it. We have had to make some tough decisions, but under the able leadership of Chairman GREGG and his able staff, I think we have made the right decisions. Senator GREGG has really taken hold of this bill this year. And, of course, I want to thank my

good friends in the other body, Chairman HAL ROGERS and Mr. ALAN MOLLOHAN of West Virginia. They are true professionals. They have outstanding staff, first rate professional staff in Jim Kulikowski, Therese McAuliffe, Jennifer Miller, Mike Ringler, Jane Wiseman, Pat Schleuter, Mark Murray, David Reich, Sally Gaines and Liz White.

I encourage my colleagues to support the FY 1998 Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the work of Straight and Narrow, a non-profit organization headquartered in Paterson, New Jersey, which has been a pioneer in the field of substance abuse treatment with impressive results.

Straight and Narrow serves more than 750 people a day, almost all of them poor. Its services cover the whole spectrum of the substance abuse field, from effective prevention services for young people to treatment of the chemically dependent. Straight and Narrow's programs have been proven to deliver effective treatment at a significantly lower cost per patient than most treatment programs. National studies of Straight and Narrow's work have concluded that its results have far exceeded those of other approaches to substance abuse treatment.

Straight and Narrow is currently working in conjunction with the New Jersey Department of Corrections and the National Development and Research Institutes [NDRI] on a research and demonstration proposal to develop a national model of Straight and Narrow's approach to substance abuse treatment. This proposal includes clinical trials of the use of patient work combined with psychological counseling, family therapy, education, job training, and after care for treatment of substance abusers from disadvantaged backgrounds, including non violent prisoners.

Mr. President, I am proud of Straight and Narrow's accomplishments in New Jersey, and I believe that it would be most advantageous for the Federal Government to assist in the development of a model for the implementation of Straight and Narrow's programs on the national level. I believe that Straight and Narrow's proposal is one that the Department of Justice should seriously consider supporting, and I hope the Department will give this proposal serious consideration.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, before I proceed to some closing bills and Executive Calendar, I would like to consult with the Democratic leader. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

DEADBEAT PARENTS PUNISHMENT ACT OF 1997

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 271, S. 1371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1371) to establish felony violations for the failure to pay legal child support obligations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, let me take a moment to explain the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act of 1997, which I introduced with Senator DEWINE and which I drafted with the help of the administration. This measure toughens the criminal penalties we created in the Child Support Recovery Act of 1992 and creates new gradations of offenders to target and punish the most egregious child support evaders. It ensures that more serious crimes receive the more serious punishments they clearly deserve. And, Mr. President, this measure sends a clear message to deadbeat dads and moms: ignore the law, ignore your responsibilities, and you will pay a high price. In other words, pay up or go to jail.

When Senator SHELBY and I introduced the original Child Support Recovery Act, we knew that Federal prosecutors had a role to play to keep these parents from shirking their legal, and I would argue moral, responsibilities. It has been estimated that if delinquent parents fully paid up their child support, approximately 800,000 women and children could be taken off the welfare rolls. In fact, Mr. President, since that legislation was signed into law in 1992, over 386 cases have been filed, resulting in at least 165 convictions to date. And not only has that law brought about punishment, but it has also brought about payment. Collections have increased by nearly 50 percent, from \$8 billion to \$11.8 billion, and a new national database has helped identify 60,000 delinquent fathers—over half of whom owed money to women on welfare. Although we should be proud of that increase, we can not merely rest on our laurels. More can be done—and today the Senate's passage of the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act is a step in the right direction.

Mr. President, as you know, current law already makes it a Federal offense to willfully fail to pay child support obligations to a child in another State if the obligation has remained unpaid for longer than a year or is greater than \$5,000. However, the current law, by providing for a maximum punishment of just 6 months in prison for a first offense, makes violations only a misdemeanor. A first offense—no matter how egregious—is not a felony under current law.

Police officers and prosecutors have used the current law effectively, but

they have found that current misdemeanor penalties do not have the teeth to adequately deal with more serious cases—those cases in which parents move from State to State, or internationally, to intentionally evade child support penalties. Those are serious cases that deserve serious felony punishment and, under this new measure, that serious punishment will be available.

Mr. President, I believe that making the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act law will make a difference in the lives of families across the country. I thank my friend from Ohio, and this bill's original cosponsor, Senator DEWINE for his efforts on behalf of children and families, and I commend my colleagues in the Senate for passing this important message. I look forward to this measure quickly passing the House and being signed into law by the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis be printed in the RECORD.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF S. 1371, THE DEADBEAT PARENTS PUNISHMENT ACT OF 1997

The "Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act of 1997" amends the current criminal statute regarding the failure to pay legal child support obligations, 18 U.S.C. 228, to create felony violations for aggravated offenses. Current law makes it a federal offense to willfully fail to pay a child support obligation with respect to a child who lives in another state if the obligation has remained unpaid for longer than a year or is greater than \$5,000. A first offense is subject to a maximum of six months of imprisonment, and a second or subsequent offense to a maximum of two years.

The bill addresses the law enforcement and prosecutorial concern that the current statute does not adequately address more serious instances of nonpayment of support obligations. For such offenses a maximum term of imprisonment of just six months does not meet the sentencing goals of punishment and deterrence. Aggravated offenses, such as those involving parents who move from state to state to evade child support payments, require more severe penalties.

Section 2 of the bill creates two new categories of felony offenses, subject to a two-year maximum prison term. These are: (1) traveling in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to evade a support obligation if the obligation has remained unpaid for a period longer than one year or is greater than \$5,000; and (2) willfully failing to pay a support obligation regarding a child residing in another state if the obligation has remained unpaid for a period longer than two years or is greater than \$10,000. These offenses, proposed 18 U.S.C. 228(a) (2) and (3), indicate a level of culpability greater than that reflected by the current six-month maximum prison term for a first offense. The level of culpability demonstrated by offenders who commit the offenses described in these provisions is akin to that demonstrated by repeat offenders under current law, who are subject to a maximum two-year prison term.

Proposed section 228(b) of title 18, United States Code, states that the existence of a support obligation in effect for the time period charged in the indictment or information creates a rebuttable presumption that the obligor has the ability to pay the support