

billion, four hundred seventy-seven million.)

Ten years ago, April 28, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,265,888,000,000. (Two trillion, two hundred sixty-five billion, eight hundred eighty-eight million.)

Fifteen years ago, April 28, 1982, the Federal debt stood at \$1,062,161,000,000. (One trillion, sixty-two billion, one hundred sixty-one million.)

Twenty-five years ago, April 28, 1972, the Federal debt stood at \$425,304,000,000 (four hundred twenty-five billion, three hundred four million), which reflects a debt increase of nearly \$5 trillion—\$4,921,821,099,434.10 (four trillion, nine hundred twenty-one billion, eight hundred twenty-one million, ninety-nine thousand, four hundred thirty-four dollars and ten cents), during the past 25 years.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1757. A communication from the Vice Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed regulations governing recordkeeping and reporting by political committees; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-1758. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "Grants Program to Indian Tribes" received on April 24, 1997; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-1759. A communication from the Acting Inspector General of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Superfund report for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1760. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, case number 96-07; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1761. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the cumulative report on rescissions deferrals dated April 1, 1997; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, to the Committee on Armed Services, to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to the Committee on the Judiciary, and to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1762. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the certification of a proposed issuance of an export license; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1763. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to establish a small business loan program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1764. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "Compensation for Certain Undiagnosed Illnesses" (RIN2900-A177) received on April 28, 1997; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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 Ms. SNOWE:

S. 662. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel VORTICE; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KERREY:

S. 663. A bill to enhance taxpayer value in auctions conducted by the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. INOUE, Mr. GLENN, Mr. DODD, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. REID):

S. 664. A bill to establish tutoring assistance programs to help children learn to read well; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. KERREY:

S. 665. A bill to monitor the progress of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 666. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to States that do not give full faith and credit to the protective orders of other States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KERREY:

S. 663. A bill to enhance taxpayer value in auctions conducted by the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE RESERVE PRICE ACT

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, for most Americans a buck doesn't go very far. A dollar will not buy a cup of coffee at Starbucks, it will not buy a comic book at the 7-11, it will not buy a package of batteries at the True Value store, or even a gallon of gas at the Amoco station. But, at the FCC, a buck will buy a radio license to serve the city of St. Louis.

On Friday, the FCC completed an auction of radio spectrum which should cause every American taxpayer to be concerned. This action yielded less than 1 percent of the amount anticipated. Rather than raising \$1.8 billion as the Congress had expected, the FCC brought in only \$13.6 million.

Perhaps worse of all, several licenses were awarded to bidders for the incredible sum of \$1. That's well below the bargain basement. Mike Mills of the Washington Post aptly observed that a sign should be put in front of the FCC auction headquarters advertising "everything for a buck." One bidder won

four licenses at a dollar a piece. Those licenses combined would allow services to reach 15 million people. Another bidder won the right to serve St. Louis, one of the largest cities in America for \$1. It is as if we had returned to the days of license lotteries. That's one heck of a way to stretch a dollar.

Radio spectrum is a national asset. It must be prudently managed. The taxpayers count on the Federal Communications Commission to allocate spectrum among and between various uses to assure that the public interest is served and to assure that those uses do not interfere with each other.

In 1993, the Congress enacted legislation which revolutionized the way radio frequencies are allocated. After years of debate, the Congress took the step to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to use auctions to allocate licenses for radio spectrum. It was built on the premise that investors would pay for the right to offer new wireless communications services.

Prior to 1993, licenses were awarded by lottery or by a comparative application process. In both cases, license winners would often sell their licenses soon after acquiring them to others for substantial sums.

To cut out the middle man and give taxpayers a return from the valuable rights they were awarding, the Congress ordered the FCC to conduct auctions to award radio spectrum licenses.

In general, this approach has worked very well. It has proven to be an efficient means of allocating scarce resources and it has reaped billions of dollars of deficit reduction for the American taxpayer.

Unfortunately, something went wrong in this last auction. One problem was that the auction rules did not establish a minimum bid or a reserve price. That's how some lucky bidders won valuable licenses for a buck.

Mr. President, I offer legislation today which will help ensure that taxpayers are protected in future FCC auctions. The importance of this legislation is heightened by the increasing congressional reliance on spectrum auctions in telecommunications and budget policy. The President's budget alone relies on \$36 billion of revenues from spectrum auctions.

The Reserve Price Act requires the FCC to set a minimum price for each unit auctioned. If no one bids the minimum, then what is not sold will be re-evaluated and placed in the next scheduled auction. With a reserve price system, taxpayers will be guaranteed that national assets are not sold for a song.

The Chairman of the FCC reportedly said that the reason for the disappointing return from Friday's auction was the "the Congress got to greedy" with spectrum revenues. Perhaps, this auction was rushed. But with reserve prices, even a rushed auction would not have to be a disastrous auction.

I urge my colleagues to review and support the Reserve Price Act. The American taxpayer deserves as much.

I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the Reserve Price Act and a copy of Mike Mills' Washington Post article entitled "Latest License Auction Disappoints FCC" be inserted in the RECORD.

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

S.663

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reserve Price Act".

SEC. 2. RESERVE PRICE.

In any auction conducted or supervised by the Federal Communications Commission (hereinafter the Commission) for any license, permit or right which has value, a reasonable reserve price shall be set by the Commission for each unit in the auction. The reserve price shall establish a minimum bid for the unit to be auctioned. If no bid is received above the reserve price for a unit, the unit shall be retained. The Commission shall reassess the reserve price for that unit and place the unit in the next scheduled or next appropriate auction.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 26, 1997]

LATEST LICENSE AUCTION DISAPPOINTS FCC
TOTAL COMES UP SHORT OF EXPECTATIONS IN
BARGAIN-BASEMENT BIDDING
(By Mike Mills)

They might as well have changed the sign at the FCC Auction headquarters to "Everything for a Buck."

Congress had expected the Federal Communications Commission to pull in about \$1.8 billion in its latest auction of a slice of the airwaves, this one for companies that want to offer wireless voice and data services. But when the bidding stopped yesterday, the FCC found it had raised less than 1 percent of that amount, only \$13.6 million.

It was by far the most disappointing yield to date in the auction program. In other bidding since the program began in July 1994, winners have pledged about \$23 billion to the Treasury Department, far higher than initial projections.

The FCC blamed yesterday's poor showing on Congress, saying it didn't give the agency or the industry enough time to prepare for the latest auction. But the low bids also might be a sign that the market for airwave licenses is becoming glutted, some analysts said.

Either way, bargain-basement prices awaited the handful of communications companies that cared to participate. McLeod Inc. of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, actually bid \$1 each for four licenses in the Midwest covering areas with a 15 million population—and won. Nobody countered its bid in 29 rounds.

"It was a fortunate opportunity," said Bryce Nemitz, McLeod's vice president of corporate relations. "There wasn't any way for us to gauge the true value of those licenses, so we bid the minimum." The company plans to use the licenses for wireless utility meter reading, he said.

According to FCC Chairman Reed E. Hundt, Congress got too greedy last summer when it passed a law ordering the FCC to quickly auction this chunk of frequencies by April 15, and to make sure the money got to the Treasury by Sept. 30.

The deadline gave the industry little time to prepare, Hundt said. Equipment makers had no idea what the frequencies could be used for. Potential bidders had difficulty raising bidding money in capital markets.

"We were right when we told the industries and Congress there wasn't enough lead time for this auction," Hundt said.

But there were other problems. In February the FCC announced restrictions that limited users of those frequencies from offering certain mobile services because they might interfere with a new satellite-based radio service. And earlier this week, the FCC also said the new license owners would have to accept other restrictions to avoid interference with other services.

Those limitations might have curbed interest in bidding, but they didn't seem to bother the winners. BellSouth Corp. was the top bidder, spending \$6 million for 22 licenses. It plans to offer wireless television service using the licenses.

Other firms aren't sure how they'll use the licenses. "It just got rushed to the market so soon that people just didn't have time to get themselves together," said Thomas Sullivan of TeleCorp, which won a St. Louis license for \$1 and two others for \$60,000.

For Congress, the \$1.786 billion shortfall won't directly affect any spending programs. But it will be a factor when bean-counters next tally up the budget deficit, sources at the Congressional Budget Office said.

Some analysts suggest the auctions are a sign that the auction process may be running out of steam. Some bidders who paid surprisingly huge sums for wireless telephone licenses earlier last year are now having big troubles raising the money to pay for them. That spooked investors in a subsequent auction last year for similar licenses, in which bidding fell below expectations.

The broadcasting lobby, which has so far successfully avoided auctions of TV and radio licenses, and the results make their case for killing the auction program.

"These sub-par receipts confirm what we have been saying for months," said Dennis Wharton, spokesman for the National Association of Broadcasters. "Spectrum auctions have clearly reached a point of diminishing returns."

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself,
Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. MIKULSKI,
Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CLELAND, Mr.
INOUE, Mr. GLENN, Mr. DODD,
Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KERRY, Mr.
SARBANES, Mr. DASCHLE, and
Mr. RIED):

S. 664. A bill to establish tutoring assistance programs to help children learn to read well; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE AMERICA READS CHALLENGE ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to introduce President Clinton's America Reads Challenge Act. Today is the closing day of the President's summit for America's future. The summit's organizers and participants have sent a clear call about the importance of volunteerism and community involvement. The America Reads Challenge Act responds to that call and will provide volunteer tutors to help all children read well by the end of the third grade.

Reading is a fundamental skill for learning, but too many children have trouble learning how to read. If students don't learn to read in the early elementary school years, it is virtually impossible for them to keep up later. According to one study, 40 percent of fourth grade students don't attain the basic level of reading, and 70 percent don't attain the proficient level.

Research shows that reading skills are developed not only in the home and in the classroom, but also in communities and libraries. Sustained, quality reading experiences outside the regular school day and during the summer can raise reading levels when combined with high quality instruction. Only 30 minutes a day of reading aloud with an adult can enable a child to make real gains in reading. Adults also serve as role models for young children.

The America Reads Challenge Act is intended to help all students learn to read—and read well—by the end of the third grade. It would provide Parents as First Teachers challenge grants. Recognizing that parents are the best first teachers, it supports programs and activities that help parents increase the reading skills of their children.

In addition, the act will provide America's Reading Corps grants to States and communities to help them establish or enhance literacy tutor programs. Some 25,000 reading specialists and tutor coordinators, including 11,000 AmeriCorps members, will participate in programs to mobilize 1 million volunteers to tutor 3 million children.

The America Reads Challenge Act will provide \$1.7 billion over the next 5 years to the Department of Education. It will also authorize the appropriation of \$200 million a year from fiscal year 1998 through fiscal year 2002 to the Corporation for National Service. The act also builds on efforts of pre-school and elementary school programs, such as Head Start and title I, to help improve children's basic skills.

I strongly support President Clinton's America Reads Challenge Act, and I hope it will receive the broad bipartisan support it deserves. Every child can learn to read, and every child deserves a chance to learn how to do it. No child should be left out or left behind.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I join my colleagues Senators KENNEDY and MURRAY in cosponsoring this important new initiative.

The goal of this legislation is to launch a campaign to ensure that every child in our Nation can read independently by the end of the third grade. I believe that this is a worthwhile goal, which will have a wide-ranging impact on our Nation.

We need to help our young children learn to read. It's the responsibility not only of parents but of schools, communities, civic groups, libraries, and business leaders. Some 40 percent of all children are now reading below the accepted level on national reading assessments.

This is a national crisis. Tens of thousands of students cannot read at the basic level. If students can't read well by the third grade, their chances for later success fall dramatically. These same students are likely to drop out of school; they will have problems with delinquency; and they will have fewer job options.

I believe that the America Reads initiative will go a long way in providing much needed resources to parents, schools, and State and local communities to help our children learn to read.

This bill would establish a corps of 1 million volunteer tutors and give States additional resources to hire 30,000 reading specialists to coordinate the corps volunteer tutors who will work with teachers, principals, and librarians to help children succeed in reading.

I support mobilizing thousands of volunteers, but I also believe that the training and screening must be adequate, especially when we place anyone in our Nation's classrooms. These are issues that my colleagues and I will be addressing.

We also want to help parents. This bill establishes Parents as First Teachers challenge grants, which invests in success by supporting effective and proven local efforts that assist parents who request help to better work with their children.

The President has also called upon colleges and universities across the country to dedicate half of their new work study funds to support 100,000 college students to serve as reading tutors. Already hundreds of colleges and universities across the country have pledged to have their work study students help children learn to read. In my State of Maryland, Anne Arundel Community College, Bowie State University, Frostburg State University, and the University of Maryland at College Park have all committed to the America Reads initiative.

We also want accountability. This legislation will use the improvements in the National Assessment of Educational Progress [NAEP] to provide an annual measure of the reading performance of 4th graders and their progress toward meeting the reading challenge.

Both the Corporation for National Service and the Department of Education will oversee and manage this program. The Corporation for National Service has the expertise to pull together the AmeriCorps volunteers and has the infrastructure in place to help mobilize the volunteers. The Department of Education has the knowledge and resources to really make this program accountable.

I support utilizing the resources that we already have in place with AmeriCorps. I know that thousands of AmeriCorps volunteers across the country are already in the schools tutoring children. In Maryland, AmeriCorps volunteers are already in public schools tutoring and mentoring students.

And, companies too are leading the way with innovative methods of teaching our children to read. Sylvan Learning Center, which is headquartered in my State of Maryland, is a company that has been having great success with its methods to help children learn to read. Sylvan operates tutoring cen-

ters across the country. The centers have produced measurable results with children. The centers are community-based facilities. The student to teacher ratio never exceeds 3:1. Sylvan's approach consists of individualized instruction, variety, a creative motivational system, and parent and teacher involvement. It is an approach that works and can be one of the models that we use for the America Reads Program.

Why does this approach work? Because specialists can tailor a program to meet an individual student's needs. In many overcrowded classrooms across our country, it's simply impossible for a teacher in charge of 30 or 40 students to give one student who's having problems extra attention.

I don't believe that America Reads is a substitute for in-school instruction nor is it a substitute for parental involvement.

What we're talking about providing is individualized after school, weekend, and summer reading tutoring for nearly 3 million children a year from kindergarten through third grade [K-3] who want and need extra help. This will supplement the learning that is taking place during classroom hours. What's more important is that this tutoring will take place at no cost to parents and students.

I know that there has been criticism about having a literacy program directly aimed at children in K-3. I have to disagree with this criticism. Schools cannot do it alone. Many public schools simply do not have the resources to give students the one-on-one attention they need.

We have to launch a large-scale effort to tackle our Nation's youth literacy problem. I believe we need to mobilize and train volunteers to come into the schools to help our children learn to read. I believe we need to hire reading specialists to help our Nation's children. Teachers cannot do it alone. And parents need our help.

When 40 percent of our Nation's children cannot read on level by the third grade, we must ask ourselves as a nation what we're doing wrong and how we can correct it. This is a widespread problem that crosses gender, racial, and religious lines.

As the Nation begins to enter the 21st century, we cannot have our young people—our future—lagging behind in basic skills. This affects our Nation as a whole. It affects our Nation's productivity. It affects our work force. When these children become adults, they will not have the basic skills needed to survive.

Reading is an ongoing activity. And, if we want our children to succeed, if we want to promote work force readiness, and if we want to raise academic standards in our schools, then we have to reach our children in their early stages of development.

I hear from teachers, administrators, and counselors in my State about the dismal crisis in public schools. Many

children come to school from impoverished backgrounds. Many children come to school either abused themselves or the witness to domestic abuse in the home. With all of these obstacles, it's even more difficult for teachers to teach and for students to learn to read.

That's why I am supporting this bold, new initiative. The idea is to use the resources that our Nation already has—libraries, volunteers, students, businesses, and civic organizations—to help our most precious resource—our youth. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. KERREY:

S. 665. A bill to monitor the progress of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT PROGRESS
REPORT ACT

• Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, the Department of Justice has approved the merger of the Bell Atlantic and Nynex Corporations. While this is a matter within the discretion and jurisdiction of the Department, I rise to express my concern and disappointment with this decision.

With this merger, two strong potential competitors with two vibrant, rich markets have combined.

Bell Atlantic/Nynex will control more than 25 percent of all access lines in the United States and would serve 26 million customers. The merger is the second largest in U.S. history and the new company will rank among the 25 largest U.S. companies.

A little more than a year ago, the Congress enacted landmark legislation to open telecommunications markets to competition, preserve and advance universal service and spur private investment in telecommunication infrastructure. Over the last year, the Federal Communications Commission has worked overtime to implement the new law. It has been a daunting task.

While the FCC struggles with implementation of the new law, it is important to remember that a key part of that legislation did not rely on regulation, it relied on the marketplace. The idea was to unleash pent up competitive forces among and between telecommunications companies.

This transaction replaces the urge to compete with the urge to merge.

To unshackle the restraints of the modified final judgment which controlled the break up of AT&T, the Congress gave regional Bell operating companies instant access to long-distance markets outside of their local service regions and access to long-distance markets inside their regions when they opened their markets to local competition as measured by the bill's competitive checklist.

In addition to responding to the lure of long-distance markets, regional Bell operating companies and other local exchange carriers were expected to covet each other's markets. The attraction of serving markets like New

York City, Baltimore, and Washington, DC, with local and long distance products was to be a key catalyst for breaking down barriers to competition. Who knows better what is needed to compete for local exchange customers in a new market better than another local exchange company?

With this transaction, local competition and long-distance competition is lost. In addition, potential internet, video and broad-band competition has disappeared.

The promise of the new law was that competition, not consolidation would bring new services at lower prices to consumers. Where competition failed to advance service and restrain prices, universal service support would assure that telephone rates and services were comparable in rural and urban areas.

When large telecommunications companies combine, they not only eliminate the potential of competition with each other in each other's markets, but they create a market power which may be capable of resisting competition from others. They also create the possibility of an unequal bargaining power when they compete with or deal with small, independent and new carriers.

A strong role for the Department of Justice was my No. 1 cause when the full Senate considered the Telecommunications Act. I supported final passage of the law because the conference committee bolstered the Department's authority as compared to the Senate version of the bill. The legislation relied on the existing, strong antitrust powers of the Department of Justice. It also removed the FCC's ability to bypass Department of Justice antitrust review.

As we measure progress against promise, it is vitally important that the Congress have sufficient information to assure that those powers are sufficient to promote competition, affordable prices and universal service.

Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today to monitor the progress of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. This bill instructs the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, in consultation with the Federal Communications Commission, the Department of Justice, other executive branch agencies and State regulatory utility commissions to issue an annual report to the Congress on telecommunications services in America.

The report would review available information and consider at a minimum the level of competition, the provision of universal service in telecommunications markets, mergers among telecommunications providers and their effect, employment in the American telecommunications industry and the affordability of residential rates for telecommunications services. The report will also make legislative and policy recommendations to the Congress and the President.

Mr. President, I believe that if properly implemented, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 can deliver on its

promises of competition, affordable rates, universal service, jobs, and investment. I am not prepared to recommend major change to the 1996 law, but I am prepared to argue for a higher level of competitive vigilance by this Congress and the executive branch.●

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 666. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to States that do not give full faith and credit to the protective orders of other States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FULL FAITH AND CREDIT FOR PROTECTIVE ORDERS ISSUED IN OTHER STATES LEGISLATION

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that will help ensure that States live up to their responsibility to give full faith and credit to protective orders issued in other States.

In the 1994 Crime Act, as part of the Violence Against Women Act, Congress passed a provision requiring states to enforce the protection orders issued in sister States.

What this means, Mr. President, is that if a woman has secured a protective order against her husband in New Jersey, and then goes to Pennsylvania to stay with her parents and her husband follows her, Pennsylvania is obligated to enforce the New Jersey protective order.

This is common sense, it will protect the lives and well-being of countless threatened women, and is the law. However, for some reason States have been disregarding their legal obligation to enforce these orders.

Mr. President, it seems that the only way to get the States to live up to this obligation is to threaten some of their Federal funding.

Accordingly, the bill I am introducing today allows the Attorney General to withhold 10 percent of all formula Byrne grant crime fighting funds given to a State if it is failing to enforce out-of-State protective orders. Although I believe that these funds are an important crime prevention and crime fighting tool, it has become clear that there must be some mechanism to ensure that States live up to their responsibilities to victims of domestic abuse.

Mr. President, violence against women is one of our country's most heinous and pressing crimes. Every 12 seconds a woman is battered. About 10 times more women are victimized annually by domestic violence than are diagnosed with breast cancer. These figures reflect only reported crimes—the actual incidence rates are even higher.

According to the FBI, domestic violence is the single most common source of injury among women ages 15 to 44, more common than auto accidents, muggings, and rape by a stranger combined.

Protective orders are an important device in combating domestic violence, and protecting women who have already been battered from further harm. But they are only effective if they are enforced.

So, Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will support the bill, and ask unanimous consent that a copy of the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 666

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

SECTION 1. FULL FAITH AND CREDIT GIVEN TO PROTECTIVE ORDERS.

Section 2265 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) FORMULA GRANT REDUCTION FOR NON-COMPLIANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the second fiscal year commencing after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, if a State is not in compliance with subsections (a) and (b), the Attorney General shall reduce by 10 percent the amount that the State would otherwise receive for that fiscal year under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751 et seq.).

“(2) REDISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNTS.—In any fiscal year, the total amount remaining for distribution under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751 et seq.) by operation of paragraph (1), shall be distributed on a pro rata basis among States that—

“(A) are eligible to receive a grant under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751 et seq.); and

“(B) are in compliance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section.”.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 28

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAGEL] were added as cosponsors of S. 28, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to certain exemptions from copyright, and for other purposes.

S. 61

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] were added as cosponsors of S. 61, a bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend eligibility for veterans' burial benefits, funeral benefits, and related benefits for veterans of certain service in the United States merchant marine during World War II.

S. 75

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 75, a bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers.

S. 181

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor of S. 181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide