

along that he really does not want to pay down the debt and that he really does not care that much about Social Security. I have believed all along that his real agenda is spending. As we move forward this fall with some of the debate, I think it will become more and more clear that the President's agenda is really spending, while the Republicans' agenda in the Congress—and I want to be part of that team—will be to fight to keep taxes down, will be to fight especially hard to pay down the debt, and to save Social Security.

I would like to take a moment to make some comments on tax cuts. I believe we took an important step toward addressing our Nation's future by passing the \$792 billion tax cut package last month. We passed a bill that pays down the debt, ensures that our obligations to Social Security are met, and provides tax relief for millions of Americans.

This tax cut package returns the tax overpayment to those who paid it. I believe this is a far better option than the plans we have seen from the other side of the aisle that would merely spend the extra money. Under our plan, a middle-class family of four will receive over \$1,000 a year in tax relief when the plan is fully implemented.

In addition to broad-based relief for all taxpayers, the tax bill provides relief in many important areas, including the marriage penalty, the alternative minimum tax, savings and investment, education, health care, the estate tax, and housing.

I, for one, believe in the "opportunity society." I believe in success and that people should not be punished when they succeed and prosper. The surplus belongs to those who are succeeding and paying record levels of taxes. When we cut taxes, people are motivated to work harder, and the economy does well. When the economy does well, everyone does well.

Some are trying to claim that the Republicans want to return money to the people instead of paying down the debt. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, in 2000, the Republican plan, along with a significant tax cut, leaves the public debt \$220 billion less than the President's budget proposal. The Republican plan saves 75 percent of the total surplus, as compared to the President's plan which only saves 67 percent of the surplus.

I also point out that the Republican plan saves every penny of the Social Security surplus. The President's budget spends \$29 billion of the Social Security surplus.

These numbers come from the Congressional Budget Office, which Members of Congress can rely on, on a non-partisan basis, to provide us with accurate figures.

Clearly, the recent debate in the Senate was not about debt repayment. The debate was about what to do with the surplus money after addressing debt repayment. I happen to believe we should refund this overpayment to the tax-

payors. Some of my colleagues believe we should spend it. I believe the American people are in a better position to know what they need than the Government, particularly the Government here in Washington. I believe we should let the people keep more of their own money to spend on their priorities, not Washington's priorities. I believe the tax package we passed will do just that.

By contrast, the President's budget increases taxes—I repeat that, increases taxes—by nearly \$100 billion over 10 years. I find it interesting that the President claims we cannot afford \$792 billion in tax cuts but believes we can afford \$1 trillion in new spending.

Although some have tried to portray the tax-relief package as large and irresponsible, I have to disagree. The tax cuts only equal 3.5 percent of what the Congressional Budget Office projects the Federal Government will take in over the next 10 years. In light of the fact Federal tax receipts are already at a record high, I consider this tax cut to be extremely modest.

In response to the claim that tax cuts only help the rich, first of all, tax cuts are for taxpayers. If you do not pay taxes, you can't get a tax cut. Under the recently passed tax bill, every American who pays income taxes will get an income tax cut.

Our income tax system is progressive. The top 1 percent of earners make 16 percent of the income but pay 32 percent of the income taxes. The top 25 percent of earners pay 81 percent of the income tax, and the top half of earners pay nearly all of the income taxes.

Looking more closely at who pays the income taxes, as I noted, the top half of earners pay nearly all of the Federal income taxes. As taxpayers, they will be the ones to receive a tax cut.

I would like to examine who those so-called rich are. The rich are 62 percent of all homeowners; 66 percent of those between the ages of 45 and 64; 67 percent of those with a child in the home; 68 percent of those who have attended college, even just one quarter of college; 69 percent of married couples; and 80 percent of two-earner households.

I want to comment about the 80 percent of two-earner households. I believe most of those are young Americans who are trying to get started. They are young families, people who have just graduated from college, maybe just come from high school and have the first job. They are trying to buy a house, get a family started, and pay for a very expensive education. In order to do that, both the husband and the wife work. We are taking 80 percent of those two-earner households and we are taxing them at record levels. This particular tax bill is going to help young families getting started, future citizens of this country, the future leaders of this country.

I think this is a very good piece of legislation. I remind Senators, again, to remember when they hear our Dem-

ocrat colleagues talk about the rich who benefit from those tax cuts, this is really who they are talking about.

I am pleased this body has taken steps to address tax relief for hard-working Americans. I will continue to support efforts to cut taxes and downsize Government. I believe Congress should reject new taxes and new spending in favor of meaningful tax relief. It is time we return Government money to the rightful owner—the American people.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will state the conference report to accompany H.R. 2587.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2587), have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of September 9, 1999.)

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, today I am pleased to bring to the Senate floor the conference report making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2000. The conference report endorses the District's \$5.3 billion operating budget and its \$1.4 billion capital budget, as adopted by the mayor, the District council, and the financial authority.

The conference report appropriates \$429.1 million in Federal funds. In fact, having worked out this legislation with the House, the conference report is actually \$18.3 million more than the President's request. This is a good bill for the residents of the District of Columbia and for the people of America, whose capital this is.

Let me list some of the positive provisions.

For education, we have provided \$17 million in funding for a new and unique tuition program that will allow D.C. students to pay instate tuition rates at universities. The District is home to only one public university. This legislation will allow D.C. students the opportunity to attend universities outside the District of Columbia without

having to pay exorbitant out-of-State tuition rates. This is a major advancement for D.C. students.

We have also provided equal funding for charter schools in the District of Columbia. Charter schools are holding great promise to improving education in the District. Just this week, I visited the Edison Friendship Charter School, less than a mile from the Capitol. This is a school that has school uniforms, teaches Spanish in kindergarten, provides take-home computers by the third grade, and every student there has doubled their test scores in 1 year. There are 700 students in the school, with 900 on the waiting list. I have to tell you, that was one of the most fun experiences I have had, seeing those bright, inquisitive kids who really love where they are. I asked one young girl, as I walked in, if she liked the school, and she said, "'Like' is not the right word." I said, "Do you love this school?" She said, "I love it."

Good education in the District is possible. We just have to allow good parents, teachers, and principals the flexibility to provide it without the top-down interference of the entrenched bureaucratic rule.

This conference report also addresses the issue of crime in the District. No one doubts that there is a drug problem in the District. At the request of Senator DURBIN, our bill provides an extra \$1 million for the District police to wipe out open-air drug markets in the city.

The conference report also provides funds for drug testing people on probation in the District. We know from studies that when people on probation return to drug use, they also return to criminal behavior. This bill will get them off the streets if they flunk the drug test.

Another important part of the bill is continuing on a path of fiscal discipline for the city. The city's finances used to be a disaster. In fact, it was the reason the control board was created. There was a time when the city's debt was rated "junk" status by the bond-rating agencies. With the leadership of Mayor Anthony Williams, the control board, and the city council, working together, this situation has changed dramatically. I want to keep it that way. In fact, I want to make it better. The city's bond rating is still the lowest rank of investment-grade quality. I think it can be higher. The conference report provides that the District budget maintain a \$150 million reserve—a true rainy day fund.

We have also required the District to maintain a 4-percent budget surplus. But we have provided the flexibility above that surplus to pay down the debt and spend more on services, should the District have funds. The triple combination of a strong reserve, a surplus budget, and the requirement above that surplus that half must go for debt reduction and half for increased spending will increase the bond rating of the District and reduce debt costs in the long run.

The economic revitalization of this city is also an important priority for me. For years, the city has lost population and many areas of the city have fallen into disrepair. In this conference report, I have included a program that I believe will be helpful for the District—a \$5 million fund to be used for commercial revitalization. I have introduced legislation similar to this in Congress for other cities, and I believe it will provide an incentive to rebuild and refurbish blighted areas in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, helping clean them up and make them more safe for the children and people who live there.

For the environment, the conference report provides \$5 million to clean up the Anacostia River. It has been a polluted river. Cleaning it up will be a significant environmental advancement for the people of the District.

Finally, the conference report includes a provision that will allow the D.C. Superior Court to spend \$1.2 million in interest from its fiscal year 1999 appropriation to pay the District's defense attorneys for indigents. Payment to these attorneys was halted by the Superior Court this week.

Until the conference report is signed into law by the President, these attorneys will not be paid salaries they have earned representing the District's indigent clients and children.

The administration has signaled Congress that the President could veto this bill because of certain riders. I hope the President will look at all of the provisions and realize that all of the so-called riders have been part of past D.C. appropriations bills he has signed.

This is a good conference report. It supports and strengthens the Mayor's new administration. It supports the council's tax cut provisions. It funds the District of Columbia Resident Tuition Support Program and it adds \$18.3 million over and above the President's request for the District. It does not allow the legalization of marijuana, it does not allow needle exchanges, and it does not allow city expenditures to sue the United States for voting rights for Senators and Congress representatives.

I think it is a good bill. I hope the President will not choose to veto the bill because it doesn't allow for the legalization of marijuana and needle exchanges. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report so the District will have the funds in time to begin the new fiscal year.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

MR. DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. President.

Today we are here to talk about the appropriations for the District of Columbia, a special city—the Nation's Capital—and our constitutional responsibility to oversee it.

As the Senator from Texas has already said, a substantial portion of tax dollars is involved in the D.C. budget,

and for that reason and others, historically and legally, Congress has accepted the responsibility to oversee the budget of the District of Columbia. About 8 percent of the funds the District spends come from the Federal Government. As a result, we assume a responsibility in managing this city unlike any other city in America.

I have been puzzled over the years as I have dealt with this challenge about how many Members of Congress—House and Senate—who have never given a thought to running for mayor or city council anxiously play that role when it comes to the District of Columbia. I think that is unfortunate. I believe in home rule.

I have had some serious misgivings about policy changes made by the District of Columbia City Council—for instance, when it comes to tax cuts—but I have made those public. I have gone no further in this bill because I think it is their decision to make.

I also want to say at this moment that it has been a pleasure to work with my colleague from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON. It is the first time we have been in this role together in her position as the Chair of the subcommittee and mine as the minority spokesman. She has been honest, open, and professional in our dealings. Though we disagree on many issues, it has been a pleasure to work with her on this.

I also want to compliment her staff, Mary Beth Nethercutt and Jim Hyland for their cooperation.

I salute as well those on my side—Terry Sauvain, who is not only the minority clerk for this bill but who also serves as the minority deputy staff director for the Appropriations Committee. Our good friend and colleague, Senator ROBERT BYRD, was kind enough to lend Terry for our effort. And without him, we wouldn't be here today.

I also want to thank Marianne Upton, a member of my personal staff, who has been working on this tirelessly since we received this assignment.

Let me say a word or two about some others who are not members of the Senate staff but deserve recognition. My former House colleague, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON has worked tirelessly for the District of Columbia. And a difficult job she has. Not being a voting Member of the House of Representatives, she has to use the powers of persuasion to be an advocate for the people of this city. I admire her greatly for the leadership she has shown. I also note that she opposes this conference report before us, as do many of the leaders in the District of Columbia.

Finally, let me say a word about the new Mayor. I have the greatest hope for this Mayor. I think he is an exceptional individual. I have known him for years in our professional relationship on Capitol Hill. He marks a real change in pace in the District of Columbia. I think he has done a great job to date with a very difficult assignment. I have

the greatest hope that he will continue and be very successful in those efforts to make our Nation's Capital a source of pride for everyone in America.

When people come to the District of Columbia to visit as tourists, or from other countries, there are certain impressions they leave with. The beautiful buildings of our Nation's Capital, perhaps the workings of our Government, but, of course, an image of the city. I am sorry to say that image is not always positive. I have cautioned people from Illinois and members of my family when they visit the District of Columbia to be careful. There is a lot of crime here, a lot of violent crime. You have to take care where you might not at home. That is not to say this is the most dangerous city. That would be an overstatement. But it is an urban city with many urban crime problems. Frankly, I think we can and should do a better job in impressing them.

I also have to concede that there are problems in the District of Columbia that may not be obvious. But they go to the heart of these riders that have been put on the District of Columbia appropriations bills. Let me tell you what has happened.

Republican Members of Congress unable or unwilling to impose changes in legislation in their own home States or on the Nation use these appropriations bills as the happy hunting grounds for every extreme viewpoint you can find. It is the last recourse for scoundrels who will not impose on their own cities and States changes in the law but will do it to the District of Columbia.

Time and time again, limitations put on the District of Columbia are not being imposed on other States across the Nation. Members of Congress think they have free reign; it is a playground to introduce any amendment to any issue they would like knowing the District of Columbia is almost powerless in this process. They are victims of this congressional excess.

That is why the President should veto this bill and say to the Republican leadership and those on the Democratic side who have joined them that enough is enough. These riders are unfair to the people of the District of Columbia. Let me give you an example.

You may visit Washington, DC, and be impressed with many things. You probably would not know unless you were told that the District of Columbia faces a severe crisis. It has the highest rate of new HIV infections and deaths due to AIDS in the Nation. It is more than seven times the national average right here in Washington, DC.

Exhaustive scientific studies that have been underway by the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and others, have concluded that some programs can help to reduce the spread of AIDS and HIV in the District of Columbia.

One of those programs, controversial as it is, is a needle exchange program.

This bill bans the District of Columbia from using any funds, Federal or local, to operate a program for needle exchange. To make it even worse, it says any entity which carries out such a program using private money is barred from eligibility for any Federal funding for any purpose.

I will tell you, there are 113 needle exchange programs across America. In virtually every instance they not only reduce the incidence of AIDS but they reduce the incidence of drug addiction.

I sat in that conference committee as my fellow colleagues in that conference said piously: We don't want to see this in the District of Columbia. I produced a map showing that many of these same Congressmen represent cities across America with similar programs and have never voted to bar or prohibit but they do in the District of Columbia where we have such a terrible epidemic of HIV and AIDS. That is sad.

Seventy-five percent of the babies born with HIV in the District of Columbia are due to the use of dirty needles by either their mother or their father. The District of Columbia has the highest rate of new HIV infections in the country. And yet we would put this provision in the law to stop even a modest effort to reduce this epidemic. I think that is awful. For that reason alone, I hope the President will veto this bill. But there are others.

There is also a ban in this bill to stop the use of any funds to implement a locally enacted law allowing District of Columbia employees to purchase health insurance or take family and medical leave to care for a domestic partner. The bill unfairly singles out the District of Columbia, discriminating against law-abiding citizens who happen to be unmarried but cohabitating.

Over 67 State and local governments, 95 colleges and universities, almost 70 of the Fortune 500 companies, and at least 450 other companies and not-for-profits and unions offer these same benefits. Not one Member of Congress is proposing to stop these programs anywhere other than the District of Columbia. That is basically unfair.

On the question of voting representation, another rider precludes the District of Columbia from using any funds, Federal or local, to finance a court challenge aimed at securing voting rights in the District of Columbia. This effectively means that the lawyers for the District of Columbia are prohibited from even reviewing legal documents on the question. I cannot imagine a Member of Congress or the Senate imposing a similar limitation on any municipality or unit of local government in their own State.

On the medical use of marijuana, I know it is controversial, but let me name some of the States which have decided if a doctor makes a decision that the operative chemical in marijuana is important for therapy, that it can be legal, if prescribed by a doctor.

These States include the States of Washington, California, Oregon, Nevada, Alaska, and Arizona. All have voted for medical use of marijuana. Yet we have a situation where Members of Congress and the Senate have said to the District of Columbia: No, you cannot do the same. I think that is unfair.

There is a cap on attorney's fees in special education cases. If someone is trying to raise a child with a serious learning disability and wants that child in a special ed program, we have provisions in the law across America in terms of access to those programs and who will pay for the attorney's fees. It is only in the District of Columbia that some Members of Congress want to limit the amount paid to those attorneys to no more than \$1,300 per case. It is basically unfair to do it only in the District of Columbia. The same Congressmen and Senators would never impose that limitation on their own States and districts.

My friends, those and many others are riders which I find objectionable. They are clear evidence of excess on the part of the conferees—primarily on the House side—who have insisted on keeping these provisions in place. I am going to vote against this bill. I refuse to sign the conference report. To my knowledge, I don't believe any Democratic Member did. Perhaps one did, I may be mistaken. For the most part, the Democrats decided this bill went entirely too far.

One thing I put in this bill which I hope will have some benefit if ultimately the President vetoes it and this provision survives is a requirement that the District of Columbia city council and mayor report to Congress on some very basic things which we think need to be addressed in the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia has decided they have so much money they will give away \$59 million in tax cuts next year. They have declared a dividend in a city with a high murder rate, in a city with terrible public health services, a city overrun with rats in the street, and a city where the schools are deplorable. Despite all of these things, they have said: We have too many dollars. We are going to give them away, give them back, \$100 to a family.

I think it is more important that families in the District of Columbia have protection in their homes, protection in their neighborhoods, that visitors to the city feel safe on the streets; that enough policemen are hired, and others are brought in to make certain that security is there. They are caught up in the notion that a \$100 tax cut for each family will transform the District of Columbia. I think they should get to the basics first.

That is why I requested a quarterly report from the District of Columbia to Congress on very basic things, including the reduction in crime, providing the basic city services, the application and management of Federal grants,

and most importantly, to deal with the problem that children in the District of Columbia have been graded by many foundations as being worse off than any children in the United States of America.

When it comes to the basics, low-birthweight babies, infant mortality, child death rate, rates of teen death, teen birth rates, these things, unfortunately, the District of Columbia is doing worse on than any other State in the Nation. Wouldn't it be better to take some of the \$59 million tax cut and put it back for the benefit of these children? I hope this quarterly report will demonstrate that the mayor and city council have proven me wrong. If they have, I will gladly concede.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues on the Democratic side to oppose this legislation, to vote no on this appropriations bill, to urge the Republican leadership to give a clean bill, send it to the President so it can be signed, and the District can continue in their efforts to reform this government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to highlight the points the Senator from Illinois raised and try to give the view of the majority on those points because I think there are some clear differences.

I appreciate the working relationship that Senator DURBIN and I have had on this committee. In the main, we have agreed on this bill. I think the very positive parts of the bill that I outlined earlier were agreed to and enhanced by our ability to work together. I do also want to thank the members of his staff, Terry Sauvain and Marianne Upton, for working with our staff, Mary Beth Nethercutt and Jim Hyland.

I think our disagreements have been very open and honest. I will address the points the Senator made. I think it should be understood why we are doing some of the things that are called riders in this bill.

The District of Columbia belongs to every American. This is our Capital City. Every American taxpayer pays for the upkeep of the city. We all point to this city, hoping that it represents the best that America is. The buildings in this city rival any, anywhere in the world. I am proud of the city. That is why, when I was chosen to be the chairman of the D.C. Subcommittee, I readily agreed because it is important to my constituents in Texas, just as much as it is to the people who live here full time. I think we do want to have standards that every American believes are the right standards for our Capital City.

Let me take the points that Senator DURBIN said he believes the President may veto the bill over because these points are in disagreement.

First, the needle exchange program. Yes, it is true we do not allow for Government funding or city funding of nee-

dle exchanges for clean needles for drug abusers. Barry McCaffrey, the drug czar of the United States, who is the President's appointee, said the following about clean needle exchanges:

[General McCaffrey has] strongly objected to needle exchange programs.

In his words:

The problem is not dirty needles, the problem is heroin addiction. The focus should be on bringing health to this suffering population, not giving them more effective means to continue their addiction. One doesn't want to facilitate this dreadful scourge on mankind.

That was in the Orlando Sentinel on March 13, 1996.

Janet Lapey, in the New York Times magazine, said this was probably not in the best interests of the people who are suffering from addictions. We do put a lot in the District budget to help people with drug addictions. We try to take the hard line on drug addiction so people who are doing criminal acts in addition to using drugs, some of which also are criminal acts in themselves, do not prey on innocent citizens.

In most of the drug needle exchange programs it has been shown that it has increased the use of illegal drugs. I think it would be a tragic mistake in our Capital City to have a federally funded or locally funded needle exchange program that gives any indication that we want to foster this habit. We want to help these people get off drugs, not make it easier for them to do it with clean needles.

Second, on the issue of marijuana, it is true this bill does ban legalization of marijuana in the District of Columbia for any purpose. I think it is important that we not have this become a haven for marijuana use, even for medicinal purposes, because I don't think we should take an illegal drug and allow it to be legalized in our Capital City. The majority on the conference committee agreed.

Last but not least, the other issue I think we have a legitimate disagreement on is the voting rights in the District. In the District of Columbia, the people do elect a city council and a mayor. We work with them because the Federal taxpayers do fund a good part of the District of Columbia budget. I think because this is our Capital City and because it was provided that the city not be in a State, but, rather be overseen by Congress in our Constitution, that most certainly we need to take those steps.

But the issue of having two Senators and a Congressman from the District of Columbia should not be decided in a D.C. appropriations bill. That is banned, using city funds for that purpose. I stand by that.

Mr. President, I think the time has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference report accompanying H.R. 2587, the District of Columbia Appropriations bill for FY 2000.

The bill provides \$429 million in new budget authority and \$389 million in

new outlays for federal contributions to the District of Columbia government. When outlays from prior-year budget authority and other completed actions are taken into account, the Senate bill totals \$429 million in budget authority and \$393 million in outlays for FY 2000.

I commend the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee, Senator Hutchison, for her hard work and diligence in fashioning this bill. The bill is exactly at the Senate Subcommittee's revised 302(b) allocation. The bill is \$36 million in budget authority above the President's request, due in part to the inclusion of a tuition assistance program for D.C. students who attend out-of-state colleges. The Administration has requested these funds, however, through the Department of Education rather than directly to the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Budget Committee scoring of the conference agreement on the District of Columbia Appropriations bill be placed in the RECORD at this point, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

H.R. 2587, D.C. APPROPRIATIONS, 2000—SPENDING
COMPARISONS—CONFERENCE REPORT
(Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars)

	General purpose	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Conference report:				
Budget authority	429	429
Outlays	393	393
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	429	429
Outlays	393	393
1999 level:				
Budget authority	621	621
Outlays	616	616
President's request:				
Budget authority	393	393
Outlays	393	393
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	453	453
Outlays	448	448
Senate-passed bill:				
Budget authority	410	410
Outlays	405	405
CONFERENCE REPORT COMPARED TO:				
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority
Outlays
1999 level:				
Budget authority	-192	-192
Outlays	-223	-223
President's request:				
Budget authority	36	36
Outlays
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	-24	-24
Outlays	-55	-55
Senate-passed bill:				
Budget authority	19	19
Outlays	-12	-12

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have an inquiry. Is there time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. The vote has been called for.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) would vote "no."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 279 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Abraham	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Allard	Frist	Nickles
Ashcroft	Gorton	Roberts
Bennett	Gramm	Roth
Bond	Grams	Santorum
Brownback	Grassley	Sessions
Bunning	Gregg	Smith (NH)
Burns	Hagel	Smith (OR)
Byrd	Hatch	Snowe
Campbell	Helms	Specter
Cochran	Hutchinson	Stevens
Collins	Hutchison	Thomas
Conrad	Inhofe	Thompson
Coverdell	Kyl	Thurmond
Craig	Lott	Voinovich
DeWine	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	Mack	
Enzi	McConnell	

NAYS—39

Akaka	Feinstein	Lincoln
Baucus	Graham	Mikulski
Bayh	Harkin	Moynihan
Biden	Hollings	Murray
Bingaman	Jeffords	Reed
Boxer	Johnson	Reid
Bryan	Kerrey	Robb
Cleland	Kohl	Rockefeller
Dodd	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Schumer
Durbin	Leahy	Shelby
Edwards	Levin	Torricelli
Feingold	Lieberman	Wyden

NOT VOTING—9

Breaux	Daschle	Kerry
Chafee	Inouye	McCain
Crapo	Kennedy	Wellstone

The conference report was agreed to.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for this vote. I think it is important that we fund the District at a responsible level. I hope the President will look at the merits of this bill and let the District have the additional funding that is included. I think the vast majority of the people in the leadership of the District realize this is a giant step forward not only for the people of the District but for every American whose capital this is.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business for

the remainder of the today's session, with Members permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

UPDATE ON CRIME CONFERENCE AND THE RELEASE OF REPORT "CRIME COMMITTED WITH FIREARMS"

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to comment briefly on the status of the youth violence bill conference. Conferees from the House and Senate had planned to meet later today to complete consideration of the conference report. Last night, conference staff met jointly with Administration officials. And discussions on firearms and culture related issues are moving forward. Chairman HYDE felt that his talks with Mr. CONYERS are going very well. Accordingly, I felt we should keep working, however, my hope and plan is to meet next week so we can complete action on this bill this month.

I also want to comment briefly on why this bill is so important. Too many violent crimes involve juveniles. According to the Justice Department, the number of juvenile arrests for violent crime, including crimes committed with a firearm, exceeds 1988 levels by 48 percent. Our youth violence problem is a compel problems that demand comprehensive solution. Our legislation makes our schools safer; it empowers parents; it recognizes the importance of prevention; and it emphasize the need for enforcement and getting tough on violent criminals. Part of any comprehensive solution to deal with crime must be a commitment to enforcing the laws on the books. Actions speak louder than words, whether we're talking about how the government deals with gun offenders or how it deals with terrorists.

I am deeply saddened by the news out of Texas concerning a crazed gunman's senseless, hate-for-religion rampage at a Forth Worth church which left seven innocent people dead and many others wounded. My prayers go out to the victims and their families and my energies will be all the more dedicated towards trying to reach a consensus on the youth violence bill. This event—and others like it in recent months—have energized a well-deserved and beneficial debate about the criminal use of firearms. Limiting criminal access to firearms, beefing up prosecutions, and responding to a popular culture which glamorizes firearms violence should all be parts of our response. But as I just noted, violent crime—violent juvenile crime, in particular—is a complex problem which deserves a comprehensive response.

In today's Washington Post, which appropriately reports on the Texas shooting on its front page, is buried an article about how a Maryland juvenile

court judge released from custody—over the objections of prosecutors—a 16-year-old, confessed violent sex offender who had been sent to Maryland's maximum security prison. He was released because the he was not receiving "individualized counseling."—Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1999, B-7. According to the article, the judge's view is that the purpose of the juvenile justice system is to "rehabilitate rather than punish young offenders." The teenager in question—whose identity has been protected, by the way—was one of six teenagers who, in March of last year, lured a 15-year-old girl from a bus stop to a vacant apartment where they took turns raping, sodomizing, and beating her for three hours. Three teenagers who participated in the rape were sentenced to life but this offender has been set free by a soft-headed juvenile justice system. According to the article, this violent sex-offender (whose fellow offenders are serving life-terms) will live with his relatives in near-by Prince George's County and will be enrolling in High Point High School.

Where's the greatest threat to the public? Ask the parents of High Point High School this question. The greatest threat to the public is from criminals who are set free by a soft-headed justice system, be they rapists or terrorists. And criminals who commit crimes but are not prosecuted are left free to commit more crimes. yesterday, I released a report reported entitled "*Crimes Committed With Firearms—A report for Parent, Prosecutors, and Policy Makers.*" Our report found that over 90% of criminals age 18 to 24 who had a substantial arrest record prior to being imprisoned are rearrested within three years for a felony or serious misdemeanor.

I mention this article and our report to illustrate, as I have said repeatedly, that this is a complex problem which demands a comprehensive solution. Simply passing more laws which get printed in DOJ's law books but which go unenforced will not nothing to fight violent crime, let alone violent juvenile crime. And legislation which fails to make meaningful reforms which promotes juvenile accountability and juvenile record disclosure—as the Hatch-Sessions bill does—will prove to be a hollow accomplishment.

In closing, we must do all we can to come together and resolve our differences and reach consensus. When I hear members drawing lines in the sand over specific provisions in the youth violence bill, I get concerned because it tells me that the politics of party are trumping the obligation to lead and do what's right.

That is what I intend to do in this juvenile justice conference. I hope we have the cooperation of everybody on both sides. I hope the rumors that some want to play this as a political matter are not true. I think we need to pass a juvenile justice bill this year, and we need to do the very best we can do in doing that. I intend to get that