

• Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague, the senior Senator from my state of Wyoming, in the effort to safeguard the integrity of the nation's military memorials from the politically expedient demands of foreign governments—in this case the so-called "Bells of Balangiga" war memorial located in Wyoming's capital city of Cheyenne. Though a similar bill was introduced during the last congress, it was not voted on before adjournment. Unfortunately, the issue this legislation hopes to address is alive and well.

Many people contend that church bells are not a fitting subject for a war memorial. The circumstances surrounding these particular bells, however, are not normal. As the Senior Senator from Wyoming related, those bells were not used by Filipino insurgents to call the faithful to prayer that harrowing morning. They were used instead to signal the massacre of Wyoming troops as they sat down, unarmed, to breakfast. Of the 74 officers and men in the garrison, only twenty survived. Eye witness accounts had some of the attackers disguised as women, their weapons hidden beneath their dresses. Many others smuggled their weapons into the village hidden in the coffins of children. Under those circumstances, one must conclude that the bells in question were used to kill. Consequently I feel their use as the subject for a war memorial is wholly appropriate.

This is especially true in light of the use for the bells originally intended by the Philippine government. As everyone conceded last year, the Philippine government desired the return of these bells in time for their 100th anniversary of independence. Apparently, these bells do not represent a religious symbol for the Philippine government either.

Most significant of all, however, is the purpose they currently serve. Contrary to the assumptions of many, they do not memorialize American foreign policies of the time. Nor do they serve as a tribute to our political system, America's turn of the century notions of race relations, or the performance of the American troops who served there during that conflict. Rather, these bells memorialize one thing and one thing only: The tragic and premature deaths of 54 young men who volunteered to do the bidding of the American people. For this purpose I believe these bells serve as a most fitting memorial indeed and I am opposed to their dismantlement.

It is time to honor our veterans, our war dead, and the principle that in this country, we do not submit to government by Presidential fiat. I ask the support of my colleagues for this legislation.●

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 405. A bill to prohibit the operation of civil supersonic transport aircraft to or from airports in the United States under certain circumstances; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

COMMERCIAL OPERATION OF SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT LEGISLATION

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, today, I introduce legislation to ban the Concorde (flown by British Airways and Air France to the U.S.) from operating in the U.S. A companion bill is being offered in the House by Congressman OBERSTAR. This measure is in direct response to a pending European Union resolution which places arbitrary design-based barriers on the operation of U.S.-registered, huskitted, aircraft meeting the highest U.S. technological noise standards. The EU, under the guise of an environmental regulation, has essentially declared a trade war. Their regulation, a so-called "non-addition rule," is to be voted on by the EU in mid-February to become effective April 1, 1999. After that date, no U.S.-registered, stage 3 compliant aircraft (the quietest standard) can be operated in Europe. This EU regulation not only violates the Chicago Convention (which sets the framework for all bilateral aviation agreements) as it not only refuses to recognize U.S. air carriers' air worthiness certificates issued by our Government, it also holds great economic consequences for U.S. manufacturers and for many airlines. Those which are most vulnerable are small airlines and freight operators, which have fleets and operations based entirely on these aircraft. In essence, this ruling treats domestic and foreign operations differently in violation of the non-discrimination principle. The United States will not suffer such insidious trade practices lightly. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 405

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

**SECTION 1. COMMERCIAL OPERATION OF SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT CATEGORY AIRCRAFT.**

The Secretary of Transportation shall prohibit the commercial operation of civil supersonic transport category aircraft to or from an airport in the United States—

(1) if the Secretary determines that the European Union has adopted Common Position (EC) No. 66/98 as a final regulation, unless

(2) the Secretary also determines that such aircraft comply with Stage 3 noise levels.●

By Mr. MURKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. INOUE):

S. 406. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to make permanent the demonstration program that allows for direct billing of medicare, medicaid, and other third party payors, and to expand the eligibility under such program to other tribes and tribal organizations.

ALASKA NATIVE AND AMERICAN INDIAN DIRECT REIMBURSEMENT ACT OF 1999

• Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I rise on behalf of myself and the Majority Leader Mr. LOTT, Senator BAUCUS, Senator COCHRAN, Senator INHOFE, Senator CAMPBELL, and Senator INOUE, to introduce legislation to permanently authorize and expand the Medicare and Medicaid direct collections demonstration program under section 405 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.

This Act will end much of the red tape and bureaucracy for IHS facilities involved with Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement, and will mean more Medicaid and Medicare dollars to Native health facilities to use for improving health care.

Our bill will allow Native hospitals to collect Medicare and Medicaid funds directly from the Health Care Financing Administration instead of having to go through the maze of regulations mandated by IHS.

This bill is an expansion of a current demonstration project that includes Bristol Bay Health Corporation of Dillingham, Alaska; the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Corporation of Sitka, Alaska; the Mississippi Choctaw Health Center of Philadelphia, Mississippi; and the Choctaw Tribe of Durant, Oklahoma. All of the participants in the demonstration program—as well as the Department of Health and Human Service and the Indian Health Services report that the program is a great success. HHS Secretary Donna Shalala stated in a letter to Senator JOHN MCCAIN on July 23, 1996, that the program has:

Dramatically increased collections for Medicare and Medicaid services, which in turn has provided badly-needed revenues for Indian and Alaska Native health care;

Significantly reduced the turn-around time between billing and the receipt of payment for Medicare and Medicaid services; and,

Increased the administrative efficiency of the participating health facilities by empowering them to track their own Medicare and Medicaid billings and collections.

In her letter, Secretary Shalala also mentions that the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Corporation has been able to make "great strides in upgrading the health facilities" as a result of increased collections brought on by its participation in the demonstration program.

In 1998, when the demonstration program was about to expire, Congress extended it through FY 2001. This extension has allowed the participants to continue their direct billing and collection efforts and has provided Congress with additional time to consider whether to permanently authorize the program.

It is time to recognize the benefits of the demonstration program by enacting legislation that would permanently authorize it and expand it to other eligible tribal participants.●

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ROBB, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, and Ms. MIKULSKI):  
S. 407. A bill to reduce gun trafficking by prohibiting bulk purchases of handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### THE STOP GUN TRAFFICKING ACT

• Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation that will reduce the murder and mayhem on our streets by making it harder for criminals to run guns between states. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Senators TORRICELLI, SCHUMER, FEINSTEIN, ROBB, SARBANES, KENNEDY, KERRY, and MIKULSKI.

Gun traffickers continue to supply an illegal gun market by buying large quantities of guns in states with lax gun laws and then reselling them on the streets—often in cities and states with strict gun laws. If these traffickers cannot legally buy a gun themselves, or if they do not want to have their name turn up if the gun is later found at a crime scene, they find others to make the purchases for them. The trafficker pays a straw purchaser, in money or drugs, to buy 25, 50 or more handguns at a time. The trafficker then resells the guns to those who otherwise could not buy them—such as convicted felons, drug addicts, or children.

The Stop Gun Trafficking Act would prohibit any person from purchasing, and any licensed dealer from selling to an individual, more than one handgun a month. This sensible limit on handgun purchases should substantially reduce gun running, while not creating an unreasonable obstacle to legitimate sportsmen and collectors. Under the law, individuals would still be able to purchase up to twelve handguns per year and hundreds of weapons during a lifetime. It is hard to imagine why anyone would need more handguns.

Last year, I introduced similar legislation. In order to make my colleagues more aware of the deadly problem of gun trafficking, I sponsored a forum on the issue. The testimony I heard at the forum has made me even more determined to pass this legislation and make it more difficult for gun traffickers to obtain and sell their deadly merchandise on our streets.

The witnesses at the forum included: Philadelphia Mayor Ed Rendell, who is also the chair of the Conference of Mayor's Task Force on Gun Violence; James and Sarah Brady; Captain R. Lewis Vass of the Virginia State Police, and Captain Thomas Bowers of the Maryland State Police.

We also heard from a panel of youth from right here in our nation's capital who live with gun violence every day in their communities. And what they had to say was terrifying. Guns were an everyday part of their lives. For these kids, D.C. does not stand for District of Columbia. It stands for Dodge City.

These young people told us that guns are easy to get in their neighborhoods and schools. They call it getting strapped. And if you do not get strapped you might not make it through the day, they said.

One young woman put it eloquently: "It's not fair," she said. "Other kids get to go to college. We get to go to funerals. These people who sell guns are the real predators. They feed off our pain."

We must shut these predators down.

And we can shut these predators down by passing this legislation. We know this approach works because three states—Virginia, Maryland, South Carolina—have passed one-gun-a-month laws and the results have been dramatic. Gun-trafficking from these states has plunged.

At the forum, officers from the Virginia State Police testified that after Virginia passed its one-handgun-a-month limit in 1993, the number of crime guns traced back to Virginia from the Northeast dropped by nearly 40 percent. Prior to one-gun-a-month, Virginia had been among the leading suppliers of weapons to the so-called "Iron Pipeline" that feed the arms race on the streets of Northeastern cities. Furthermore, in 1995, the Virginia Crime Commission conducted a comprehensive study of the one-handgun-a-month limit to determine if the law had achieved its purpose. That study found, and I quote, "Virginia's one-gun-a-month statute . . . has had its intended effect of reducing Virginia's status as a source state for gun trafficking."

Maryland and South Carolina witnessed similar results. In South Carolina, according to the same Crime Commission report: "Prior to the passage of the one-gun-a-month law, South Carolina was a leading source state for guns traced to New York City, accounting for 39% of guns recovered in criminal investigations. Following the implementation of the law, South Carolina virtually dropped off of the statistical list of source states for firearms trafficked to the northeast."

Maryland—the most recent state to pass a limit on handgun purchases—passed its law in 1996 and has already seen the benefits. According to testimony from the Maryland State Police: "In 1991 Maryland was nationally ranked second in terms of suppliers of crime guns to the City of New York. By 1997, one year after the passage of Maryland's one gun a month law, Maryland moved out of the top ten suppliers of crime guns to New York City."

So limits on gun sales are working in some regions. But we need a national law to prevent criminals from simply moving their operations from state-to-state.

Poll after poll shows that Americans, including gun-owning Americans, want tougher controls on guns. A 1996 University of Chicago study found that 80 percent of those polled support legisla-

tion limiting handgun sales to one a month.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the American people: stop turning a blind eye to the daily destruction caused by guns in America. I urge my colleagues to have the will to do something to help the youth of America live without the sound of gunshots in their lives. I ask my colleagues to support this common sense approach to keep handguns out of the hands of criminals.

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

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

S. 407

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stop Gun Trafficking Act of 1999".

#### SEC. 2. PROHIBITION AGAINST MULTIPLE HANDGUN SALES OR PURCHASES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (y) the following:

"(z) PROHIBITION AGAINST MULTIPLE HANDGUN SALES OR PURCHASES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any licensed dealer—

"(A) during any 30-day period, to sell 2 or more handguns to an individual who is not licensed under section 923; or

"(B) to sell a handgun to an individual who is not licensed under section 923 and who purchased a handgun during the 30-day period ending on the date of the sale.

"(2) TIME LIMITATION.—It shall be unlawful for any individual who is not licensed under section 923 to purchase 2 or more handguns during any 30-day period.

"(3) EXCHANGES.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to an exchange of 1 handgun for 1 handgun."

(b) PENALTIES.—Section 924(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "or (o)" and inserting "(o), or (z)".

#### SEC. 3. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR MAKING KNOWINGLY FALSE STATEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH FIREARMS.

Section 924(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "one year" and inserting "5 years".

#### SEC. 4. DEADLINES FOR DESTRUCTION OF RECORDS RELATED TO CERTAIN FIREARMS TRANSFERS.

(a) HANDGUN TRANSFERS SUBJECT TO THE WAITING PERIOD.—Section 922(s)(6)(B)(i) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "20 business days" and inserting "35 calendar days".

(b) FIREARMS TRANSFERS SUBJECT TO INSTANT CHECK.—Section 922(t)(2)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "not later than 35 calendar days after the date the system provides the licensee with the number," before "destroy".

#### SEC. 5. REVISED DEFINITION.

Section 921(a)(21)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting " , except that such term shall include any person who transfers more than 1 handgun in any 30-day period to a person who is not a licensed dealer" before the semicolon.●

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. REID, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. ROBB, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. SNOWE):