

drugs. Second, it raises the sentence to 3 years for those who traffic drugs to children. And third, it raises the sentence to 3 years for those who traffic drugs in or near a school or other protected location, including colleges, playgrounds, public housing facilities, youth centers, public swimming pools or video arcade facilities.

In each of these circumstances, it raises the mandatory minimum sentence for a second time offender to 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, protecting children should be a top priority for our society. Crime is down in America but we must remain vigilant. This bill sends an important and unmistakable message, do not involve our kids in your drug trade. By passing and enacting this legislation, we are doing more to make sure our children realize the promising future to which they are entitled. I urge my colleagues to support the Protecting Our Children From Drugs Act of 2000. I want to express my gratitude to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), who is the sponsor of this legislation, for his leadership in moving forward with this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5312, the "Protecting Our Children From Drugs Act of 2000," which would increase mandatory minimums for certain drug offenses involving minors. While I certainly support any legislative action which would keep drugs out of the hands of our kids, this bill will not do that.

Unfortunately, we are here again with Congress' favorite solution to crime—mandatory minimum sentencing. This despite the fact that scientific studies have found no empirical evidence linking mandatory minimum sentences to reductions in crime. Instead, what the studies have shown is that mandatory minimum sentences distort the sentencing process, discriminate against minorities in their application and waste money.

In a study report entitled "Mandatory Minimum Drug Sentences: Throwing Away the Key or the Tax Payers Money?," the Rand Commission concluded that mandatory minimum sentences were significantly less effective than discretionary sentencing, and substantially less effective than drug treatment in reducing drug related crime, and far more costly than either.

Further, both the Judicial Center in its study report entitled "The General Effects of Mandatory Minimum Prison Terms: A longitudinal Study of Federal Sentences Imposed," and the United States Sentencing Commission in its study report entitled "Mandatory Minimum Penalties in the Federal Criminal Justice System," found that minorities were substantially more likely than whites under comparable circumstances to receive mandatory minimum sentences.

Perhaps the problem with mandatory minimums is best stated in a March 17, 2000 letter from the Judicial Conference of the United States to Chairman HYDE, and which provided as follows:

The reason for our opposition is manifest: Mandatory minimums severely distort and

damage the federal sentencing system. Mandatories undermine the Sentencing Guidelines regimen Congress so carefully established under the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 by preventing the rational development of guidelines that reduce unwarranted disparity and provide proportionality and fairness. Mandatory minimums also destroy honesty in sentencing by encouraging charge and fact plea bargains to avoid mandatory minimums. In fact, the U.S. Sentencing Commission has documented that mandatory minimum sentences have the opposite of their intended effect. Far from fostering certainty in punishment, mandatory minimums result in unwarranted sentencing disparity. Mandatories also treat dissimilar offenders in a similar manner—offenders who can be quite different with respect to the seriousness of their conduct or their danger to society. Mandatories require the sentencing court to impose the same sentence on offenders when sound policy and common sense call for reasonable differences in punishment.

The fact is, we know how to reduce drug abuse—its with prevention and drug rehabilitation programs. One study of a program in California has shown drug rehabilitation to be so effective that for every dollar the state spends on its drug abuse program, it saves seven dollars in reduced costs in health care, welfare, and crime.

In addition, late last year several of us worked on the bipartisan task force on juvenile crime. We heard from experts from across the country, and all the testimony we heard pointed to prevention and early intervention as appropriate strategies to deal with juvenile crime. We did not hear a single witness suggest we enact mandatory minimum sentencing schemes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5312 was introduced just two weeks ago by Representative MCCOLLUM, and comes to the floor today without the benefit of hearings or the opportunity to amend the bill. Thus, it is no surprise that it reflects an old approach which has been proven to be ineffective and discriminatory in its impact. For those reasons, I must oppose H.R. 5312, and urge my colleagues to vote against the bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5312, the Protecting Our Children From Drugs Act of 2000. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this worthy legislation.

H.R. 5312 amends the Controlled Substances Act to increase penalties for: (1) using persons under the age of 18 to distribute drugs, (2) distributing drugs to minors, (3) drug trafficking near a school or other protected location, such as a youth center, playground, or public housing facility.

In all of these cases, the penalty for a first time offense increases from a minimum of one to three years in prison. The penalty for subsequent offenses is increased to a minimum of five years in prison.

Mr. Speaker, the threat posed by illegal drugs is one of the greatest national security threats facing our nation. This is the cold truth.

While opponents have argued that we spend too much on combating drugs, they are ignoring the true cost of drug use on our society. In addition to costs associated with supply and demand reduction, drug use costs billions each year in health care expenses and lost productivity. Moreover, it also has intangible costs in terms of broken families and destroyed lives.

Our children are on the front lines of this drug war. They are the primary target of both

the drug producers and the sellers. This legislation is a small step designed to make selling drugs to minors, a less attractive option. I urge my colleagues to lend it their full support.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support legislation sponsored by my colleague from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM). The Protecting Our Children From Drugs Act will give this country a much needed additional source of ammunition in our war against drugs. This legislation will send a forceful message to drug dealers that our children and our schools are not going to be participants in the drug trade. In addition, by taking increased measures to protect our children from the dangers of illegal drugs, we are ensuring that one day they will be readily equipped to continue the fight for a drug free America.

As statistics show that the rate of teen drug use in this country has doubled since 1992, it is clear that the time for this legislation is now. I, unfortunately, know all too well about the constant challenges of protecting innocent children from being corrupted by the drug trade. In June of 1999, the ONDCP designated my district a High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area. A month before, an arrest in the suburban town of Newington, Connecticut, that netted 60 bags of heroin, took place 1500 feet from a day care center. In November of that same year, a man was arrested in Hartford for using a 15 year old to sell over a hundred bags of heroin. These examples highlight the disturbing reality that our children and our schools are not ignored by drug dealers, but that they are often targeted. As both a legislator and a father of three young children, it is painfully obvious that drug trafficking is everywhere. We must send a message to drug dealers that their crimes will be punished with significantly harsher penalties if they invade our schools, and infiltrate among our children.

In his long and continuing effort to protect our country and our children from illegal drugs, my colleague notes that intervention is the first step necessary to winning the drug war. However, intervention is not always the goal we strive for. Perhaps it is because we often see exposure to drugs as an inevitable part of our children's lives. It doesn't have to be. We must intervene and prevent exposure at the source, and let dealers know that our kids are off limits. Further action, such as this legislation, will protect our children and give them the opportunity to lead this country into the 21st century. I rise in support of this legislation today and I urge our colleagues to join us.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5312.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROSECUTION DRUG TREATMENT ALTERNATIVE TO PRISON ACT OF 2000

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and

pass the bill (H.R. 4493) to establish grants for drug treatment alternative to prison programs administered by State or local prosecutors.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4493

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 "Prosecution Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. DRUG TREATMENT ALTERNATIVE TO PRISON PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY STATE OR LOCAL PROSECUTORS.

(a) PROSECUTION DRUG TREATMENT ALTERNATIVE TO PRISON PROGRAMS.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART AA—PROSECUTION DRUG TREATMENT ALTERNATIVE TO PRISON PROGRAMS

"SEC. 2701. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may make grants to State or local prosecutors for the purpose of developing, implementing, or expanding drug treatment alternative to prison programs that comply with the requirements of this part.

"(b) USE OF FUNDS.—A State or local prosecutor who receives a grant under this part shall use amounts provided under the grant to develop, implement, or expand the drug treatment alternative to prison program for which the grant was made, which may include payment of the following expenses:

"(1) Salaries, personnel costs, equipment costs, and other costs directly related to the operation of the program, including the enforcement unit.

"(2) Payments to licensed substance abuse treatment providers for providing treatment to offenders participating in the program for which the grant was made, including aftercare supervision, vocational training, education, and job placement.

"(3) Payments to public and nonprofit private entities for providing treatment to offenders participating in the program for which the grant was made.

"(c) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of a grant under this part shall not exceed 75 percent of the cost of the program.

"(d) SUPPLEMENT AND NOT SUPPLANT.—Grant amounts received under this part shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be available for activities funded under this part.

"SEC. 2702. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

"A drug treatment alternative to prison program with respect to which a grant is made under this part shall comply with the following requirements:

"(1) A State or local prosecutor shall administer the program.

"(2) An eligible offender may participate in the program only with the consent of the State or local prosecutor.

"(3) Each eligible offender who participates in the program shall, as an alternative to incarceration, be sentenced to or placed with a long term, drug free residential substance abuse treatment provider that is licensed under State or local law.

"(4) Each eligible offender who participates in the program shall serve a sentence of imprisonment with respect to the underlying crime if that offender does not successfully complete treatment with the residential substance abuse provider.

"(5) Each residential substance abuse provider treating an offender under the program shall—

"(A) make periodic reports of the progress of treatment of that offender to the State or local prosecutor carrying out the program and to the appropriate court in which the defendant was convicted; and

"(B) notify that prosecutor and that court if that offender absconds from the facility of the treatment provider or otherwise violates the terms and conditions of the program.

"(6) The program shall have an enforcement unit comprised of law enforcement officers under the supervision of the State or local prosecutor carrying out the program, the duties of which shall include verifying an offender's addresses and other contacts, and, if necessary, locating, apprehending, and arresting an offender who has absconded from the facility of a residential substance abuse treatment provider or otherwise violated the terms and conditions of the program, and returning such offender to court for sentence on the underlying crime.

"SEC. 2703. APPLICATIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—To request a grant under this part, a State or local prosecutor shall submit an application to the Attorney General in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

"(b) CERTIFICATIONS.—Each such application shall contain the certification of the State or local prosecutor that the program for which the grant is requested shall meet each of the requirements of this part.

"SEC. 2704. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.

"The Attorney General shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, the distribution of grant awards is equitable and includes State or local prosecutors—

"(1) in each State; and

"(2) in rural, suburban, and urban jurisdictions.

"SEC. 2705. REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.

"For each fiscal year, each recipient of a grant under this part during that fiscal year shall submit to the Attorney General a report regarding the effectiveness of activities carried out using that grant. Each report shall include an evaluation in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require. The Attorney General shall specify the dates on which such reports shall be submitted.

"SEC. 2706. DEFINITIONS.

"In this part:

"(1) The term 'State or local prosecutor' means any district attorney, State attorney general, county attorney, or corporation counsel who has authority to prosecute criminal offenses under State or local law.

"(2) The term 'eligible offender' means an individual who—

"(A) has been convicted of, or pled guilty to, or admitted guilt with respect to a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment is required and has not completed such sentence;

"(B) has never been convicted of, or pled guilty to, or admitted guilt with respect to, and is not presently charged with, a felony crime of violence or a major drug offense or a crime that is considered a violent felony under State or local law; and

"(C) has been found by a professional substance abuse screener to be in need of substance abuse treatment because that offender has a history of substance abuse that is a significant contributing factor to that offender's criminal conduct.

"(3) The term 'felony crime of violence' has the meaning given such term in section 924(c)(3) of title 18, United States Code.

"(4) The term 'major drug offense' has the meaning given such term in section 36(a) of title 18, United States Code."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act of 1968 (42

U.S.C. 3793(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(24) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part AA—

"(A) \$75,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

"(B) \$85,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

"(C) \$95,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

"(D) \$105,000,000 for fiscal year 2003; and

"(E) \$125,000,000 for fiscal year 2004."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4493.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4493, the Prosecution Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison Act of 2000 would authorize grants for drug treatment alternative to prison programs administered by State or local prosecutors. This legislation represents a responsible approach to drug treatment because it holds the individual receiving treatment accountable and it allows local prosecutors to exercise discretion regarding those for whom drug treatment is appropriate.

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the sponsor of this legislation, for his leadership on this innovative legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), I would like to enter into the record the other original cosponsors of this bill, those being, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER); the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN); the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS); the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER); the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON); the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON); the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM); the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN); the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP); and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

The reason I do that is I want to evidence the broad geographic interest in providing some means of relief for folks who are suffering from the malaise of drugs. I wish to thank also the dozens of cosponsors of this legislation from both sides of the aisle. It is my expectation that the bill soon will be

introduced and receive bipartisan support in the United States Senate as well.

This legislation will provide much needed resources to State and local governments for new prosecutor-managed drug treatment options for eligible nonviolent offenders. The program is designed for offenders who need and seek an opportunity to break the terrible chains of drug addiction and take back control of their lives.

In fact, such a program has been administered successfully for more than a decade in Brooklyn, New York. It has been rigorously evaluated and found to have resulted in higher treatment success, low recidivism rates and substantial tax dollar savings. This legislation will be an important new addition to our Nation's drug demand reduction efforts.

Mr. Speaker, most State and local criminal prosecutions are resolved through guilty pleas and plea bargains. Plea agreements prevent our criminal justice system from coming to a screeching halt and, as such, they are a valuable tool. This particular legislation represents another option for offenders who plead guilty to nonviolent offenses such as personal drug use. Just to be clear, violent drug offenders and serious drug traffickers will not be eligible under this legislation. The legislation also authorizes new Federal funding for programs designed and managed by State and local prosecutors who prosecute nonviolent offenders who are in desperate need of treatment. It allows prosecutors to select only eligible nonviolent offenders for a rigorous program of mandatory drug treatment and strict rules and conditions. Prosecutors have total discretion to select participants. Participants must be identified as being in need of treatment but they must also not have been convicted of a felony crime of violence or a major drug offense as defined under Federal law.

An important benefit of this option is that a prosecutor retains the leverage of a substantial prison sentence to be used if an offender violates program or treatment requirements. That is called accountability.

This accountability provides prosecutors with a common sense cost-effective alternative for offenders who really want to reform their lives. A successful model program of this type is the drug treatment alternative to prison program, as I mentioned, established in 1990 by the Office of the District Attorney for Kings County, which is Brooklyn, New York.

Evaluation results of the New York program indicate high treatment retention rates, low recidivism and significant cost savings. The 1-year retention rate in drug treatment is 66 percent. The recidivism rate for participants is less than a half for comparable offenders, 23 percent compared to 47 percent. Nearly all employable program graduates, that is 92 percent, are now working or are in vocational pro-

grams compared with only 26 percent who were employed prior to entering the program.

This particular program in Brooklyn, New York, reportedly has saved the city and the State more than \$15 million over the past 10 years. The program holds great promise for communities across America. It is designed to combat drugs and address the treatment needs of eligible nonviolent offenders who desire to forsake crime and drugs and regain control of their lives. Experience has shown that this approach breaks addiction, protects lives, assists families, promotes gainful employment and saves substantial tax dollars. The legislation itself will provide funds up to 75 percent of program costs directly to State and local governments. The total authorized under this bill is almost a half a billion dollars. The program grants will be administered by the United States Department of Justice. State and local government recipients must match by at least 25 percent the Federal grant award amount.

1300

Evaluations will be required and funded.

Each program is required to maintain an enforcement unit of sworn officers to monitor and apprehend any offenders who violate program requirements and attempt to abscond from their responsibilities.

There are requirements for ensuring a fair geographic distribution of funds, so that people in Maine or people in California or people in Washington or Iowa get a fair shot at getting the funding for their treatment. Grant awards are to be made, to the extent practicable, to each State and to rural suburban and urban jurisdictions.

Madam Speaker, I do not have to remind you or other Members of the need for us to do everything possible to help State and local governments respond to their continuing drug challenges. Even the White House's Office of National Drug Control Policy indicates that overall drug use has increased from 6.4 percent of our population in 1997 to 7 percent in 1999. That is a 10 percent increase in 2 years.

While marijuana and crack use has decreased among youth, Ecstasy, methamphetamine and "designer drug" use has shot through the roof among youth and adults. We are seeing overdoses and deaths as we have never seen them before. Drug-induced deaths number about 17,000 annually and are rising. In total, drug-related deaths, that is, where someone dies as a result of drug use, now exceed 50,000 each year. That is more than the number of murders in this country on an annual basis.

We need to take this important step as outlined in this legislation in a national effort to turn this situation around, to make our communities safer and to improve the quality of life for everybody in America. This initiative will make a substantial contribution to this effort.

Madam Speaker, I want to highlight in particular how this program, on a point-by-point comparison, will help in California because, as always, I go home every weekend, and that is kind of where my heart is.

California has an initiative on the ballot this year called Prop 36, and it is being marketed to the voters as a drug treatment initiative to try and give people assistance. In fact, the initiative itself is around 4,500 words; and interestingly enough, of those 4,500 words, about 3,600 talk about sentencing and incarceration and doing time in prison.

You would think that an initiative that is supposed to address drug treatment would talk about drug treatment instead of about sentencing and the like. In fact, this initiative spends about 390 words out of 4,500 talking about treatment, and then it only talks about funding.

Prop 36 in California is a sham, and I would hope that the other Members of this body would take the time to read it and share it with their people, because, if it is successful in California, it is coming to your State soon. It is kind of like a bad movie.

We need to defeat Prop 36. The legislation that is on the floor today addresses actual treatment opportunities for people, compared to Prop 36, which offers no treatment whatsoever.

In fact, the single most effective means of helping people suffering from drug addiction, which is blood testing and urinalysis, under Prop 36 is forbidden. Think about that. Prop 36 says it is a drug treatment, but it removes the single most effective tool that professionals in the field use to hold folks accountable for getting rid of this scourge.

I want to close, if I can, Madam Speaker. This legislation put forward by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is about fighting drugs harder and smarter. It can make a real difference in promoting demand reduction and breaking the link between drugs and crime for many eligible nonviolent offenders who are at great risk of pursuing criminal careers.

Both sides of the aisle support this legislation. So do criminal justice professionals. Treatment experts and providers, such as Phoenix House and the Therapeutic Communities of America, have endorsed this legislation. So have Pennsylvania and New York District Attorney Associations. We have worked very closely with the DA from Brooklyn, New York, to develop this legislation based upon his proven experience.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), has personally visited the program and discussed it with the offenders going through it. Respected researchers and evaluators have documented the program's successes. If properly designed and administered as outlined in this legislation, I am convinced that we have the opportunity to save lives and save money in this country.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4493 is a good bill, and it is much needed. It is important to States, communities, and families across this country. In combatting drug use, we must identify programs that work and support them. We cannot afford any longer to squander tax dollars on unnecessary bureaucracies and ineffective approaches.

Accordingly, I urge all Members to vote for H.R. 4493. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this very important issue this afternoon.

Mr. GORDON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, could not be here today; but I will submit his statement.

If I could take a brief moment, Madam Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY), this is his last or soon to be last presentation, I suspect, before this body; and I just want to say that over the years he has been here, there may be some that have disagreed with him on occasion, but hopefully no one would ever disagree that he is a man of integrity. I appreciate his friendship. I know he is going to enjoy going back and spending more time with his family, and I want to wish him well in his endeavors in Florida.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the kind remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, as we passed the threshold of two million incarcerated, it has become apparent that our nation's war on drugs has taken its toll on communities across the nation. With the support of the federal government, many states are implementing innovative programs to address the problems of incarceration and drug addiction. H.R. 4493 does not advance the best efforts to stem this tide.

The best programs currently under consideration return discretion to the judges for an assessment of the best methods for rehabilitation. Programs, like those in H.R. 4493, that vest prosecutors with the discretion to grant alternative sentence are not new and suffer from a clear flaw that has limited their effectiveness.

As a general matter, prosecutors are concerned with conviction rates, not rehabilitation. Consequently, these kinds of programs have been used as bargaining chips to obtain evidence and convictions, rather than tools for reducing recidivism. Moreover, these programs contain no long term "after care" services which have proven critical to addressing the continuing problems faced by addicts after incarceration.

This session, during a markup of methamphetamine legislation, an amendments that provide a good starting point for reforming our national drug policy was approved by the full Judiciary Committee.

This legislation established federal drug courts that would allow the federal government

to vigorously pursue sentencing and treatment alternatives to break the cycle and control the costs of drug-offense incarceration. This would allow us to join alternative sentencing and treatment programs that have been adopted in states such as Arizona, California, and New York that have been credited with significant declines in their prison population.

The stakes could hardly be higher in our efforts for policy reform. It is a sad fact of life that more people were imprisoned during the 1990s than any other period on record, with nearly one-in-four prisoners incarcerated for drug offenses, many carrying mandatory minimum sentences.

In raw numbers, today, there are almost as many inmates imprisoned for drug offense as the entire U.S. prison population in 1980. It will cost counties, states and the federal government over \$9 billion to incarcerate our 458,131 drug offenders this year.

We should continue to look for and support successful strategies like those offered in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4493.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING AN INTERPRETIVE CENTER NEAR DIAMOND VALLEY LAKE, CALIFORNIA

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4187) to assist in the establishment of an interpretive center and museum in the vicinity of the Diamond Valley Lake in southern California to ensure the protection and interpretation of the paleontology discoveries made at the lake and to develop a trail system for the lake for use by pedestrians and nonmotorized vehicles.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4187

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

SECTION 1. INTERPRETIVE CENTER AND MUSEUM, DIAMOND VALLEY LAKE, HEMET, CALIFORNIA.

(a) ASSISTANCE FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER AND MUSEUM.—The Secretary of the Interior shall enter into an agreement with an appropriate entity for the purpose of sharing costs incurred to design, construct, furnish, and operate an interpretive center and museum, to be located on lands under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, intended to preserve, display, and interpret the paleontology discoveries made at and in the vicinity of the Diamond Valley Lake, near Hemet, California, and to promote other historical and cultural resources of the area.

(b) ASSISTANCE FOR NONMOTORIZED TRAILS.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the State of California, a po-

litical subdivision of the State, or a combination of State and local public agencies for the purpose of sharing costs incurred to design, construct, and maintain a system of trails around the perimeter of the Diamond Valley Lake for use by pedestrians and nonmotorized vehicles.

(c) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall require the other parties to an agreement under this section to secure an amount of funds from non-Federal sources that is at least equal to the amount provided by the Secretary.

(d) TIME FOR AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall enter into the agreements required by this section not later than 180 days after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out this section.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$14,000,000 to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have introduced H.R. 4187, along with the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO), the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER), the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Madam Speaker, this legislation will assist in establishing the Western Archeology and Paleontology Center in the vicinity of Diamond Valley Lake in Southern California. This center will preserve, protect and make available the extraordinary discoveries that were uncovered during the construction of Diamond Valley Lake to all citizens of the United States. The University of California, Riverside, has been instrumental in developing this center; and I look forward to their continued leadership in the establishment and operation of the center. House report language calls for the Secretary of Interior to work with UCR, metropolitan water districts, and local shareholders in this effort.

During the past 10 years, the construction of Diamond Valley Lake outside of Hemet, California, has been the largest private earth-moving construction project in the United States. The reservoir is now the largest man-made lake in Southern California. It covers 4,500 acres, is 4½ miles long, 2 miles wide, and 250 feet deep. The cost of this was \$2.1 million for construction, was totally borne by the residents of Southern California. The reservoir will provide a desperately needed emergency supply of water for the City of Los Angeles and the surrounding area.

During the construction and excavation of this massive project, extraordinary paleontology and archeology