

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House.

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

AMENDING TITLE 44, U.S. CODE, TO ENSURE PRESERVATION OF THE RECORDS OF THE FREEDMEN'S BUREAU

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5157, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5157) to amend title 44, United States Code, to ensure preservation of the records of the Freedmen's Bureau.

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (H.R. 5157) was read the third time and passed.

PAUL COVERDELL NATIONAL FORENSIC SCIENCES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 3045, and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3045) to improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on June 9, 1999, our departed friend and colleague, the former senior Senator from Georgia, introduced the National Forensic Sciences Improvement Act of 1999. This important legislative initiative called for an infusion of Federal funds to improve the quality of State and local forensic science services. I am pleased that Senator SESSIONS has revived the bill, and that we are passing it today as the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Sciences Improvement Act of 2000, S. 3045.

The use of quality forensic science services is widely accepted as a key to effective crime-fighting, especially with advanced technologies such as DNA testing. Over the past decade, DNA testing has emerged as the most reliable forensic technique for identifying criminals when biological material is left at a crime scene. Because of its scientific precision, DNA testing

can, in some cases, conclusively establish a suspect's guilt or innocence. In other cases, DNA testing may not conclusively establish guilt or innocence, but may have significant probative value for investigators.

While DNA's power to root out the truth has been a boon to law enforcement, it has also been the salvation of law enforcement's mistakes—those who for one reason or another, are prosecuted and convicted of crimes that they did not commit. In more than 75 cases in the United States and Canada, DNA evidence has led to the exoneration of innocent men and women who were wrongfully convicted. This number includes at least 9 individuals sentenced to death, some of whom came within days of being executed. In more than a dozen cases, moreover, post-conviction DNA testing that has exonerated an innocent person has also enhanced public safety by providing evidence that led to the apprehension of the real perpetrator.

Clearly, forensic science services like DNA testing are critical to the effective administration of justice in 21st century America.

Forensic science workloads have increased significantly over the past five years, both in number and complexity. Since Congress established the Combined DNA Index System in the mid-1990s, States have been busy collecting DNA samples from convicted offenders for analysis and indexing. Increased Federal funding for State and local law enforcement programs has resulted in more and better trained police officers who are collecting immense amounts of evidence that can and should be subjected to crime laboratory analysis.

Funding has simply not kept pace with this increasing demand, and State crime laboratories are now seriously bottlenecked. Backlogs have impeded the use of new technologies like DNA testing in solving cases without suspects—and reexamining cases in which there are strong claims of innocence—as laboratories are required to give priority status to those cases in which a suspect is known. In some parts of the country, investigators must wait several months—and sometimes more than a year—to get DNA test results from rape and other violent crime evidence. Solely for lack of funding, critical evidence remains untested while rapists and killers remain at large, victims continue to anguish, and statutes of limitation on prosecution expire.

Let me describe the situation in my home State. The Vermont Forensics Laboratory is currently operating in an old Vermont State Hospital building in Waterbury, Vermont. Though it is proudly one of only two fully-accredited forensics labs in New England, it is trying to do 21st century science in a 1940's building. The lab has very limited space and no central climate control—both essential conditions for precise forensic science. It also has a large storage freezer full of untested DNA evidence from unsolved cases, for

which there are no other leads besides the untested evidence. The evidence is not being processed because the lab does not have the space, equipment or manpower.

I commend the scientists and lab personnel at the Vermont Forensics Laboratory for the fine work they do everyday under difficult circumstances. But the people of the State of Vermont deserve better. This is our chance to provide them with the facilities and equipment they deserve.

Passage of the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Sciences Improvement Act will give States like Vermont the help they desperately need to handle the increased workloads placed upon their forensic science systems. It allocates \$738 million over the next six years for grants to qualified forensic science laboratories and medical examiner's offices for laboratory accreditation, automated equipment, supplies, training, facility improvements, and staff enhancements.

I have worked with Senator SESSIONS to revise the bill's allocation formula to make it fair for all States. We have agreed to add a minimum allocation of .06 percent of the total appropriation for each fiscal year for smaller states and have increased the maximum percentage of federal funds available for facility costs from 40 percent to 80 percent for these smaller states. This is only fair for smaller States with limited tax bases and other finite resources, such as my home State of Vermont.

The bill we pass today also authorizes \$30 million for fiscal year 2001 for the elimination of DNA convicted offender database sample backlogs and other related purposes. I support this provision, although I regret that it does not go further. Senator SCHUMER and I have proposed increasing this authorization by \$25 million, which is the amount needed to eliminate the backlog of untested crime scene evidence from unsolved crimes. This backlog is as serious a problem as the convicted offender sample backlog, and we should take the opportunity to address it now.

I am also deeply disappointed that S. 3045 fails to address the urgent need to increase access to DNA testing for prisoners who were convicted before this truth-seeking technology became widely available. Prosecutors and law enforcement officers across the country use DNA testing to prove guilt, and rightly so. By the same token, however, it should be used to do what is equally scientifically reliable to do—prove innocence.

I was greatly heartened earlier this month when the Governor of Virginia finally pardoned Earl Washington, after new DNA tests confirmed what earlier DNA tests had shown: He was the wrong guy. He was the 88th wrong guy discovered on death row since the reinstatement of capital punishment. His case only goes to show that we cannot sit back and assume that prosecutors and courts will do the right thing

when it comes to DNA. It took Earl Washington years to convince prosecutors to do the very simple tests that would prove his innocence, and more time still to win a pardon. And he is still in prison today.

States like Virginia continue to stonewall on requests for DNA testing. They continue to hide behind time limits and procedural default rules to deny prisoners the right to present DNA test results in court. They are still destroying the DNA evidence that could set innocent people free. These sorts of practices must stop. We should not pass up the promise of truth and justice for both sides of our adversarial system that DNA evidence offers.

By passing S. 3045, we substantially increase funding to improve the quality and availability of DNA analysis for law enforcement purposes. That is an appropriate use of Federal funds. But we at least ought to require that this truth-seeking technology be made available to both sides.

I proposed a modest Sense of Congress amendment to S. 3045, which the Senate is passing today. It describes how DNA testing can and has resulted in the post-conviction exoneration of scores of innocent men and women, including some under sentence of death, and expresses the sense of Congress that we should condition forensic science-related grants to a State or State forensic facility on the State's agreement to ensure post-conviction DNA testing in appropriate cases. Because post-conviction DNA testing has shown that innocent people are sentenced to death in this country with alarming frequency, and because the most common constitutional error in capital cases is egregiously incompetent defense lawyering, my amendment also calls on Congress to work with the States to improve the quality of legal representation in capital cases through the establishment of counsel standards.

I introduced legislation in this Congress that would have accomplished both of these things. The Innocence Protection Act of 2000 contains meaningful reforms that I believe could save innocent lives. As the 106th Congress winds down, we have 14 cosponsors in the Senate, and about 80 in the House. We have Democratic and Republican cosponsors, supporters of the death penalty and opponents. President Clinton, Vice-President GORE, and Attorney General Reno have all expressed support for the bill.

Tragically, real reform of our nation's capital punishment system foundered on the shoals of election-year politics. But with the Sense of Congress provision that we pass today, at least we have agreed on a blueprint for effective reform legislation in the 107th Congress.

Finally, I want to discuss another amendment that I proposed, together with Senator SESSIONS, and that the Senate passes today. It concerns the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act of

2000, which the Senate passed on March 27, 2000.

The Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act was an important step forward, and I want to thank Mr. HYDE, Mr. CONYERS and Senators SESSIONS, SCHUMER, BIDEN, and all others who worked with us in good faith to enact these long overdue reforms. At the same time, there was some unfinished business in connection with this legislation that my amendment completes.

The bill that the Senate passed by unanimous consent on March 27th was supposed to be a substitute amendment to H.R. 1658. I had been led to believe that the substitute was word-for-word that which I had painstakingly worked out over the preceding weeks for approval by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary the previous Thursday, March 23, 2000. Imagine my surprise to see reprinted in the RECORD the next day a substitute amendment at variance with the version to which I had agreed to and at variance with the language that had been circulated to and approved by the Committee.

Specifically, the agreed upon version of the bill would amend section 983(a)(2)(C) of title 18, United States Code, to describe what a claimant in a civil asset forfeiture case must state to assert a claim. The amendment to which I agreed and which the Judiciary Committee "ordered reported" requires that a "claim shall—(i) identify the specific property being claimed; (ii) state the claimant's interest in such property; and (iii) be made under oath, subject to penalty of perjury."

By contrast, the version of the amendment submitted to the Senate for passage contained the following additional clause in subparagraph (ii): "state the claimant's interest in such property (and provide customary documentary evidence of such interest if available) and state that the claim is not frivolous". I did not approve the language inserted in the version considered by the Senate and this language was not approved by the Judiciary Committee.

The inserted language is superfluous at best, since even without it, a claimant must provide evidence of his interest in the property early in the proceeding or face summary dismissal for lack of standing. Moreover, a claim already must be made under oath and penalty of perjury.

At worst, the inserted language is an invitation for mischief in an area where the record has already amply demonstrated overreaching by law enforcement agencies. At the claim stage, most claimants do not have counsel. Many are uneducated and unsophisticated. They may not know what "customary documentary evidence" means, and even if they do, they may not know how to get it. It is not so simple for such individuals to obtain a bank statement or a title document, much less to obtain such documents within the 30 days afforded by the Act. They may be deterred from fil-

ing a claim simply because they cannot produce documentary evidence—even if no documentary evidence exists.

Take for example an all cash seizure. What constitutes "customary documentary evidence" of an interest in cash? An ATM receipt? A bank record? What about money that is received from legitimate sources other than financial institutions. A waiter would be hard pressed to produce documentary evidence of his interest in tip money.

Beyond this, the inserted language gives seizing agencies too much discretion to reject claims because the documentary evidence is incomplete or otherwise unsatisfactory, and prior experience tells us that agencies may exercise their discretion to deny claims arbitrarily.

The requirement that claims be certified as non-frivolous is also problematic. If an uncounseled claimant certifies in good faith that his claim is not frivolous, and a court ultimately determines otherwise, would the claimant be put at risk of a perjury prosecution? Even the threat of such risks puts additional burdens on claimants and may dissuade claimants from filing claims.

In sum, the inserted language has the potential to deter valid claims as well as frivolous claims, and it is unnecessary: Frivolous claims will be dismissed anyway, when the claimant is unable to meet his burden of establishing standing.

For these reasons, I had objected to insertion of this language and approved a substitute amendment that did not contain this problematic insert. Moreover, the version of that substitute amendment "ordered reported" by the Judiciary Committee and in the Committee's official files simply does not contain that problematic insert.

We rely every day on each other and on the professionalism of our staffs. Having raised my concern about the change as soon as it was discovered, I am pleased that Chairman HATCH and Senator SESSIONS have worked with me to pass a correction to the law that strikes the language that was added without agreement.

I hope that the House will move quickly to pass the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Sciences Improvement Act, as amended, before it winds up its work for the year.

AMENDMENT NO. 4345

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], for Mr. SESSIONS, proposes an amendment numbered 4345.

The amendment reads as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Paul Coverdell National Forensic Sciences Improvement Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. IMPROVING THE QUALITY, TIMELINESS, AND CREDIBILITY OF FORENSIC SCIENCE SERVICES FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE PURPOSES.

(a) DESCRIPTION OF DRUG CONTROL AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 501(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 375(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (25), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (26), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(27) improving the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes.”.

(b) STATE APPLICATIONS.—Section 503(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3753(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) If any part of the amount received from a grant under this part is to be used to improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes, a certification that, as of the date of enactment of this paragraph, the State, or unit of local government within the State, has an established—

“(A) forensic science laboratory or forensic science laboratory system, that—

“(i) employs 1 or more full-time scientists—

“(I) whose principal duties are the examination of physical evidence for law enforcement agencies in criminal matters; and

“(II) who provide testimony with respect to such physical evidence to the criminal justice system;

“(ii) employs generally accepted practices and procedures, as established by appropriate accrediting organizations; and

“(iii) is accredited by the Laboratory Accreditation Board of the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors or the National Association of Medical Examiners, or will use a portion of the grant amount to prepare and apply for such accreditation by not later than 2 years after the date on which a grant is initially awarded under this paragraph; or

“(B) medical examiner's office (as defined by the National Association of Medical Examiners) that—

“(i) employs generally accepted practices and procedures, as established by appropriate accrediting organizations; and

“(ii) is accredited by the Laboratory Accreditation Board of the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors or the National Association of Medical Examiners, or will use a portion of the grant amount to prepare and apply for such accreditation by not later than 2 years after the date on which a grant is initially awarded under this paragraph.”.

(c) PAUL COVERDELL FORENSIC SCIENCES IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—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:

“PART BB—PAUL COVERDELL FORENSIC SCIENCES IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

“SEC. 2801. GRANT AUTHORIZATION.

“The Attorney General shall award grants to States in accordance with this part.

“SEC. 2802. APPLICATIONS.

“To request a grant under this part, a State shall submit to the Attorney General—

“(1) a certification that the State has developed a consolidated State plan for forensic science laboratories operated by the State or by other units of local government within the State under a program described in section 2804(a), and a specific description of the manner in which the grant will be used to carry out that plan;

“(2) a certification that any forensic science laboratory system, medical exam-

iner's office, or coroner's office in the State, including any laboratory operated by a unit of local government within the State, that will receive any portion of the grant amount uses generally accepted laboratory practices and procedures, established by accrediting organizations; and

“(3) a specific description of any new facility to be constructed as part of the program described in paragraph (1), and the estimated costs of that facility, and a certification that the amount of the grant used for the costs of the facility will not exceed the limitations set forth in section 2804(c).

“SEC. 2803. ALLOCATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) POPULATION ALLOCATION.—Seventy-five percent of the amount made available to carry out this part in each fiscal year shall be allocated to each State that meets the requirements of section 2802 so that each State shall receive an amount that bears the same ratio to the 75 percent of the total amount made available to carry out this part for that fiscal year as the population of the State bears to the population of all States.

“(2) DISCRETIONARY ALLOCATION.—Twenty-five percent of the amount made available to carry out this part in each fiscal year shall be allocated pursuant to the Attorney General's discretion to States with above average rates of part 1 violent crimes based on the average annual number of part 1 violent crimes reported by such State to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3 most recent calendar years for which such data is available.

“(3) MINIMUM REQUIREMENT.—Each State shall receive not less than 0.6 percent of the amount made available to carry out this part in each fiscal year.

“(4) PROPORTIONAL REDUCTION.—If the amounts available to carry out this part in each fiscal year are insufficient to pay in full the total payment that any State is otherwise eligible to receive under paragraph (3), then the Attorney General shall reduce payments under paragraph (1) for such payment period to the extent of such insufficiency. Reductions under the preceding sentence shall be allocated among the States (other than States whose payment is determined under paragraph (3)) in the same proportions as amounts would be allocated under paragraph (1) without regard to paragraph (3).

“(b) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, except that—

“(1) for purposes of the allocation under this section, American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands shall be considered as 1 State; and

“(2) for purposes of paragraph (1), 67 percent of the amount allocated shall be allocated to American Samoa, and 33 percent shall be allocated to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“SEC. 2804. USE OF GRANTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives a grant under this part shall use the grant to carry out all or a substantial part of a program intended to improve the quality and timeliness of forensic science or medical examiner services in the State, including such services provided by the laboratories operated by the State and those operated by units of local government within the State.

“(b) PERMITTED CATEGORIES OF FUNDING.—Subject to subsections (c) and (d), a grant awarded under this part—

“(1) may only be used for program expenses relating to facilities, personnel, computerization, equipment, supplies, accreditation

and certification, education, and training; and

“(2) may not be used for any general law enforcement or nonforensic investigatory function.

“(c) FACILITIES COSTS.—

“(1) STATES RECEIVING MINIMUM GRANT AMOUNT.—With respect to a State that receives a grant under this part in an amount that does not exceed 0.6 percent of the total amount made available to carry out this part for a fiscal year, not more than 80 percent of the total amount of the grant may be used for the costs of any new facility constructed as part of a program described in subsection (a).

“(2) OTHER STATES.—With respect to a State that receives a grant under this part in an amount that exceeds 0.6 percent of the total amount made available to carry out this part for a fiscal year—

“(A) not more than 80 percent of the amount of the grant up to that 0.6 percent may be used for the costs of any new facility constructed as part of a program described in subsection (a); and

“(B) not more than 40 percent of the amount of the grant in excess of that 0.6 percent may be used for the costs of any new facility constructed as part of a program described in subsection (a).

“(d) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 10 percent of the total amount of a grant awarded under this part may be used for administrative expenses.

“SEC. 2805. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

“(a) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General may promulgate such guidelines, regulations, and procedures as may be necessary to carry out this part, including guidelines, regulations, and procedures relating to the submission and review of applications for grants under section 2802.

“(b) EXPENDITURE RECORDS.—

“(1) RECORDS.—Each State, or unit of local government within the State, that receives a grant under this part shall maintain such records as the Attorney General may require to facilitate an effective audit relating to the receipt of the grant, or the use of the grant amount.

“(2) ACCESS.—The Attorney General and the Comptroller General of the United States, or a designee thereof, shall have access, for the purpose of audit and examination, to any book, document, or record of a State, or unit of local government within the State, that receives a grant under this part, if, in the determination of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, or designee thereof, the book, document, or record is related to the receipt of the grant, or the use of the grant amount.

“SEC. 2806. REPORTS.

“(a) REPORTS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—For each fiscal year for which a grant is awarded under this part, each State that receives such a grant shall submit to the Attorney General a report, at such time and in such manner as the Attorney General may reasonably require, which report shall include—

“(1) a summary and assessment of the program carried out with the grant;

“(2) the average number of days between submission of a sample to a forensic science laboratory or forensic science laboratory system in that State operated by the State or by a unit of local government and the delivery of test results to the requesting office or agency; and

“(3) such other information as the Attorney General may require.

“(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the last day of each fiscal year for which 1 or more grants are awarded under this part, the Attorney General shall submit

to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, a report, which shall include—

“(1) the aggregate amount of grants awarded under this part for that fiscal year; and
 “(2) a summary of the information provided under subsection (a).”

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3753(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(24) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part BB, to remain available until expended—

“(A) \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

“(B) \$85,400,000 for fiscal year 2002;

“(C) \$134,733,000 for fiscal year 2003;

“(D) \$128,067,000 for fiscal year 2004;

“(E) \$56,733,000 for fiscal year 2005; and

“(F) \$42,067,000 for fiscal year 2006.”

(B) BACKLOG ELIMINATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 for the elimination of DNA convicted offender database sample backlogs and for other related purposes, as provided in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001.

(3) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by striking the table of contents.

(4) REPEAL OF 20 PERCENT FLOOR FOR CITA CRIME LAB GRANTS.—Section 102(e)(2) of the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 14601(e)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by adding “and” at the end; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION REGARDING CERTAIN CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 983(a)(2)(C)(ii) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “(and provide customary documentary evidence of such interest if available) and state that the claim is not frivolous”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the amendment made by section 2(a) of Public Law 106-185.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE OBLIGATION OF GRANTEE STATES TO ENSURE ACCESS TO POST-CONVICTION DNA TESTING AND COMPETENT COUNSEL IN CAPITAL CASES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) over the past decade, deoxyribonucleic acid testing (referred to in this section as “DNA testing”) has emerged as the most reliable forensic technique for identifying criminals when biological material is left at a crime scene;

(2) because of its scientific precision, DNA testing can, in some cases, conclusively establish the guilt or innocence of a criminal defendant;

(3) in other cases, DNA testing may not conclusively establish guilt or innocence, but may have significant probative value to a finder of fact;

(4) DNA testing was not widely available in cases tried prior to 1994;

(5) new forensic DNA testing procedures have made it possible to get results from minute samples that could not previously be tested, and to obtain more informative and accurate results than earlier forms of forensic DNA testing could produce, resulting in some cases of convicted inmates being exonerated by new DNA tests after earlier tests had failed to produce definitive results;

(6) DNA testing can and has resulted in the post-conviction exoneration of more than 75 innocent men and women, including some under sentence of death;

(7) in more than a dozen cases, post-conviction DNA testing that has exonerated an innocent person has also enhanced public safety by providing evidence that led to the apprehension of the actual perpetrator;

(8) experience has shown that it is not unduly burdensome to make DNA testing available to inmates in appropriate cases;

(9) under current Federal and State law, it is difficult to obtain post-conviction DNA testing because of time limits on introducing newly discovered evidence;

(10) the National Commission on the Future of DNA Evidence, a Federal panel established by the Department of Justice and comprised of law enforcement, judicial, and scientific experts, has urged that post-conviction DNA testing be permitted in the relatively small number of cases in which it is appropriate, notwithstanding procedural rules that could be invoked to preclude such testing, and notwithstanding the inability of an inmate to pay for the testing;

(11) only a few States have adopted post-conviction DNA testing procedures;

(12) States have received millions of dollars in DNA-related grants, and more funding is needed to improve State forensic facilities and to reduce the nationwide backlog of DNA samples from convicted offenders and crime scenes that need to be tested or retested using upgraded methods;

(13) States that accept such financial assistance should not deny the promise of truth and justice for both sides of our adversarial system that DNA testing offers;

(14) post-conviction DNA testing and other post-conviction investigative techniques have shown that innocent people have been sentenced to death in this country;

(15) a constitutional error in capital cases is incompetent defense lawyers who fail to present important evidence that the defendant may have been innocent or does not deserve to be sentenced to death; and

(16) providing quality representation to defendants facing loss of liberty or life is essential to fundamental due process and the speedy final resolution of judicial proceedings.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should condition forensic science-related grants to a State or State forensic facility on the State's agreement to ensure post-conviction DNA testing in appropriate cases; and

(2) Congress should work with the States to improve the quality of legal representation in capital cases through the establishment of standards that will assure the timely appointment of competent counsel with adequate resources to represent defendants in capital cases at each stage of the proceedings.

Amend the title to read as follows: “A bill to improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes, and for other purposes.”

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, the amendment to the title be agreed to, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 4345) was agreed to.

The bill (S. 3045), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

RECOGNIZING THAT THE BIRMINGHAM PLEDGE HAS MADE A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION IN FOSTERING RACIAL HARMONY

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.J. Res. 102, and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 102) recognizing that the Birmingham Pledge has made a significant contribution in fostering racial harmony and reconciliation in the United States and around the world, and for other purposes.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4347

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBAC), for Mr. SESSIONS, proposes an amendment numbered 4347.

The amendment reads as follows:

Whereas Birmingham, Alabama, was the scene of racial strife in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s;

Whereas since the 1960s, the people of Birmingham have made substantial progress toward racial equality, which has improved the quality of life for all its citizens and led to economic prosperity;

Whereas out of the crucible of Birmingham's role in the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, a present-day grassroots movement has arisen to continue the effort to eliminate racial and ethnic divisions in the United States and around the world;

Whereas that grassroots movement has found expression in the Birmingham Pledge, which was authored by Birmingham attorney James E. Rotch, is sponsored by the Community Affairs Committee of Operation New Birmingham, and is promoted by a broad cross section of the community of Birmingham;

Whereas the Birmingham Pledge reads as follows:

“I believe that every person has worth as an individual.

“I believe that every person is entitled to dignity and respect, regardless of race or color.

“I believe that every thought and every act of racial prejudice is harmful; if it is in my thought or act, then it is harmful to me as well as to others.

“Therefore, from this day forward I will strive daily to eliminate racial prejudice from my thoughts and actions.

“I will discourage racial prejudice by others at every opportunity.

“I will treat all people with dignity and respect; and I will strive to honor this pledge, knowing that the world will be a better place because of my effort.”

Whereas commitment and adherence to the Birmingham Pledge increases racial harmony by helping individuals communicate in a positive way concerning the diversity of the people of the United States and by encouraging people to make a commitment to racial harmony;