

whip, who has shown, as has the representative from the District of Columbia, a deep and abiding caring for the children of this Nation and of this community, and to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), whose task and commitment in this process were necessary to see this legislation move forward.

My reason for wanting to add my comments is to say to Brianna Blackmond that we have not forgotten her, and to be able to say that this legislation brings honor to lawyers who practice in family courts and to the discipline of family law and family courts. This system now will develop in the District of Columbia judges who will have long-lasting expertise and commitment to the issues dealing with families, and a D.C. bar that is further enhanced because their focus is on the family court system and families. That will help put a dent in the tragedy of 180 of the District of Columbia's children from 1993 to 2000 that died after the families came to the attention of the District's Child and Family Services.

Mr. Speaker, the important aspect of this is that they came to the attention of that agency, but the connection was lost so those children may have been placed back in homes or back in foster care that was not good for them and resulted in their death.

Obviously we know that abused children result in juvenile delinquents and incarcerated adults. With a family court tracking the system of many of our States, we will have a professional court that deals specifically with these issues. This has been a tumultuous time. We have seen in the last week the trauma on families and the trauma on children across the Nation who may have lost their parents during the tragedies of September 11.

We are making a commitment today to provide another vehicle to nurture our children and protect them, as we will do throughout these days for children who suffered through September 11, 2001.

I applaud the proponents of this legislation. I believe this will make the family court in the District of Columbia a very prominent example of how we can save lives and track families and how we can intervene appropriately in order to provide the most nurturing and supportive system for our children.

Mr. Speaker, I add my applause for those who have supported and will help pass this legislation.

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate this is a terrific bill. It is a gleam of light in a very difficult time. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) for his leadership and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS). I thank my colleagues who

spoke, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), and all of the people who will be voting for this bill. Indeed, it could not happen if we did not have great staff.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate the names of some of the staff: Casie Bevan, Russell Smith, Heea Vazirani-Fales, John Bouker, Victoria Proctor, Melissa Wogciak, and all of the others who have toiled to bring this about. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2657, a bill that will be beneficial to the most vulnerable children of the District of Columbia and their families and strengthen our Nation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2657.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2779

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2779.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 2001

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1900) to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide quality prevention programs and accountability programs relating to juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1900

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2001".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings.
- Sec. 3. Purpose.
- Sec. 4. Definitions.
- Sec. 5. Concentration of Federal effort.

Sec. 6. Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Sec. 7. Annual report.

Sec. 8. Allocation.

Sec. 9. State plans.

Sec. 10. Juvenile delinquency prevention block grant program.

Sec. 11. Research; evaluation; technical assistance; training.

Sec. 12. Demonstration projects.

Sec. 13. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 14. Administrative authority.

Sec. 15. Use of funds.

Sec. 16. Limitation on use of funds.

Sec. 17. Rules of construction.

Sec. 18. Leasing surplus Federal property.

Sec. 19. Issuance of rules.

Sec. 20. Content of materials.

Sec. 21. Technical and conforming amendments.

Sec. 22. Effective date; application of amendments.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Section 101 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601) is amended to read as follows:

"FINDINGS

"SEC. 101. (a) The Congress finds the following:

"(1) Although the juvenile violent crime arrest rate in 1999 was the lowest in the decade, there remains a consensus that the number of crimes and the rate of offending by juveniles nationwide is still too high.

"(2) According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, allowing 1 youth to leave school for a life of crime and of drug abuse costs society \$1,700,000 to \$2,300,000 annually.

"(3) One in every 6 individuals (16.2 percent) arrested for committing violent crime in 1999 was less than 18 years of age. In 1999, juveniles accounted for 9 percent of murder arrests, 17 percent of forcible rape arrests, 25 percent of robbery arrest, 14 percent of aggravated assault arrests, and 24 percent of weapons arrests.

"(4) More than ½ of juvenile murder victims are killed with firearms. Of the nearly 1,800 murder victims less than 18 years of age, 17 percent of the victims less than 13 years of age were murdered with a firearm, and 81 percent of the victims 13 years of age or older were killed with a firearm.

"(5) Juveniles accounted for 13 percent of all drug abuse violation arrests in 1999. Between 1990 and 1999, juvenile arrests for drug abuse violations rose 132 percent.

"(6) Over the last 3 decades, youth gang problems have increased nationwide. In the 1970's, 19 States reported youth gang problems. By the late 1990's, all 50 States and the District of Columbia reported gang problems. For the same period, the number of cities reporting youth gang problems grew 843 percent, and the number of counties reporting gang problems increased more than 1,000 percent.

"(7) According to a national crime survey of individuals 12 years of age or older during 1999, those 12 to 19 years old are victims of violent crime at higher rates than individuals in all other age groups. Only 30.8 percent of these violent victimizations were reported by youth to police in 1999.

"(8) One-fifth of juveniles 16 years of age who had been arrested were first arrested before attaining 12 years of age. Juveniles who are known to the juvenile justice system before attaining 18 years of age are responsible for a disproportionate share of serious crimes and violence.

"(9) The increase in the arrest rates for girls and young juvenile offenders has changed the composition of violent offenders entering the juvenile justice system.

“(10) These problems should be addressed through a 2-track common sense approach that addresses the needs of individual juveniles and society at large by promoting—

“(A) quality prevention programs that—

“(i) work with juveniles, their families, local public agencies, and community-based organizations, and take into consideration such factors as whether or not juveniles have been the victims of family violence (including child abuse and neglect); and

“(ii) are designed to reduce risks and develop competencies in at-risk juveniles that will prevent, and reduce the rate of, violent delinquent behavior; and

“(B) programs that assist in holding juveniles accountable for their actions and in developing the competencies necessary to become responsible and productive members of their communities, including a system of graduated sanctions to respond to each delinquent act, requiring juveniles to make restitution, or perform community service, for the damage caused by their delinquent acts, and methods for increasing victim satisfaction with respect to the penalties imposed on juveniles for their acts.

“(11) Coordinated juvenile justice and delinquency prevention projects that meet the needs of juveniles through the collaboration of the many local service systems juveniles encounter can help prevent juveniles from becoming delinquent and help delinquent youth return to a productive life.

“(b) Congress must act now to reform this program by focusing on juvenile delinquency prevention programs, as well as programs that hold juveniles accountable for their acts and which provide opportunities for competency development. Without true reform, the juvenile justice system will not be able to overcome the challenges it will face in the coming years when the number of juveniles is expected to increase by 18 percent between 2000 and 2030.”.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

Section 102 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5602) is amended to read as follows:

“PURPOSES

“SEC. 102. The purposes of this title and title II are—

“(1) to support State and local programs that prevent juvenile involvement in delinquent behavior;

“(2) to assist State and local governments in promoting public safety by encouraging accountability for acts of juvenile delinquency; and

“(3) to assist State and local governments in addressing juvenile crime through the provision of technical assistance, research, training, evaluation, and the dissemination of information on effective programs for combating juvenile delinquency.”.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

Section 103 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5603) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking “to help prevent juvenile delinquency” and inserting “designed to reduce known risk factors for juvenile delinquent behavior, provides activities that build on protective factors for, and develop competencies in, juveniles to prevent, and reduce the rate of, delinquent juvenile behavior”;

(2) in paragraph (4) by inserting “title I of” before “the Omnibus” each place it appears;

(3) in paragraph (7) by striking “the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.”;

(4) in paragraph (12)(B) by striking “, of any nonoffender.”;

(5) in paragraph (13)(B) by striking “, any nonoffender.”;

(6) in paragraph (14) by inserting “drug trafficking,” after “assault.”;

(7) in paragraph (16)—

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

(B) by striking subparagraph (C),

(8) in paragraph (22)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (i), (ii), and (iii) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and

(B) by striking “and” at the end,

(9) in paragraph (23) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon, and

(10) by adding at the end the following:

“(24) the term ‘graduated sanctions’ means an accountability-based, graduated series of sanctions (including incentives, treatment, and services) applicable to juveniles within the juvenile justice system to hold such juveniles accountable for their actions and to protect communities from the effects of juvenile delinquency by providing appropriate sanctions for every act for which a juvenile is adjudicated delinquent, by inducing their law-abiding behavior, and by preventing their subsequent involvement with the juvenile justice system;

“(25) the term ‘prohibited physical contact’ means—

“(i) any physical contact between a juvenile and an adult inmate; and

“(ii) proximity that provides an opportunity for physical contact between a juvenile and an adult inmate;

“(26) the term ‘sustained oral and visual contact’ means the imparting or interchange of speech by or between an adult inmate and a juvenile, or clear visual contact between an adult inmate and a juvenile in close proximity, but does not include—

“(A) brief communication or brief visual contact that is accidental or incidental; or

“(B) sounds or noises that cannot reasonably be considered to be speech;

“(27) the term ‘adult inmate’ means an individual who—

“(A) has reached the age of full criminal responsibility under applicable State law; and

“(B) has been arrested and is in custody for or awaiting trial on a criminal charge, or is convicted of a criminal offense;

“(28) the term ‘violent crime’ means—

“(A) murder or nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, or robbery, or

“(B) aggravated assault committed with the use of a firearm;

“(29) the term ‘collocated facilities’ means facilities that are located in the same building, or are part of a related complex of buildings located on the same grounds; and

“(30) the term ‘related complex of buildings’ means 2 or more buildings that share—

“(A) physical features, such as walls and fences, or services beyond mechanical services (heating, air conditioning, water and sewer); or

“(B) the specialized services that are allowable under section 31.303(e)(3)(i)(C)(3) of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on December 10, 1996.”.

SEC. 5. CONCENTRATION OF FEDERAL EFFORT.

Section 204 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5614) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3) by striking “and of the prospective” and all that follows through “administered”,

(B) in paragraph (5) by striking “parts C and D” each place it appears and inserting “parts D and E”, and

(C) by amending paragraph (7) to read as follows:

“(7) not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, issue model standards for providing mental health care to incarcerated juveniles.”.

(2) in subsection (c) by striking “and reports” and all that follows through “this

part”, and inserting “as may be appropriate to prevent the duplication of efforts, and to coordinate activities, related to the prevention of juvenile delinquency”;

(3) by striking subsection (i), and

(4) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (f).

SEC. 6. COORDINATING COUNCIL ON JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION.

Section 206(c)(2)(B) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5616(c)(2)(B)) is amended by striking “Education and Labor” and inserting “Education and the Workforce”.

SEC. 7. ANNUAL REPORT.

Section 207 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5617) is amended by striking paragraphs (4) and (5), and inserting the following:

“(4) An evaluation of the programs funded under this title and their effectiveness in reducing the incidence of juvenile delinquency, particularly violent crime, committed by juveniles.”.

SEC. 8. ALLOCATION.

Section 222 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5632) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “(other than parts D and E)”,

(II) by striking “amount, up to \$400,000,” and inserting “amount up to \$400,000”,

(III) by striking “1992” the 1st place it appears and inserting “2000”,

(IV) by striking “1992” the last place it appears and inserting “2000”,

(V) by striking “the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,”, and

(VI) by striking “amount, up to \$100,000,” and inserting “amount up to \$100,000”,

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “(other than part D)”,

(II) by striking “\$400,000” and inserting “\$600,000”,

(III) by striking “or such greater amount, up to \$600,000” and all that follows through “section 299(a) (1) and (3)”,

(IV) by striking “the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,”,

(V) by striking “amount, up to \$100,000,” and inserting “amount up to \$100,000”, and

(VI) by striking “1992” and inserting “2000”,

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “allot” and inserting “allocate”, and

(ii) by striking “1992” each place it appears and inserting “2000”, and

(2) in subsection (b) by striking “the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.”.

SEC. 9. STATE PLANS.

Section 223 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5633) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the 2d sentence by striking “and challenge” and all that follows through “part E”, and inserting “, projects, and activities”,

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “, which—” and inserting “that—”,

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “not less” and all that follows through “33”, and inserting “the attorney general of the State or such other State official who has primary responsibility for overseeing the enforcement of State criminal laws, and”,

(II) by inserting “, in consultation with the attorney general of the State or such other State official who has primary responsibility for overseeing the enforcement of State criminal laws” after “State”,

(III) in clause (i) by striking “or the administration of juvenile justice” and inserting “, the administration of juvenile justice, or the reduction of juvenile delinquency”;

(IV) in clause (ii) by striking “include” and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of subclause (VIII), and inserting the following:

“represent a multidisciplinary approach to addressing juvenile delinquency and may include—

“(I) individuals who represent units of general local government, law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies, public agencies concerned with the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency and with the adjudication of juveniles, juveniles, or nonprofit private organizations, particularly such organizations that serve juveniles; and

“(II) such other individuals as the chief executive officer considers to be appropriate; and”, and

(V) by striking clauses (iv) and (v),

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) in clause (i) by inserting “and” at the end,

(II) in clause (ii) by striking “paragraphs” and all that follows through “part E”, and inserting “paragraphs (11), (12), and (13)”, and

(III) by striking clause (iii), and

(iv) in subparagraph (E) by striking “title—” and all that follows through “(ii)” and inserting “title,”;

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “, other than” and inserting “reduced by the percentage (if any) specified by the State under the authority of paragraph (25) and excluding”, and

(ii) in subparagraph (C) by striking “paragraphs (12)(A), (13), and (14)” and inserting “paragraphs (11), (12), and (13)”,

(D) by striking paragraph (6),

(E) in paragraph (7) by inserting “, including in rural areas” before the semicolon at the end,

(F) in paragraph (8)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “for (i)” and all that follows through “relevant jurisdiction”, and inserting “for an analysis of juvenile delinquency problems in, and the juvenile delinquency control and delinquency prevention needs (including educational needs) of, the State”, and

(II) by striking “of the jurisdiction; (ii)” and all that follows through the semicolon at the end, and inserting “of the State; and”,

(ii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) contain—

“(i) a plan for providing needed gender-specific services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

“(ii) a plan for providing needed services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency in rural areas; and

“(iii) a plan for providing needed mental health services to juveniles in the juvenile justice system, including information on how such plan is being implemented and how such services will be targeted to those juveniles in such system who are in greatest need of such services;”, and

(iii) by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D),

(G) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

“(9) provide for the coordination and maximum utilization of existing juvenile delinquency programs, programs operated by public and private agencies and organizations, and other related programs (such as education, special education, recreation, health, and welfare programs) in the State;”,

(H) in paragraph (10)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “, specifically” and inserting “including”;

(II) by striking clause (i), and

(III) redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively,

(ii) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D) programs that provide treatment to juvenile offenders who are victims of child abuse or neglect, and to their families, in order to reduce the likelihood that such juvenile offenders will commit subsequent violations of law;”;

(iii) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and

(II) by striking “juveniles, provided” and all that follows through “provides; and”, and inserting the following:

“juveniles—

“(i) to encourage juveniles to remain in elementary and secondary schools or in alternative learning situations;

“(ii) to provide services to assist juveniles in making the transition to the world of work and self-sufficiency; and”,

(iv) by amending subparagraph (F) to read as follows:

“(F) expanding the use of probation officers—

“(i) particularly for the purpose of permitting nonviolent juvenile offenders (including status offenders) to remain at home with their families as an alternative to incarceration or institutionalization; and

“(ii) to ensure that juveniles follow the terms of their probation;”,

(v) by amending subparagraph (G) to read as follows:

“(G) one-on-one mentoring programs that are designed to link at-risk juveniles and juvenile offenders, particularly juveniles residing in high-crime areas and juveniles experiencing educational failure, with responsible adults (such as law enforcement officers, Department of Defense personnel, adults working with local businesses, and adults working with community-based organizations and agencies) who are properly screened and trained;”,

(vii) in subparagraph (H) by striking “handicapped youth” and inserting “juveniles with disabilities”;

(viii) by striking subparagraph (K),

(ix) in subparagraph (L)—

(I) in clause (iv) by adding “and” at the end,

(II) in clause (v) by striking “and” at the end, and

(III) by striking clause (vi),

(x) in subparagraph (M) by striking “boot camps”;

(xi) by amending subparagraph (N) to read as follows:

“(N) community-based programs and services to work with juveniles, their parents, and other family members during and after incarceration in order to strengthen families so that such juveniles may be retained in their homes;”,

(xii) in subparagraph (O)—

(I) in striking “cultural” and inserting “other”, and

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon,

(xiii) by redesignating subparagraphs (L), (M), (N), and (O) as subparagraphs (K), (L), (M), and (N), respectively; and

(xiv) by adding at the end the following:

“(O) programs designed to prevent and to reduce hate crimes committed by juveniles;

“(P) after-school programs that provide at-risk juveniles and juveniles in the juvenile justice system with a range of age-appropriate activities, including tutoring, mentoring, and other educational and enrichment activities;

“(Q) community-based programs that provide follow-up post-placement services to adjudicated juveniles, to promote successful reintegration into the community;

“(R) projects designed to develop and implement programs to protect the rights of juveniles affected by the juvenile justice system; and

“(S) programs designed to provide mental health services for incarcerated juveniles suspected to be in need of such services, including assessment, development of individualized treatment plans, and discharge plans.”;

(I) by amending paragraph (12) to read as follows:

“(12) shall, in accordance with rules issued by the Administrator, provide that—

“(A) juveniles who are charged with or who have committed an offense that would not be criminal if committed by an adult, excluding—

“(i) juveniles who are charged with or who have committed a violation of section 922(x)(2) of title 18, United States Code, or of a similar State law;

“(ii) juveniles who are charged with or who have committed a violation of a valid court order; and

“(iii) juveniles who are held in accordance with the Interstate Compact on Juveniles as enacted by the State; shall not be placed in secure detention facilities or secure correctional facilities; and

“(B) juveniles—

“(i) who are not charged with any offense; and

“(ii) who are—

“(I) aliens; or

“(II) alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused;

shall not be placed in secure detention facilities or secure correctional facilities;”,

(J) by amending paragraph (13) to read as follows:

“(13) provide that—

“(A) juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent or juveniles within the purview of paragraph (11) will not be detained or confined in any institution in which they have prohibited physical contact or sustained oral and visual contact with adult inmates; and

“(B) there is in effect in the State a policy that requires individuals who work with both such juveniles and such adult inmates, including in collocated facilities, have been trained and certified to work with juveniles;”,

(K) by amending paragraph (14) to read as follows:

“(14) provide that no juvenile will be detained or confined in any jail or lockup for adults except—

“(A) juveniles who are accused of non-status offenses and who are detained in such jail or lockup for a period not to exceed 6 hours—

“(i) for processing or release;

“(ii) while awaiting transfer to a juvenile facility; or

“(iii) in which period such juveniles make a court appearance;

and only if such juveniles do not have prohibited physical contact or sustained oral and visual contact with adults inmates and only if there is in effect in the State a policy that requires individuals who work with both such juveniles and adult inmates in collocated facilities have been trained and certified to work with juveniles;

“(B) juveniles who are accused of non-status offenses, who are awaiting an initial court appearance that will occur within 48 hours after being taken into custody (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays), and who are detained in a jail or lockup—

“(i) in which—

“(I) such juveniles do not have prohibited physical contact or sustained oral and visual contact with adults inmates; and

“(II) there is in effect in the State a policy that requires individuals who work with both such juveniles and adults inmates in collocated facilities have been trained and certified to work with juveniles; and

“(ii) that—

“(I) is located outside a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget) and has no existing acceptable alternative placement available;

“(II) is located where conditions of distance to be traveled or the lack of highway, road, or transportation do not allow for court appearances within 48 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) so that a brief (not to exceed an additional 48 hours) delay is excusable; or

“(III) is located where conditions of safety exist (such as severe adverse, life-threatening weather conditions that do not allow for reasonably safe travel), in which case the time for an appearance may be delayed until 24 hours after the time that such conditions allow for reasonable safe travel;

“(C) juveniles who are accused of non-status offenses and who are detained not to exceed 20 days in a jail or lockup that satisfies the requirements of subparagraph (B)(i) if—

“(i) such jail or lockup—

“(I) is located outside a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget); and

“(II) has no existing acceptable alternative placement available;

“(ii) a parent or other legal guardian (or guardian ad litem) of the juvenile involved, in consultation with the counsel representing the juvenile, consents to detaining such juvenile in accordance with this subparagraph and has the right to revoke such consent at any time;

“(iii) the juvenile has counsel, and the counsel representing such juvenile—

“(I) consults with the parents of the juvenile to determine the appropriate placement of the juvenile; and

“(II) has an opportunity to present the juvenile's position regarding the detention involved to the court before the court approves such detention;

“(iv) the court hears from the juvenile before court approval of such placement; and

“(v) detaining such juvenile in accordance with this subparagraph is—

“(I) approved in advance by a court with competent jurisdiction that has determined that such placement is in the best interest of such juvenile; and

“(II) required to be reviewed periodically and in the presence of the juvenile, at intervals of not more than 5 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays), by such court for the duration of detention;”,

(L) in paragraph (15)—

(i) by striking “paragraph (12)(A), paragraph (13), and paragraph (14)” and inserting “paragraphs (11), (12), and (13)”, and

(ii) by striking “paragraph (12)(A) and paragraph (13)” and inserting “paragraphs (11) and (12)”,

(M) in paragraph (16) by striking “mentally, emotionally, or physically handicapping conditions” and inserting “disability”,

(N) by amending paragraph (19) to read as follows:

“(19) provide assurances that—

“(A) any assistance provided under this Act will not cause the displacement (including a partial displacement, such as a reduction in the hours of nonovertime work, wages, or employment benefits) of any currently employed employee;

“(B) activities assisted under this Act will not impair an existing collective bargaining relationship, contract for services, or collective bargaining agreement; and

“(C) no such activity that would be inconsistent with the terms of a collective bargaining agreement shall be undertaken without the written concurrence of the labor organization involved;”,

(O) by amending paragraph (22) to read as follows:

“(22) provide that the State agency designated under paragraph (1) will—

“(A) to the extent practicable give priority in funding to programs and activities that are based on rigorous, systematic, and objective research that is scientifically based;

“(B) from time to time, but not less than annually, review its plan and submit to the Administrator an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the programs and activities carried out under the plan, and any modifications in the plan, including the survey of State and local needs, that it considers necessary; and

“(C) not expend funds to carry out a program if the recipient of funds who carried out such program during the preceding 2-year period fails to demonstrate, before the expiration of such 2-year period, that such program achieved substantial success in achieving the goals specified in the application submitted by such recipient to the State agency;”,

(P) by amending paragraph (23) to read as follows:

“(23) address juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority groups, who come into contact with the juvenile justice system;”,

(Q) by amending paragraph (24) to read as follows:

“(24) provide that if a juvenile is taken into custody for violating a valid court order issued for committing a status offense—

“(A) an appropriate public agency shall be promptly notified that such juvenile is held in custody for violating such order;

“(B) not later than 24 hours during which such juvenile is so held, an authorized representative of such agency shall interview, in person, such juvenile; and

“(C) not later than 48 hours during which such juvenile is so held—

“(i) such representative shall submit an assessment to the court that issued such order, regarding the immediate needs of such juvenile; and

“(ii) such court shall conduct a hearing to determine—

“(I) whether there is reasonable cause to believe that such juvenile violated such order; and

“(II) the appropriate placement of such juvenile pending disposition of the violation alleged;”,

(R) in paragraph (25)—

(i) by striking “1992” and inserting “2000”, and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon,

(S) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (25) as paragraphs (6) through (24), respectively, and

(T) by adding at the end the following:

“(25) specify a percentage (if any), not to exceed 5 percent, of funds received by the State under section 222 (other than funds made available to the State advisory group under section 222(d)) that the State will reserve for expenditure by the State to provide incentive grants to units of general local government that reduce the caseload of probation officers within such units;

“(26) provide that the State, to the maximum extent practicable, will implement a system to ensure that if a juvenile is before a court in the juvenile justice system, public child welfare records (including child protective services records) relating to such juvenile that are on file in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such court will be made known to such court;

“(27) establish policies and systems to incorporate relevant child protective services records into juvenile justice records for purposes of establishing and implementing treatment plans for juvenile offenders; and

“(28) provide assurances that juvenile offenders whose placement is funded through section 472 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 672) receive the protections specified in section 471 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 671), including a case plan and case plan review as defined in section 475 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 675).”,

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) If a State fails to comply with any of the applicable requirements of paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (22) of subsection (a) in any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 2001, then—

“(1) subject to paragraph (2), the amount allocated to such State under section 222 for the subsequent fiscal year shall be reduced by not less than 12.5 percent for each such paragraph with respect to which the failure occurs, and

“(2) the State shall be ineligible to receive any allocation under such section for such fiscal year unless—

“(A) the State agrees to expend 50 percent of the amount allocated to the State for such fiscal year to achieve compliance with any such paragraph with respect to which the State is in noncompliance; or

“(B) the Administrator determines that the State—

“(i) has achieved substantial compliance with such applicable requirements with respect to which the State was not in compliance; and

“(ii) has made, through appropriate executive or legislative action, an unequivocal commitment to achieving full compliance with such applicable requirements within a reasonable time.”,

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “allotment” and inserting “allocation”, and

(B) by striking “subsection (a) (12)(A), (13), (14) and (23)” each place it appears and inserting “paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (22) of subsection (a)”, and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall establish appropriate administrative and supervisory board membership requirements for a State agency designated under subsection (a)(1) and permit the State advisory group appointed under subsection (a)(3) to operate as the supervisory board for such agency, at the discretion of the chief executive officer of the State.”.

SEC. 10. JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

Title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5611 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking parts C, D, E, F, G, and H,

(2) by striking the 1st part I,

(3) by redesignating the 2d part I as part F, and

(4) by inserting after part B the following:

PART C—JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

SEC. 241. AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.

“(a) GRANTS TO ELIGIBLE STATES.—The Administrator may make grants to eligible

States, from funds allocated under section 242, for the purpose of providing financial assistance to eligible entities to carry out projects designed to prevent juvenile delinquency, including—

“(1) projects that provide treatment (including treatment for mental health problems) to juvenile offenders, and juveniles who are at risk of becoming juvenile offenders, who are victims of child abuse or neglect or who have experienced violence in their homes, at school, or in the community, and to their families, in order to reduce the likelihood that such juveniles will commit violations of law;

“(2) educational projects or supportive services for delinquent or other juveniles—

“(A) to encourage juveniles to remain in elementary and secondary schools or in alternative learning situations in educational settings;

“(B) to provide services to assist juveniles in making the transition to the world of work and self-sufficiency;

“(C) to assist in identifying learning difficulties (including learning disabilities);

“(D) to prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions;

“(E) to encourage new approaches and techniques with respect to the prevention of school violence and vandalism;

“(F) which assist law enforcement personnel and juvenile justice personnel to more effectively recognize and provide for learning-disabled and other juveniles with disabilities;

“(G) which develop locally coordinated policies and programs among education, juvenile justice, and social service agencies; or

“(H) to provide services to juveniles with serious mental and emotional disturbances (SED) in need of mental health services;

“(3) projects which expand the use of probation officers—

“(A) particularly for the purpose of permitting nonviolent juvenile offenders (including status offenders) to remain at home with their families as an alternative to incarceration or institutionalization; and

“(B) to ensure that juveniles follow the terms of their probation;

“(4) one-on-one mentoring projects that are designed to link at-risk juveniles and juvenile offenders who did not commit serious crime, particularly juveniles residing in high-crime areas and juveniles experiencing educational failure, with responsible adults (such as law enforcement officers, adults working with local businesses, and adults working for community-based organizations and agencies) who are properly screened and trained;

“(5) community-based projects and services (including literacy and social service programs) which work with juvenile offenders and juveniles who are at risk of becoming juvenile offenders, including those from families with limited English-speaking proficiency, their parents, their siblings, and other family members during and after incarceration of the juvenile offenders, in order to strengthen families, to allow juvenile offenders to be retained in their homes, and to prevent the involvement of other juvenile family members in delinquent activities;

“(6) projects designed to provide for the treatment (including mental health services) of juveniles for dependence on or abuse of alcohol, drugs, or other harmful substances;

“(7) projects which leverage funds to provide scholarships for postsecondary education and training for low-income juveniles who reside in neighborhoods with high rates of poverty, violence, and drug-related crimes;

“(8) projects which provide for an initial intake screening of each juvenile taken into custody—

“(A) to determine the likelihood that such juvenile will commit a subsequent offense; and

“(B) to provide appropriate interventions (including mental health services) to prevent such juvenile from committing subsequent offenses;

“(9) projects (including school- or community-based projects) that are designed to prevent, and reduce the rate of, the participation of juveniles in gangs that commit crimes (particularly violent crimes), that unlawfully use firearms and other weapons, or that unlawfully traffic in drugs and that involve, to the extent practicable, families and other community members (including law enforcement personnel and members of the business community) in the activities conducted under such projects;

“(10) comprehensive juvenile justice and delinquency prevention projects that meet the needs of juveniles through the collaboration of the many local service systems juveniles encounter, including schools, courts, law enforcement agencies, child protection agencies, mental health agencies, welfare services, health care agencies (including collaboration on appropriate prenatal care for pregnant juvenile offenders), private non-profit agencies, and public recreation agencies offering services to juveniles;

“(11) to develop, implement, and support, in conjunction with public and private agencies, organizations, and businesses, projects for the employment of juveniles and referral to job training programs (including referral to Federal job training programs);

“(12) delinquency prevention activities which involve youth clubs, sports, recreation and parks, peer counseling and teaching, the arts, leadership development, community service, volunteer service, before- and after-school programs, violence prevention activities, mediation skills training, camping, environmental education, ethnic or cultural enrichment, tutoring, and academic enrichment;

“(13) to establish policies and systems to incorporate relevant child protective services records into juvenile justice records for purposes of establishing treatment plans for juvenile offenders;

“(14) programs that encourage social competencies, problem-solving skills, and communication skills, youth leadership, and civic involvement;

“(15) programs that focus on the needs of young girls at-risk of delinquency or status offenses;

“(16) projects which provide for—

“(A) an assessment by a qualified mental health professional of incarcerated juveniles who are suspected to be in need of mental health services;

“(B) the development of an individualized treatment plan for those incarcerated juveniles determined to be in need of such services;

“(C) the inclusion of a discharge plan for incarcerated juveniles receiving mental health services that addresses aftercare services; and

“(D) all juveniles receiving psychotropic medications to be under the care of a licensed mental health professional;

“(17) after-school programs that provide at-risk juveniles and juveniles in the juvenile justice system with a range of age-appropriate activities, including tutoring, mentoring, and other educational and enrichment activities;

“(18) programs related to the establishment and maintenance of a school violence hotline, based on a public-private partnership, that students and parents can use to re-

port suspicious, violent, or threatening behavior to local school and law enforcement authorities;

“(19) programs (excluding programs to purchase guns from juveniles) designed to reduce the unlawful acquisition and illegal use of guns by juveniles, including partnerships between law enforcement agencies, health professionals, school officials, firearms manufacturers, consumer groups, faith-based groups and community organizations;

“(20) programs designed to prevent animal cruelty by juveniles and to counsel juveniles who commit animal cruelty offenses, including partnerships among law enforcement agencies, animal control officers, social services agencies, and school officials;

“(21) programs that provide suicide prevention services for incarcerated juveniles and for juveniles leaving the incarceration system;

“(22) programs to establish partnerships between State educational agencies and local educational agencies for the design and implementation of character education and training programs that reflect the values of parents, teachers, and local communities, and incorporate elements of good character, including honesty, citizenship, courage, justice, respect, personal responsibility, and trustworthiness;

“(23) programs that foster strong character development in at-risk juveniles and juveniles in the juvenile justice system;

“(24) local programs that provide for immediate psychological evaluation and follow-up treatment (including evaluation and treatment during a mandatory holding period for not less than 24 hours) for juveniles who bring a gun on school grounds without permission from appropriate school authorities; and

“(25) other activities that are likely to prevent juvenile delinquency.

“(b) GRANTS TO ELIGIBLE INDIAN TRIBES.—The Administrator may make grants to eligible Indian tribes from funds allocated under section 242(b), to carry out projects of the kinds described in subsection (a).

SEC. 242. ALLOCATION.

“(a) ALLOCATION AMONG ELIGIBLE STATES.—Subject to subsection (b), funds appropriated to carry out this part shall be allocated among eligible States proportionately based on the population that is less than 18 years of age in the eligible States.

“(b) ALLOCATION AMONG INDIAN TRIBES COLLECTIVELY.—Before allocating funds under subsection (a) among eligible States, the Administrator shall allocate among eligible Indian tribes as determined under section 246(a), an aggregate amount equal to the amount such tribes would be allocated under subsection (a), and without regard to this subsection, if such tribes were treated collectively as an eligible State.

SEC. 243. ELIGIBILITY OF STATES.

“(a) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 241, a State shall submit to the Administrator an application that contains the following:

“(1) An assurance that the State will use—

“(A) not more than 5 percent of such grant, in the aggregate, for—

“(i) the costs incurred by the State to carry out this part; and

“(ii) to evaluate, and provide technical assistance relating to, projects and activities carried out with funds provided under this part; and

“(B) the remainder of such grant to make grants under section 244.

“(2) An assurance that, and a detailed description of how, such grant will supplement, and not supplant State and local efforts to prevent juvenile delinquency.

“(3) An assurance that such application was prepared after consultation with and

participation by the State advisory group, community-based organizations, and organizations in the local juvenile justice system, that carry out programs, projects, or activities to prevent juvenile delinquency.

“(4) An assurance that the State advisory group will be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on all grant applications submitted to the State agency.

“(5) An assurance that each eligible entity described in section 244 that receives an initial grant under section 244 to carry out a project or activity shall also receive an assurance from the State that such entity will receive from the State, for the subsequent fiscal year to carry out such project or activity, a grant under such section in an amount that is proportional, based on such initial grant and on the amount of the grant received under section 241 by the State for such subsequent fiscal year, but that does not exceed the amount specified for such subsequent fiscal year in such application as approved by the State.

“(6) Such other information and assurances as the Administrator may reasonably require by rule.

“(b) APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Administrator shall approve an application, and amendments to such application submitted in subsequent fiscal years, that satisfy the requirements of subsection (a).

“(2) LIMITATION.—The Administrator may not approve such application (including amendments to such application) for a fiscal year unless—

“(A)(i) the State submitted a plan under section 223 for such fiscal year; and

“(ii) such plan is approved by the Administrator for such fiscal year; or

“(B) the Administrator waives the application of subparagraph (A) to such State for such fiscal year, after finding good cause for such a waiver.

“SEC. 244. GRANTS FOR LOCAL PROJECTS.

“(a) GRANTS BY STATES.—Using a grant received under section 241, a State may make grants to eligible entities whose applications are received by the State, and reviewed by the State advisory group, to carry out projects and activities described in section 241.

“(b) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—For purposes of making grants under subsection (a), the State shall give special consideration to eligible entities that—

“(1) propose to carry out such projects in geographical areas in which there is—

“(A) a disproportionately high level of serious crime committed by juveniles; or

“(B) a recent rapid increase in the number of nonstatus offenses committed by juveniles;

“(2)(A) agreed to carry out such projects or activities that are multidisciplinary and involve more than 2 private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions that have experience dealing with juveniles; or

“(B) represent communities that have a comprehensive plan designed to identify at-risk juveniles and to prevent or reduce the rate of juvenile delinquency, and that involve other entities operated by individuals who have a demonstrated history of involvement in activities designed to prevent juvenile delinquency; and

“(3) the amount of resources (in cash or in kind) such entities will provide to carry out such projects and activities.

“SEC. 245. ELIGIBILITY OF ENTITIES.

“(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), to be eligible to receive a grant under section 244, a unit of general purpose local government, acting jointly with not fewer than 2 private nonprofit agen-

cies, organizations, and institutions that have experience dealing with juveniles, shall submit to the State an application that contains the following:

“(1) An assurance that such applicant will use such grant, and each such grant received for the subsequent fiscal year, to carry out throughout a 2-year period a project or activity described in reasonable detail, and of a kind described in one or more of paragraphs (1) through (25) of section 241(a) as specified in, such application.

“(2) A statement of the particular goals such project or activity is designed to achieve, and the methods such entity will use to achieve, and assess the achievement of, each of such goals.

“(3) A statement identifying the research (if any) such entity relied on in preparing such application.

“(b) LIMITATION.—If an eligible entity that receives a grant under section 244 to carry out a project or activity for a 2-year period, and receives technical assistance from the State or the Administrator after requesting such technical assistance (if any), fails to demonstrate, before the expiration of such 2-year period, that such project or such activity has achieved substantial success in achieving the goals specified in the application submitted by such entity to receive such grants, then such entity shall not be eligible to receive any subsequent grant under such section to continue to carry out such project or activity.

“SEC. 246. GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.

“(a) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 241(b), an Indian tribe shall submit to the Administrator an application in accordance with this section, in such form and containing such information as the Administrator may require by rule.

“(2) PLANS.—Such application shall include a plan for conducting programs, projects, and activities described in section 241(a), which plan shall—

“(A) provide evidence that the applicant Indian tribe performs law enforcement functions (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior);

“(B) identify the juvenile justice and delinquency problems and juvenile delinquency prevention needs to be addressed by activities conducted with funds provided by the grant for which such application is submitted, by the Indian tribe in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of the Indian tribe;

“(C) provide for fiscal control and accounting procedures that—

“(i) are necessary to ensure the prudent use, proper disbursement, and accounting of grants received by applicants under this section; and

“(ii) are consistent with the requirement specified in subparagraph (B); and

“(D) comply with the requirements specified in section 223(a) (excluding any requirement relating to consultation with a State advisory group) and with the requirements specified in section 222(c); and

“(E) contain such other information, and be subject to such additional requirements, as the Administrator may reasonably require by rule to ensure the effectiveness of the projects for which grants are made under section 241(b).

“(b) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—For the purpose of selecting eligible applicants to receive grants under section 241(b), the Administrator shall consider—

“(1) the resources that are available to each applicant Indian tribe that will assist, and be coordinated with, the overall juvenile justice system of the Indian tribe; and

“(2) with respect to each such applicant—

“(A) the juvenile population; and

“(B) the population and the entities that will be served by projects proposed to be carried out with the grant for which the application is submitted.

“(C) GRANT PROCESS.—

“(1) SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—

“(A) SELECTION REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Administrator shall—

“(i) make grants under this section on a competitive basis; and

“(ii) specify in writing to each applicant selected to receive a grant under this section, the terms and conditions on which such grant is made to such applicant.

“(B) PERIOD OF GRANT.—A grant made under this section shall be available for expenditure during a 2-year period.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—If—

“(A) in the 2-year period for which a grant made under this section shall be expended, the recipient of such grant applies to receive a subsequent grant under this section; and

“(B) the Administrator determines that such recipient performed during the year preceding the 2-year period for which such recipient applies to receive such subsequent grant satisfactorily and in accordance with the terms and conditions applicable to the grant received;

then the Administrator may waive the application of the competition-based requirement specified in paragraph (1)(A)(i) and may allow the applicant to incorporate by reference in the current application the text of the plan contained in the recipient's most recent application previously approved under this section.

“(3) AUTHORITY TO MODIFY APPLICATION PROCESS FOR SUBSEQUENT GRANTS.—The Administrator may modify by rule the operation of subsection (a) with respect to the submission and contents of applications for subsequent grants described in paragraph (2).

“(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each Indian tribe that receives a grant under this section shall be subject to the fiscal accountability provisions of section 5(f)(1) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450c(f)(1)), relating to the submission of a single-agency audit report required by chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code.

“(e) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—(1) Funds appropriated for the activities of any agency of an Indian tribal government or the Bureau of Indian Affairs performing law enforcement functions on any Indian lands may be used to provide the non-Federal share of any program or project with a matching requirement funded under this section.

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to funds appropriated before the date of the enactment of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2001.

“(3) If the Administrator determines that an Indian tribe does not have sufficient funds available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of any program or activity to be funded under the grant, the Administrator may increase the Federal share of the cost thereof to the extent the Administrator deems necessary.”.

“SEC. 11. RESEARCH; EVALUATION; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE; TRAINING.

Title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5611 et seq.) is amended by inserting after part C, as added by section 10, the following:

“PART D—RESEARCH; EVALUATION; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE; TRAINING

“SEC. 251. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION; STATISTICAL ANALYSES; INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

“(a) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—(1) The Administrator may—

“(A) plan and identify the purposes and goals of all agreements carried out with funds provided under this subsection; and

“(B) conduct research or evaluation in juvenile justice matters, for the purpose of providing research and evaluation relating to—

“(i) the prevention, reduction, and control of juvenile delinquency and serious crime committed by juveniles;

“(ii) the link between juvenile delinquency and the incarceration of members of the families of juveniles;

“(iii) successful efforts to prevent first-time minor offenders from committing subsequent involvement in serious crime;

“(iv) successful efforts to prevent recidivism;

“(v) the juvenile justice system;

“(vi) juvenile violence;

“(vii) appropriate mental health services for juveniles and youth at risk of participating in delinquent activities;

“(viii) reducing the proportion of juveniles detained or confined in secure detention facilities, secure correctional facilities, jails, and lockups who are members of minority groups;

“(ix) evaluating services, treatment, and aftercare placement of juveniles who were under the care of the State child protection system before their placement in the juvenile justice system;

“(x) determining—

“(I) the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of drug use by youth in schools and communities in the States using, if appropriate, data submitted by the States pursuant to this subparagraph and subsection (b); and

“(II) the frequency, degree of harm, and morbidity of violent incidents, particularly firearm-related injuries and fatalities, by youth in schools and communities in the States, including information with respect to—

“(aa) the relationship between victims and perpetrators;

“(bb) demographic characteristics of victims and perpetrators; and

“(cc) the type of weapons used in incidents, as classified in the Uniform Crime Reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

“(xi) other purposes consistent with the purposes of this title and title I.

“(2) The Administrator shall ensure that an equitable amount of funds available to carry out paragraph (1)(B) is used for research and evaluation relating to the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

“(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to permit the development of a national database of personally identifiable information on individuals involved in studies, or in data-collection efforts, carried out under paragraph (1)(B)(x).

“(4) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall conduct a study with respect to juveniles who, prior to placement in the juvenile justice system, were under the care or custody of the State child welfare system, and to juveniles who are unable to return to their family after completing their disposition in the juvenile justice system and who remain wards of the State. Such study shall include—

“(A) the number of juveniles in each category;

“(B) the extent to which State juvenile justice systems and child welfare systems are coordinating services and treatment for such juveniles;

“(C) the Federal and local sources of funds used for placements and post-placement services;

“(D) barriers faced by State in providing services to these juveniles;

“(E) the types of post-placement services used;

“(F) the frequency of case plans and case plan reviews; and

“(G) the extent to which case plans identify and address permanency and placement barriers and treatment plans.

“(b) STATISTICAL ANALYSES.—The Administrator may—

“(1) plan and identify the purposes and goals of all agreements carried out with funds provided under this subsection; and

“(2) undertake statistical work in juvenile justice matters, for the purpose of providing for the collection, analysis, and dissemination of statistical data and information relating to juvenile delinquency and serious crimes committed by juveniles, to the juvenile justice system, to juvenile violence, and to other purposes consistent with the purposes of this title and title I.

“(c) COMPETITIVE SELECTION PROCESS.—The Administrator shall use a competitive process, established by rule by the Administrator, to carry out subsections (a) and (b).

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENTS.—A Federal agency that makes an agreement under subsections (a)(1)(B) and (b)(2) with the Administrator may carry out such agreement directly or by making grants to or contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations.

“(e) INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.—The Administrator may—

“(1) review reports and data relating to the juvenile justice system in the United States and in foreign nations (as appropriate), collect data and information from studies and research into all aspects of juvenile delinquency (including the causes, prevention, and treatment of juvenile delinquency) and serious crimes committed by juveniles;

“(2) establish and operate, directly or by contract, a clearinghouse and information center for the preparation, publication, and dissemination of information relating to juvenile delinquency, including State and local prevention and treatment programs, plans, resources, and training and technical assistance programs; and

“(3) make grants and contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, for the purpose of disseminating information to representatives and personnel of public and private agencies, including practitioners in juvenile justice, law enforcement, the courts, corrections, schools, and related services, in the establishment, implementation, and operation of projects and activities for which financial assistance is provided under this title.

SEC. 252. TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

“(a) TRAINING.—The Administrator may—

“(1) develop and carry out projects for the purpose of training representatives and personnel of public and private agencies, including practitioners in juvenile justice, law enforcement, courts (including model juvenile and family courts), corrections, schools, and related services, to carry out the purposes specified in section 102; and

“(2) make grants to and contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations for the purpose of training representatives and personnel of public and private agencies, including practitioners in juvenile justice, law enforcement, courts (including model juvenile and family courts), corrections, schools, and related services, to carry out the purposes specified in section 102.

“(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator may—

“(1) develop and implement projects for the purpose of providing technical assistance to representatives and personnel of public and private agencies and organizations, in-

cluding practitioners in juvenile justice, law enforcement, courts (including model juvenile and family courts), corrections, schools, and related services, in the establishment, implementation, and operation of programs, projects, and activities for which financial assistance is provided under this title; and

“(2) make grants to and contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, for the purpose of providing technical assistance to representatives and personnel of public and private agencies, including practitioners in juvenile justice, law enforcement, courts (including model juvenile and family courts), corrections, schools, and related services, in the establishment, implementation, and operation of programs, projects, and activities for which financial assistance is provided under this title.

“(c) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.—The Administrator shall provide training and technical assistance to mental health professionals and law enforcement personnel (including public defenders, police officers, probation officers, judges, parole officials, and correctional officers) to address or to promote the development, testing, or demonstration of promising or innovative models (including model juvenile and family courts), programs, or delivery systems that address the needs of juveniles who are alleged or adjudicated delinquent and who, as a result of such status, are placed in secure detention or confinement or in nonsecure residential placements.”

SEC. 12. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

Title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5611 et seq.) is amended by inserting after part D, as added by section 11, the following:

PART E—DEVELOPING, TESTING, AND DEMONSTRATING PROMISING NEW INITIATIVES AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 261. GRANTS AND PROJECTS.

“(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—The Administrator may make grants to and contracts with States, units of general local government, Indian tribal governments, public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals, or combinations thereof, to carry out projects for the development, testing, and demonstration of promising initiatives and programs for the prevention, control, or reduction of juvenile delinquency. The Administrator shall ensure that, to the extent reasonable and practicable, such grants are made to achieve an equitable geographical distribution of such projects throughout the United States.

“(b) USE OF GRANTS.—A grant made under subsection (a) may be used to pay all or part of the cost of the project for which such grant is made.

SEC. 262. GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

“The Administrator may make grants to and contracts with public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals to provide technical assistance to States, units of general local government, Indian tribal governments, local private entities or agencies, or any combination thereof, to carry out the projects for which grants are made under section 261.

SEC. 263. ELIGIBILITY.

“To be eligible to receive a grant made under this part, a public or private agency, Indian tribal government, organization, institution, individual, or combination thereof shall submit an application to the Administrator at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Administrator may reasonably require by rule.

SEC. 264. REPORTS.

“Recipients of grants made under this part shall submit to the Administrator such reports as may be reasonably requested by the

Administrator to describe progress achieved in carrying out the projects for which such grants are made.”.

SEC. 13. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 299 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (e), and
- (2) by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c), and inserting the following:

“(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TITLE II (EXCLUDING PARTS C AND E).

(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title such sums as may be appropriate for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006.

“(2) Of such sums as are appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this title (other than parts C and E)—

“(A) not more than 5 percent shall be available to carry out part A;

“(B) not less than 80 percent shall be available to carry out part B; and

“(C) not more than 15 percent shall be available to carry out part D.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PART C.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part C such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006.

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PART E.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part E, and authorized to remain available until expended, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006.”.

SEC. 14. ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY.

Section 299A of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5672) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d) by striking “as are consistent with the purpose of this Act” and inserting “only to the extent necessary to ensure that there is compliance with the specific requirements of this title or to respond to requests for clarification and guidance relating to such compliance”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) If a State requires by law compliance with the requirements described in paragraphs (11), (12), and (13) of section 223(a), then for the period such law is in effect in such State such State shall be rebuttably presumed to satisfy such requirements.”.

SEC. 15. USE OF FUNDS.

Section 299C(c) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5674(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) No funds may be paid under this title to a residential program (excluding a program in a private residence) unless—

“(1) there is in effect in the State in which such placement or care is provided, a requirement that the provider of such placement or such care may be licensed only after satisfying, at a minimum, explicit standards of discipline that prohibit neglect, physical and mental abuse, as defined by State law;

“(2) such provider is licensed as described in paragraph (1) by the State in which such placement or care is provided; and

“(3) such provider satisfies the licensing standards of each other State from which such provider receives a juvenile for such placement or such care, in accordance with the Interstate Compact on Child Placement as entered into by such other State.”.

SEC. 16. LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS.

Part F of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671 et seq.), as so redesignated by section 10, is amended adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 299F. LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS.

“None of the funds made available to carry out this title may be used to advocate for, or

support, the unsecured release of juveniles who are charged with a violent crime.”.

SEC. 17. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Part F of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671 et seq.), as so redesignated by section 10 and amended by section 16, is amended adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 299G. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

“Nothing in this title or title I shall be construed—

“(1) to prevent financial assistance from being awarded through grants under this title to any otherwise eligible organization; or

“(2) to modify or affect any Federal or State law relating to collective bargaining rights of employees.”.

SEC. 18. LEASING SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY.

Part F of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671 et seq.), as so redesignated by section 10 and amended by sections 16 and 17, is amended adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 299H. LEASING SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY.

“The Administrator may receive surplus Federal property (including facilities) and may lease such property to States and units of general local government for use in or as facilities for juvenile offenders, or for use in or as facilities for delinquency prevention and treatment activities.”.

SEC. 19. ISSUANCE OF RULES.

Part F of title II or the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671 et seq.), as so redesignated by section 10 and amended by sections 16, 17, and 18, is amended adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 299I. ISSUANCE OF RULES.

“The Administrator shall issue rules to carry out this title, including rules that establish procedures and methods for making grants and contracts, and distributing funds available, to carry out this title.”.

SEC. 20. CONTENT OF MATERIALS.

Part F of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671 et seq.), as so redesignated by section 10 and amended by sections 16, 17, 18, and 19, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 299J. CONTENT OF MATERIALS.

“Materials produced, procured, or distributed both using funds appropriated to carry out this Act and for the purpose of preventing hate crimes that result in acts of physical violence, shall not recommend or require any action that abridges or infringes upon the constitutionally protected rights of free speech, religion, or equal protection of juveniles or of their parents or legal guardians.”.

SEC. 21. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 202(b) by striking “prescribed for GS-18 of the General Schedule by section 5332” and inserting “payable under section 5376”;

(2) in section 221(b)(2) by striking the last sentence;

(3) in section 299D by striking subsection (d), and

(4) by striking titles IV and V, as originally enacted by Public Law 93-415 (88 Stat. 1132-1143).

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—(1) The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 214(b)(1) by striking “262, 293, and 296 of subpart II of title II” and inserting “299B and 299E”;

(B) in section 214A(c)(1) by striking “262, 293, and 296 of subpart II of title II” and inserting “299B and 299E”;

(C) in section 217(c)(1) by striking “sections 262, 293, and 296 of subpart II of title II” and inserting “sections 299B and 299E”;

(D) in section 223(c) by striking “section 262, 293, and 296” and inserting “sections 262, 299B, and 299E”.

(2) Section 404(a)(5)(E) of the Missing Children’s Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773) is amended by striking “section 313” and inserting “section 331”.

SEC. 22. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.**—The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1900.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1900, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2001. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was created by Congress in 1974 to help communities and States prevent and control delinquency and to improve their juvenile justice systems. The nature and extent of juvenile delinquency has changed considerably since the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was created, and this reauthorization has taken that into account.

This office has not been reauthorized since 1994, although a similar bill has passed this House by overwhelming margins at least twice since then. This year we have an opportunity for both the House and the Senate to pass this legislation and get it to the President for his signature.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for their good work in marking H.R. 1900 up through the Subcommittee on Select Education and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for their able assistance in reporting the bill from the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for joining me in introducing this legislation. This bill is virtually the same legislation the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and I

successfully negotiated on a bipartisan basis last Congress. We are looking forward to having the House and the Senate pass this measure so after 6 years of hard work, the reauthorization of this act can become law.

I want to particularly emphasize the spirit of bipartisanship my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), has put into this measure from the beginning. Tough issues have not been easily resolved; but day after day, week after week, year after year the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and his able staff have been extraordinarily good natured and willing to wrestle these controversies to the ground.

I thank my legislative director, Judy Borger, who has worked tirelessly on this legislation for years. As all of the Members know, we do the talking and we do some of the thinking in terms of concept, and then it is the staff that works the 12- and 16- and 24-hour days hammering out the language and doing all of the detail work that finally makes it possible.

I also thank Denise Fort from the staff of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who has worked equally tirelessly, as well as Bob Sweet and Chris Anne Pierce from our committee.

H.R. 1900 is designed to assist States and local communities to develop strategies to combat juvenile crime through a wide range of prevention and intervention programs. This legislation acknowledges that most successful solutions to juvenile crime are developed at the State and local levels of government by those individuals who understand the unique characteristics of youth in their areas.

By combining the current discretionary programs into a prevention block grant to the States, and allowing States and local communities discretion in how such funds are used, we allow the local officials to use their own good judgment, and based upon the realities of each situation, and yet we have not given them so much flexibility that harm could be done to the children.

It is an extraordinarily difficult task to create a juvenile justice system in each of the States and in each of the counties that can respond to the very, very different young people in our society who get caught up in the law. But I believe that this bipartisan bill represents good policy. The bill successfully strikes a balance in dealing with children who grow up and come before the juvenile justice system who are already very dangerous and vicious criminals, and other children who come before the juvenile justice system who are harmless and scared and running away from abuse at home.

We dealt with very sensitive issues like the deinstitutionalization of status offenders, how to assure that juveniles who need to be temporarily housed with adults be held out of sight and sound of adults, how to address the overrepresentation of minorities in the

juvenile justice system, and determining the correct balance between block-granting funds to the States and keeping some strings attached.

We added language directing the States to give priority in funding to programs and activities that are based on rigorous, systematic, and objective research that is scientifically based; and we found a way to provide the additional flexibility that our local officials need, still protect society from dangerous teenagers while protecting scared kids from overly harsh kids in the juvenile justice system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1900.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as we begin to rebuild from the tragedy and devastation we experienced in New York, Pennsylvania, and at the Pentagon, it is appropriate that two of the first three bills we take up this week concern the safety and well-being of our children.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1900, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, with my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD). Juvenile justice is always a challenge because we have a choice of playing politics or reducing crime.

This bill is a bipartisan initiative that lays the groundwork for sensible juvenile crime policy. Five years ago we started from a decidedly different perspective. The House considered juvenile crime bills with such titles as the "Violent Youth Predator Act," the "Juvenile Crime Control Act," and others. The titles of the bills made it clear that Congress was more considered in using political sound bites than coming up with sound policy designed to reduce crime. After those bills collapsed in partisan controversy, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) appointed a bipartisan working group on youth violence to thoughtfully review the issue of youth violence and to make meaningful suggestions.

Our working group reviewed studies of problems of youth violence and heard testimony from academia, law enforcement, the judicial system, and advocacy groups. Those experts that met with us agreed that prevention and early intervention were the things that we needed to reduce crime. Those efforts needed to require parental and community participation.

H.R. 1900 is a culmination of 5 years of work, at the end of which we made the choice to stop playing politics and to promote constructive legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have arrived at a different place today than where we were 5 years ago. We have made the right choice. H.R. 1900 is a bipartisan agreement that promotes sound juvenile crime policy which is based on proven research.

H.R. 1900 reflects what was presented to the bipartisan working group and testimony heard through numerous hearings in Washington and across the country. We heard that prevention programs are effective in reducing youth violence in the community and often save more money than they cost. Programs such as early childhood education, structured after-school activities, dropout prevention, and mentoring have all been shown successful in reducing youth delinquency.

I am also pleased that we were able to maintain the core mandates of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act so that juveniles who come in contact with the juvenile justice system are assured of fundamental protections. For example, runaways and truants should not be jailed in secure facilities. And if juveniles are ever housed in adult facilities, it must be for short periods of time; and during that time they must be separated by sight and sound from adult offenders.

Lastly, States have a responsibility to address the disproportionate number of minority youth who are under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court system.

The bill before us recognizes the need for community input and requires community collaboration and planning that encourages bringing delinquency prevention professionals around the table to decide how best to respond to the crime prevention needs of the community. Those experts should include the school system, law enforcement, social services, business, sociology and other experts. And for the first time we are also asking the States to ensure that the child welfare system, the foster care system, and the juvenile justice system are working together to address the needs of juvenile offenders. We know that two-thirds of children in the juvenile system are already known by the child welfare system. The link between abuse, neglect, and delinquency demands greater involvement between the various systems that serve at-risk youth.

H.R. 1900 starts us down the path of greater collaboration, and I appreciate the work of my ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) in offering these important improvements to the bill. H.R. 1900 deserves the support of this body. It is not based on politics or sound bites, but instead represents sound policy; and it is the product of a constructive, bipartisan cooperative effort to reduce youth crime in our communities. It will add to the safety and security of future generations.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the juvenile justice

bill that we have on the floor, and thank all of my colleagues that have taken part in bringing us to this important day. I think the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) have fully explained the bill.

My reason for rising today is to say that, without a true bipartisan effort over the long journey of bringing this bill to the floor, we would not be here. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) have worked diligently for 5 years trying to bridge the differences, and they have done it in such a way that we have learned a great deal from them.

I also thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), for their efforts in shepherding this bill through the committee process. Lastly, I thank the ranking Democrat, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), who provided an atmosphere of cooperation and respect which I think brings this bill here in front of us today.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great example of what can happen when people keep their eye on the goal, and the goal being what is it that we can do from our perspective here in Washington to help these juvenile justice programs work better. They have done a great job, and they deserve our thanks.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership for bringing this bill to the floor today. As the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) earlier said, in the wake of the tragedies in New York, Pennsylvania and here at the Pentagon, our concentration on our children and those children who are so desperately in need of services and at risk is a nice tribute to America's families.

I also want to join those who have already expressed their thanks to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) for their diligence on this matter.

□ 1115

I cannot think of two people in the Congress who have worked harder to try to bring about a resolution of what was a very contentious issue over the last several years to make sure that we move forward in the protection and the service of our children; in making sure that we, in fact, develop those kinds of programs that have the best opportunity at reducing juvenile crime, at

reducing juvenile delinquency and making sure that our children, in fact, get into programs of opportunity and programs that will help them to sort out their lives and lead productive lives in America. I want to thank them very, very much for all their effort, all their time to bring this legislation to the floor in the form that it is now in. While we have seen a decrease in juvenile crime over the last couple of years, we also see some disturbing factors, that many of the perpetrators of that crime are younger and younger. We see the inclusion of more and more young girls in the perpetration of these crimes, and these are reasons for concern. It is a reason we need to take new approaches and new choices.

This legislation is really about prevention and about accountability and about focusing our efforts on the early part of a child's life because, again, the scientific-based research, the peer-reviewed research tells us that this is our best opportunity to intervene on behalf of these children, to intervene in their dysfunctional families.

I want to commend those who supported the previous bill on the floor today dealing with the D.C. court system and the foster care system in the District of Columbia. Understanding the need to intervene early, to save these children and to give them an opportunity, where they are caught up in a family that is so clearly dysfunctional that it now becomes a threat to those children in the immediate sense, but the long-term ramifications and impact on the kinds of lives those children will lead in terms of their involvement in the juvenile justice system or the adult criminal system makes it all the more important.

I believe that H.R. 1900 does this by providing the recognition of early intervention and accountability and providing the guidelines to make sure that we, in fact, protect these children at the same time that we are dealing with their transgressions, so that we do not send them off to schools that improve their ability to commit a crime but do not improve their ability to extract themselves from that life of crime.

I also want to quickly mention the parts of this legislation dealing with the question about the needs, and the support for the needs of these services. According to a report produced by the Inspector General at the Department of Health and Human Services, an audit of cases in California found that few children are ever receiving case planning and family permanency planning systems.

What does that mean? That means that these children are really never given the tools, or the caseworkers are not given the tools to get these children out of the situation that they are in. And without family permanency or planning permanency, the children find themselves continually swirling around the system from one foster care, one institution, over and over again, be-

cause we have not taken the time as the law in fact requires, to develop planning for these children's futures, so that we can make sure that they have the absolute best opportunity at success.

I also want to draw attention to the fact that this legislation deals with the children who are sent to boot camps, and recognizing that the New York Times recently reported that since 1980 there have been over 31 children who have died in these boot camps and numerous other children have been subjected to sexual abuse and assault while they are in these camps.

In July, a child who was voluntarily placed in a wilderness camp in Arizona died as a result of abuse and negligence of the camp operators. The autopsy revealed that he drowned in a hotel shower where the camp staff had left him after he had collapsed. He had collapsed after being punished for bad behavior. What was his bad behavior? He complained that the program was too hard. What was his punishment for that bad behavior? They made him eat dirt and he subsequently died.

That kind of punishment, if it had been meted out by a parent or a relative, would have been child abuse. We have got to make sure that child abuse laws protect these children in this kind of custody. And I believe that this legislation, in fact, does that in a manner in which we know that you cannot delegate, you cannot delegate the right to abuse a child to another factor.

H.R. 1900 requires that any residence program receiving funds under this act must be licensed by State and must have standards of discipline to prohibit abuse and neglect as defined by State law. What the State standard is will apply to those operations within that State. I think this is the minimum that we can do for these children.

Let me close again by just thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for all of the time. I think very often the public does not understand the kind of effort or the kind of time that individual Members or legislators put into subjects like this, where there is not a lot of attention given except when things go terribly wrong.

These are children that, in many instances, are seriously disenfranchised from the system; that, in many instances, through no fault of their own, found themselves caught up in dysfunctional institutions, dysfunctional families. And this is an effort, and the time that these two gentlemen have spent, this is an effort to throw them, if you will, a life preserver to see that if we can bring them back, we can provide the services, provide the accountability for those rendering the services and see whether or not we can give these children an opportunity at success rather than almost a condemnation to failure under the existing system.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), an active member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1900, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. I am particularly pleased to see language in the bill to provide positive youth development which includes mentoring. We often see money spent on building prisons, drug rehabilitation programs, hiring more police, and building youth correction facilities as money that is well spent. Money spent on prevention of juvenile crime, drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, is often seen as less important and sometimes is perceived as being wasteful. It costs 25 to \$30,000 per year to incarcerate a young person. If that young person stays in prison for life, it is more than \$1 million. States are currently raising unwanted children at unprecedeted cost. Drug addiction leads to other crime and a great social cost to those involved. Recidivism is very high. It is much more cost effective to prevent juvenile misbehavior than to attempt to correct behavior after the fact.

One example is mentoring. According to "Character Counts," mentoring reduces absenteeism from school by more than 50 percent, significantly cuts dropout rates, reduces drug abuse by more than 50 percent, certainly curtails teenage pregnancy, crime and violent behavior by significant degrees, and the cost is only about \$400 per year, on the average, for a good mentoring program. So it is tremendously cost effective. The return is phenomenal in terms of the expense.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out the fact that the bill provides more flexibility for the use of funds at the local level. I think all of us realize that money spent at the local level is spent much more effectively than money spent at the Federal or the State level.

Finally, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) for their efforts, and strongly encourage passage of H.R. 1900.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 1900. I stand here as a new member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. My heart is full, because I realize that this is such an important issue that needs to be addressed. In my district alone, in Los Angeles County, I represent the East Lake detention facility. I had the opportunity of visiting that facility a couple of months ago and realized that a good number of the children, youngsters, that are there represented my district. I felt com-

elled that we need to do something immediately to help them, prevent them from furthering a life of crime and hopefully deterring them into a better life-style.

But I found that many of the young people, particular Latinos that I found there from my district, were experiencing some different kinds of hardships. Many of them at the age of 13 and 14 were already finding themselves as mothers. They were pregnant. I found that the treatment and medical attention that they needed to be prioritized. I asked the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and other Members if they would please include an amendment in this bill to help address prenatal assistance in assessing these young women's needs. They adopted that.

I also wanted to thank them for including another provision, suicide prevention. Many of the youngsters that I saw at these facilities were also coming from a life of hardship. Some of them were recent immigrants, coming from war-torn El Salvador and other Central American countries. Faced with that dilemma, many of them had this put before them, of how they were going to lead their lives, not having appropriate supervision by their parents and by our inadequate school system that does not provide enough counseling and after-school programs. This bill, I believe, in my opinion will do that.

I want to thank the committee and I want to thank our leadership for taking the time to address these issues and including these two amendments in this bill. I ask for support of this legislation.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), another active member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1900. One of the things that our community in Littleton, Colorado had to deal with shortly after the Columbine tragedy was the fact that there were many parents and children who were frightened to return to school. They were frightened because they felt helpless in their ability to control their own environment. With that in mind, I asked the Colorado Bureau of Investigation, the Colorado Department of Education, U.S. West and AT&T to help me construct the Colorado school safety hotline. Within just a few months after the tragedy at Columbine, these posters were up in every school in the State of Colorado and a 24-hour hotline had been started and was in operation at CBI. Since that time, there have been some 1,323 phone calls, there have been several arrests, and God only knows how many incidents have been avoided as a result of the Colorado school safety hotline.

H.R. 1900 includes a provision that would allow States to use their safe and drug-free school money in the cre-

ation of their own hotline. I certainly encourage them to think about this as a way of preventing possible incidents similar to Columbine. The one thing we learned since then is that in every single situation we have had of school violence, without exception, the perpetrators of the crime told somebody.

With this knowledge in mind, it is imperative that every State in the Nation take the kind of action that we took in Colorado, the establishment of the hotline, to allow someone who may have heard something to call somebody anonymously, tell them what they have heard, and let the authorities take what actions need to be taken. With the inclusion of this particular amendment and for all of the other good things that are in this particular piece of legislation, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will support H.R. 1900.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time. I also thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), both the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), for a very policy-changing initiative, H.R. 1900, that will really turn the corner in how we address the questions of juvenile crime control and the issue of delinquency. Let me thank them and their staff for this legislation.

Let me thank in particular my colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary for merging his responsibilities as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Education and the Workforce, realizing that these are two very important responsibilities, that there is some commonality.

Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, I held a hearing in my district with Senator PAUL WELLSTONE on the question of mental health and juvenile delinquency. We had over 90 witnesses, of local authorities, mental health specialists, parents who had dealt with suicide amongst their teenagers, and teenagers who said they had attempted suicide on a number of occasions.

□ 1135

One thing we determined out of that hearing was that we had to approach the issue of juvenile delinquency and the resulting crime in a totally different mode; that prevention and intervention on these young people and their families was crucial for America to get its hands around the whole question of juvenile indiscretions or crime and delinquency.

This bill authorizes the use of juvenile delinquency prevention block grants for projects that provide treatment to juvenile offenders. The bill

covers a litany of programs, including treatment for mental health problems for juveniles who have experienced violence, projects which provide for an individualized assessment, and the treatment plans for incarcerated juveniles suspected to be in need of mental health services, after-school programs for at-risk juveniles, programs related to the establishment and maintenance of a school violence hot line, and programs designed to reduce the unlawful acquisition and illegal use of guns by juveniles. It is heavy on prevention.

When we visited one of our juvenile detention centers with Senator WELLSTONE and County Judge Bob Eckels, we were able to see youngsters who were crying out for services, crying out for an adult that would help supervise them, and certainly in need of mental health.

This bill, of course, is of special importance to me; and I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), for addressing the question of the issue of mental health.

The mental health of children, including its intersection with the issue of juvenile justice, is an issue that has long been ignored. In the bill, as this passed through the Committee on the Judiciary, I was very glad that amendments that I proposed, language I proposed, was included, dealing with the mental health aspect as it was in the Committee on Education and Workforce.

Yet one to which I pay special attention, not only in my capacity as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary but also in my capacity as founder and chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, in working with the House Bipartisan Working Group on Youth Violence that many of my colleagues served on, it was interesting that Members from both sides of the aisle came away from that 6- or 7- or 8-week time frame, and determined that prevention had to be the way this country and this Congress would go.

In doing so, mental health was raised as a very important issue. In the presentation I made, my particular subcommittee was dealing with mental health, it was without question that that was what was needed.

The mental health of children is an issue that has been too long ignored. Untreated, it manifests itself in many ways, ranging from eating disorders to school bullying and violence. That is why I have H.R. 75, that deals in particular with helping children overcome their frustration or their need for counseling by providing enhanced community mental health services.

We held a hearing a couple of weeks ago, the Congressional Children's Caucus, about bullying; and we determined that children need counseling to intervene so they do not bully each other and that turns into violence.

This legislation has many aspects to it, but what I believe is the key element to this legislation is a recognizing that we must look at juvenile

delinquency and crime control in a totally different manner; intervene, prevent, before we run into trouble.

I, in conclusion, will simply say that this bill overall is an excellent bill. I would raise a reservation, however, about the provision of the bill that gives local authorities the ability to hold juveniles in adult lockups for more than 24 hours if other alternatives are not available. I would encourage my local communities to find alternative sites for our children, because what we want to do is intervene so those children can grow up to be contributing adults.

I support H.R. 1900, and ask my colleagues to unanimously support it.

I rise in support of the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act, H.R. 1900.

This bill authorizes the use of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Block Grants for projects that provide treatment to juvenile offenders. The bill covers a litany of programs, including treatment for mental health problems, for juveniles who have experienced violence, projects which provide for an individualized assessment and the treatment plans for incarcerated juveniles suspected to be in need of mental health services, after-school programs for at-risk juveniles, programs related to the establishment and maintenance of a school violence hotline and programs designed to reduce the unlawful acquisition and illegal use of guns by juveniles.

This bill also authorizes the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention to undertake specified activities regarding research, evaluation, technical assistance, and training, including providing training and technical assistance to mental health professionals and law enforcement personnel to address or promote the development, testing, or demonstration of promising or innovative models, programs, or delivery systems addressing the needs of delinquent juveniles who are placed in secure detention, confinement or in non-secure residential placements.

This bill is of special importance to me because it so wisely addresses the issue of mental health. The mental health of children, including its intersection with the issue of juvenile justice, is an issue that has been long ignored, yet one to which I pay special attention, not only in my capacity as a member of the Judiciary Committee, but also in my capacity as Founder and Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus and as a member of the House Bipartisan Working Group on Youth Violence, which was formed on June 25, 1999 by Speaker HASTERT and Minority Leader GEPHARDT and which issued its final report on March 8, 2000.

Just this past July, the Congressional Children's Caucus held a briefing on the relationship between children's mental health and school bullying, and we discussed how bullying, which causes and is caused by mental health problems, can escalate into violence. And I am the sponsor of the bi-partisan bill H.R. 75, which would sponsor grants to schools to put more mental health professionals in our schools.

The issue is of such pressing importance that during the Congressional Black Caucus annual legislative conference this month, I will be hosting a forum on the nexus between ju-

venile justice and children's mental health. National experts will join us to discuss this topic.

The mental health of children is an issue that has been too long ignored. Untreated, it manifests itself in many ways, ranging from eating disorders to school bullying and violence, as I just discussed. In fact, in the bipartisan Working Group on Youth Violence formed a mental health subgroup to determine the extent to which mental health problems lead to incidences of youth violence and how to address the problem. We determined, in part, that it is important to identify at risk youths in school to encourage them to see schools are safe, stable learning environments and to ensure that they have access to mental health services. The Report also noted that the juvenile justice system should screen youths who enter the system and that treatment is provided where the need is identified. Hence, I am pleased to see that many of the recommendations of the Working Groups have been considered in drafting this legislation. This was not a group of mere talking heads, but a group that proposed and is enacting real, practical solutions.

The fact the juvenile violent crime has decreased does not mean that we should ignore the problem. Indeed, we should see it as an opportunity to identify the previously unanswered problems and reach those who might otherwise be issued.

I do have reservations about the provision of the bill that gives local authorities the ability to hold juveniles in adult lockups for more than 24 hours if other alternatives are not available. However, I applaud efforts to address the mental health needs of the troubled youths. Hence, I believe that the benefits of the bill far outweigh its negative aspects and believe that as its provisions are enacted, we will work to correct any shortcomings.

It is time we took an affirmative step forward and realized that although we may differ on some provisions, we all agree that we must help our youth become, productive, mentally and physically, law-abiding citizens. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and honor to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the most distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Education Reform of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased also to support this legislation. When police arrest children and young adults who shrug off their criminal acts as a right of passage, our response is often fear and anger. How can we protect ourselves? How can we make them pay for what they have done?

Then a secondary, more productive response sets in, how did these children become settled in lives of delinquency and crime? How can we intervene to break the link between a single delinquent act and a life of criminal activity?

Today, after countless hearings and debates, we seek to answer these questions with a balanced response through H.R. 1900, the Juvenile Crime Control

□ 1145

and Delinquency Prevention Act. This act, sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), is a product of extensive negotiations between Members of both sides of the aisle; and I am pleased that it comes to the floor with bipartisan support, thanks in large part to the sustained effort of the bill's authors.

H.R. 1900 recognizes that there are many root causes of crime. When we examine the lives of our most troubled young adults, we often see many predictors of their behavior, absent parents and an absence of safe and enriching places to go after school, among others.

The bill also appreciates the fact that most successful solutions to juvenile crime are developed at the State and local levels, encompassing multiple strategies that are put in place according to specific need of families, neighbors, and communities. In so doing, H.R. 1900 is flexible enough to fund State and local programs and services ranging from character education and mental health, to school violence hot lines.

In addition, H.R. 1900 recognizes that after-school programs give our most at-risk children a positive alternative to television, drugs, and crime; and it ensures that funds are available to support these programs. In this age of dual-income families, roughly 5 million children come home to an empty house after school. It is, therefore, not surprising then that juvenile crime increases by 300 percent after 3 p.m. This bill will help change that.

Finally, H.R. 1900 allows States to use their funds to extend the reach of after-school programs to children in need. As we all know, children who enjoy the advantages of caring parents and good schools can just as easily go astray as those who do not.

Many adults in prison today began their criminal careers as youths and teenagers, and any attempt to reduce crime and its societal cost must place a high priority on the needs of our young adults.

For 6 years, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) have worked to create a bipartisan solution to this difficult problem. This year, I am confident that, with our support, they will see their bill become law. To that end, I urge an aye vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a product of a lot of hard work. We had leadership from the committee, from the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER); the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA); the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE); and, our side, from our ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER); and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

But, more important, Mr. Chairman, we had hard work from our staffs, Jo-

Marie St. Martin, Judy Borger, Bob Sweet, and Krisann Pearce from the Republican side, and Denise Forte, Maggie McDow, Cheryl Johnson, and Ruth Friedman from the Democratic side.

I would point out that Judy Borger and Denise Forte spent innumerable long hours over the last 5 years working on this bill, and they are really the experts on juvenile justice for the House of Representatives.

I am particularly pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have worked over those years with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD). We have had many long, difficult discussions. This is a very politically charged issue. Two years ago when we went through this, there were a lot of provisions put into the bill that his side wanted, but our side did not; a lot of provisions were put in the bill that our side wanted, that his side did not; and when we ended up, we had a bill that nobody wanted and it did not pass.

We focused on those core, important issues. That was very difficult, and I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) for his hard work and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House approve the bill. It is a product of very hard work and will help our next generation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me also return the kind word of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). We have worked together long and hard. There were a dozen issues in which it would have been a relatively easy matter for us to collapse our negotiations and collapse our talks and walk away and give up, which is sadly too often what happens in this body.

But each and every time that I went to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and said we have to work this out, how can we do this, let us put our heads together, can you yield a little bit here if I yield a little bit here, can you get your Members to go along with this compromise if I can get my Members to go along, without exception, every single time the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) was there to do that.

I have made a good friend of one of the best Members of this House, and I am proud to be associated with the gentleman in this work and thank him again.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a time of national crisis; and, ultimately, our success will depend partly upon our superiority when it comes to technology and to our military equipment. Ultimately, our success over the coming months and years and decade will be a function of the character of the American people.

When we talk about the character of the American people, we have to remember that that means everyone.

No one can be absent from the national cause to develop the strength of character and to see us through these dark times and to resecure America's place in the world.

As a former caseworker who has worked with abused and neglected and troubled and delinquent children, I know firsthand that what these kids need more than anything else is adults in their lives who care about them, who are interested in their future, who believe in them, who have confidence in them, and who do not throw them away into the dark dungeons of the juvenile justice system but, in fact, spend time with them to teach them discipline, to teach them self control, to teach them about the need to take responsibility for the consequences of their actions.

I believe that this legislation will promote those efforts in every State and county in the country so that the young people who find themselves, generally because of difficulties in their home situation, with histories of abuse and violence and neglect and terrible home situations, find themselves in trouble with the law. These provisions in H.R. 1900, I think, will help these young people become full-fledged members of society who can contribute to our national security and well-being, rather than drain resources for important and vital needs.

Again, I thank all of the Members and the staff who have worked on this. I urge passage of H.R. 1900.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1900, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2001. The rise of crime, particularly violent crime, among our nation's youth is a problem that affects us all. The downstream result of our action—or inaction—is tremendous. Today is all about the future. Future generations will be affected by the actions we take today, and we can choose to either address the current situation and work for tomorrow, or turn a blind eye. I believe we must work with our youth to make a brighter future.

I am particularly pleased that the bill before the House today includes a provision which I wrote to help local schools detain and monitor, including a psychological evaluation, any student who brings a gun to school. Recent school tragedies, like the one that took place in my home State of Oregon, have occurred after a student was sent home after bringing a gun to school. The WU provision in the Juvenile Justice bill will ensure that local schools can provide for immediate psychological evaluation and follow-up treatment for any juvenile that brings a gun on school grounds.

By ensuring that local schools will have these students evaluated in a timely fashion, we are intervening at the right time: before another tragedy transpires. I believe this provision is in the best spirit of commonsense and prevention. I want to thank my colleague from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO, who

has been very supportive of this amendment. He has toiled very hard on behalf of his constituents, including those in Springfield, and deserves to be recognized for his good work. I thank him for his friendship and counsel.

I thank the Members of the Committee on both sides of the aisle for their good efforts, and urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, today we consider legislation to prevent juvenile crime, while at the same time holding juvenile criminal offenders accountable for their actions. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) was created by Congress in 1974 to help communities and States prevent and control delinquency and to improve their juvenile justice systems. The nature and extent of delinquency and abuse have changed considerably since OJJDP was created, and this reauthorization has taken that into account.

I want to especially thank my colleagues JIM GREENWOOD and BOBBY SCOTT for this bipartisan bill. They have worked tirelessly for several years to craft a bipartisan bill that I believe will provide flexibility and assistance to States and local communities in preventing and controlling juvenile crime. And I also want to thank Chairman HOEKSTRA and Ranking Member TIM ROEMER for the good work they did in steering this bill through Committee. My thanks to Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER who has worked closely with me in bringing this bill through full Committee and to the Floor for consideration today.

These programs have not been authorized since 1994, although a similar bill has passed the Congress by overwhelming margins at least twice since then. This year, I believe we have an opportunity to send this bill to the President for his signature.

There have been a number of issues that we have included in this bill that are worthy of note.

The collection of data on the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of drug use by youth and information on the relationship between victims and perpetrators of violence; the determination of the type of weapon used in violent incidents as reported in the FBI's Uniform Crime Report; the prohibition of the development of any national data base of personally identifiable information; a prevention block grant that will give states added flexibility in how they use grant funds to prevent and control juvenile delinquency; an emphasis on making sure that juvenile justice programs under this act are proven effective based on scientifically based research; participation by the State advisory groups in helping States determine those areas most in need of juvenile justice system improvements; mentoring and positive youth development programs; attention to the mental health needs of juvenile offenders; the development and implementation of character education programs; and a school violence hotline for students and parents to report suspicious, violent, or threatening student behavior.

Although violent juvenile crime peaked in 1994 and has declined almost 36 percent since then, we must not become complacent. The juvenile justice system, including the courts, face new challenges, including ways to

deal with illegal drug dependence, underage drinking, youth gangs, violent juvenile offenders, and an increasing number of female juvenile offenders, just to name a few. We must find solutions to these new challenges, and the best way to do this is offering flexibility to those most directly responsible for preventing and controlling juvenile crime. The reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention programs is an important step in providing this assistance. I urge a favorable vote on this bill today.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to HR 1900, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2001.

Few things are more important than reducing youth violence and delinquency. If America's children are truly important—and I believe they are—then we should be prepared to spend whatever it takes, and do whatever is necessary to help them on their way to full wholesome participation in American society. Mr. Speaker, I am also convinced this Congress is capable of accomplishing these important goals. The political will of the House probably exists. But if it does, we will not know, because the bill in question betrays our noble intentions regarding America's youth and the scourge of youth violence.

Mr. Speaker, the current research associated with the subject of HR 1900 provides alarming, overwhelming, irrefutable, and confirmed evidence that programs undertaken by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) are a complete waste of taxpayer dollars, because they cannot be proven to work.

Despite these programs lack of proven effectiveness, the number of active OJJDP discretionary grants has more than tripled since 1996 (the time of OJJDP's expiration), and the related funding has almost doubled to \$555 million. Before reauthorizing this questionable program again, Congress should at least question whether OJJDP programs are a good use of federal funds. Congress should also devote its energy to ensuring any and all such programs yield the kinds of results that might inspire public confidence and ultimately improve the lives of America's youth.

In 1997, the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence released Blueprints for Violence Prevention, the most comprehensive review of juvenile crime prevention programs at that time. The Congress was referred to this report by the Department of Justice itself during testimony before the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. The study contains a scathing review and rather harsh criticism of various youth justice and delinquency programs. The expository report filled a void for much-needed research on the ineffectiveness of violence prevention programs.

The authors of Blueprints surveyed 400 program activities and could identify only a paltry 10 that met their standards for effectiveness. The report's analysis pronounced a credible and shocking indictment on violence prevention programs, stating, "the vast majority of these programs are not being evaluated. Worse yet, some of the most popular programs have actually been demonstrated in careful scientific studies to be ineffective, and yet we continue to invest huge sums of money in them for largely political reasons."

The report goes on to lambaste violence prevention programs further. "A responsible accounting to the taxpayers, private foundations, or businesses funding these programs requires that we justify these expenditures with tangible results. No respectable business or corporation would invest millions of dollars in an enterprise without checking to see if it is profitable."

In the long run, Blueprints found that "the deterrent effects of most prevention programs deteriorate quickly once youth leave the program and return to their original neighborhoods, families, and peer groups." So, unfortunately, even the best violence prevention programs have little lasting value over time.

Since Blueprints was released in 1997, the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence has reviewed 100 additional programs, yet it has added only one to its list of effective programs. An additional 19 programs have been listed as "promising."

Just this past week, I received a briefing on the status of two GAO reports to be released in October on OJJDP programs. The findings are not complimentary of the way OJJDP is monitoring and evaluating its programs. In fact, the reports provide even more compelling evidence that OJJDP has not responded to 1996 GAO recommendations for better grant monitoring as the agency pledged it would. Mr. Speaker, why should anyone expect OJJDP to comply now?

The soon-to-be-released GAO reports show that an incredible 96 percent of the demonstration grants had no documentation showing the required number of phone contacts had been met, and 88 percent of the grants had no documentation for the proper number of site visits. Progress reports did not cover the entire grant period in 56 percent of the 89 demonstration grant files and 80 percent of the 45 training and technical assistance grants files. Financial status reports did not cover the entire grant period in 65 percent of the demonstration grant files and 60 percent of the 45 training and technical assistance grant files. According to the GAO, "Our current observations are similar to those we reported in May 1996 about the agency's lack of documentation of its monitoring activities."

In addition to grant monitoring problems, the GAO has found major problems in the way OJJDP is evaluating some of its programs for effectiveness on juvenile attitudes and behavior. A standard component of good social science research is the inclusion of a control group by which to compare students in OJJDP programs to those not in the programs. GAO has found that a significant number of OJJDP impact evaluations do not include control groups, thus rendering the evaluations useless and a complete waste of money.

Congress should be alarmed by this information. If OJJDP cannot determine the effectiveness of its own programs, why should the American people, especially during a time of resource scarcity, continue to fund unproven—sometimes dangerous—programs? I submit to this House, Mr. Speaker, there is no compelling answer.

In light of the ongoing monitoring and evaluation failures at OJJDP and the embarrassing lack of evidence for program effectiveness, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 1900. We should not continue to fund OJJDP programs to the tune of more than \$500 million per year when the programs consistently receive poor marks for effectiveness and the research shows no progress toward actually making an appreciable difference in the lives of America's youth.

To pass this legislation is to perpetrate great harm upon America's youth and a cruel hoax upon those who expect this Congress to act in a compassionate, responsible manner toward the provision of suitable guidance for troubled young citizens. On the contrary, Congress owes our youngest Americans more than the hollow effort, and the sinister gesture that the research reveals HR 1900 to be.

Mr. Speaker, this House should instead act in a dignified way by rejecting this bill in deference to a more serious effort to restructure the Nation's juvenile justice programs in a way that will work. This House should insist that the efforts of the federal bureaucracy reflect the higher value of America's young citizens. We should be prepared to spend whatever it takes, and devote as much as we can for the legitimate improvement of American society.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, HR 1900 only perpetuates the bad habits of an uncaring and unproven bureaucracy and it abandons the very children in whose name this poor legislation is deceptively cloaked.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1900, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 47 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately noon.

□ 1205

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD) at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FAMILY COURT ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2657.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs.

MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2657, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]		
YEAS—408		
Abercrombie	DeLay	Jackson (IL)
Ackerman	DeMint	Jackson-Lee
Aderholt	Deutsch	(TX)
Akin	Diaz-Balart	Jefferson
Allen	Dicks	Jenkins
Andrews	Doggett	John
Armey	Dooley	Johnson (CT)
Baca	Doolittle	Johnson (IL)
Bachus	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Baird	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Baldacci	Duncan	Jones (NC)
Baldwin	Dunn	Jones (OH)
Ballenger	Edwards	Kanjorski
Barcia	Ehlers	Kaptur
Barr	Ehrlich	Keller
Barrett	Emerson	Kelly
Bartlett	Engel	Kennedy (MN)
Barton	English	Kennedy (RI)
Bass	Eshoo	Kerns
Becerra	Etheridge	Kildee
Bentsen	Evans	Kilpatrick
Bereuter	Everett	Kingston
Berkley	Farr	Kirk
Berry	Fattah	Kleczka
Biggert	Ferguson	Knollenberg
Bilirakis	Filner	Kolbe
Bishop	Flake	Kucinich
Blagojevich	Fletcher	LaFalce
Blumenauer	Foley	LaHood
Blunt	Forbes	Lampson
Boehlert	Ford	Langevin
Boehner	Fossella	Lantos
Bonilla	Frank	Largent
Bonior	Frelinghuysen	LaFalce
Bono	Frost	Larsen (WA)
Borski	Gallagly	Larson (CT)
Boswell	Ganske	Latham
Boucher	Gekas	LaTourette
Boyd	Gephart	Leach
Brady (PA)	Gibbons	Lee
Brady (TX)	Gilchrest	Levin
Brown (FL)	Gilman	Lewis (CA)
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Brown (SC)	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Bryant	Goodlatte	Linder
Burr	Gordon	Lipinski
Buyer	Goss	LoBiondo
Calvahan	Graham	Lofgren
Calvert	Granger	Lowey
Camp	Graves	Lucas (KY)
Cannon	Green (TX)	Luther
Cantor	Green (WI)	Maloney (CT)
Capito	Greenwood	Maloney (NY)
Capps	Grucci	Manzullo
Capuano	Gutierrez	Markey
Cardin	Gutknecht	Mascara
Carson (IN)	Hall (OH)	Matheson
Carson (OK)	Hall (TX)	Matsui
Castle	Hansen	McCarthy (MO)
Chabot	Harman	McCarthy (NY)
Chambliss	Hart	McCollum
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	McCrary
Clement	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Clyburn	Hayes	McGovern
Coble	Hayworth	McHugh
Collins	Hefley	McIntyre
Combest	Herger	McKeon
Condit	Hill	McKinney
Conyers	Hildeary	McNulty
Cooksey	Hilliard	Meehan
Costello	Hinchey	Meek (FL)
Cox	Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)
Coyne	Hobson	Menendez
Cramer	Hoefel	Mica
Crane	Hoekstra	Millender-Lee
Crenshaw	Holt	McDonald
Crowley	Honda	Miller (FL)
Cubin	Hooley	Miller, Gary
Culberson	Horn	Miller, George
Cummings	Houghton	Mink
Cunningham	Hoyer	Mollohan
Davis (CA)	Hulshof	Moore
Davis (FL)	Hunter	Moran (KS)
Davis (IL)	Hyde	Moran (VA)
Davis, Jo Ann	Inslee	Morella
Davis, Tom	Isackson	Myrick
DeFazio	Israel	Nadler
Delahunt	Issa	Napolitano
DeLauro	Istook	Neal
		Nethercutt
		Ney
		Northup
		Nussle
		Oberstar
		Olver
		Osborne
		Ose
		Otter
		Owens
		Oxley
		Pallone
		Pascarella
		Pastor
		Paul
		Payne
		Pelosi
		Pence
		Peterson (MN)
		Peterson (PA)
		Petri
		Phelps
		Pickering
		Pitts
		Platts
		Shimkus
		Showa
		Shaw
		Upton
		Velazquez
		Viscosky
		Vitter
		Walden
		Walsh
		Wamp
		Waters
		Watson (CA)
		Watson (FL)
		Watson (PA)
		Watts (NC)
		Watts (OK)
		Wexler
		Whitfield
		Wicks
		Wicker
		Wilson
		Wolf
		Woolsey
		Wu
		Strickland
		Young (AK)
		Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Baker	Holden	Rush
Berman	Hostettler	Sawyer
Burton	Kind (WI)	Schaffer
Clay	King (NY)	Stupak
Deal	Lucas (OK)	Towns
DeGette	McInnis	Watkins (OK)
Dingell	Murtha	
Gillmor	Ortiz	

□ 1246

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO EXPAND TIME FOR GENERAL DEBATE DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2586, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 2586 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to the order of September 19, 2001, general debate be enlarged to 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.