

TITLE V: COMPASSION CAPITAL FUND

To help small community and faith-based organizations better partner with the government and serve communities in need, the bill creates a Compassion Capital Fund and authorizes four agencies to distribute its resources. HHS, DOJ, HUD and the Corporation for National and Community Service will collectively have over \$150 million to offer technical assistance to community-based organizations for activities such as writing and managing grants, assistance in incorporating and gaining tax-exempt status, information on capacity building and help researching and replicating model social service programs.

TITLE VI: SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

This section would increase Federal funding for the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), which most charitable organizations agree is a critically important and effective program for meeting the needs of disadvantaged communities and families. SSBG provides flexible funds to states for such vital programs as Meals on Wheels, child and elderly protective services, and support services for the disabled. Over the last five years, however, the program has seen its funding reduced by more than \$1 billion.

The bill aims to restore funding for SSBG over the next two years to its authorized level as dictated in the 1996 welfare reform law. It would first increase the funding level to \$1.975 billion for fiscal year 2003; the program is currently funded at \$1.7 billion. It would then raise the funding level to its full authorized level—\$2.8 billion—for fiscal year 2004. This would represent an increase of \$275 million for the coming fiscal year, and more than \$800 million for the following year.

TITLE VII: MATERNITY GROUP HOMES

This section is designed to advance one of the key goals of welfare reform—helping teenage mothers achieve self-sufficiency—by strengthening federal support for locally-run maternity group home programs. The 1996 welfare reform law requires that minors live at home under adult supervision or in one of these maternity group homes in order to receive benefits. Teenagers who are provided the opportunity to live in these homes are more likely to continue their education or receive job training, less likely to have a second teenage pregnancy, and more likely to find gainful employment that allows them to leave welfare. To help give more teenage mothers this kind of opportunity, the bill creates a separate funding stream for maternity group home programs and authorizes \$33 million in additional funding.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. GREGG):

S. 1925. A bill to establish the Freedom's Way National Heritage Area in the States of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation to establish the Freedom's Way National Heritage Area in New Hampshire and Massachusetts. The bill is cosponsored by Senator KENNEDY and Senator GREGG.

The bill proposes to establish a national heritage area including 36 communities in Massachusetts and six communities in New Hampshire. The area has important cultural and natural legacies that are important to New England and the entire Nation. I want to highlight just a few of the reasons I believe this designation makes sense.

The Freedom's Way is an ideal candidate because it is rich in historic sites, trails, landscapes and views. The land and the area's resources are pieces of American history and culture. The entire region, and especially places like Lexington and Concord, is important to our country's founding and our political and philosophical principles. Within the 42 communities are truly special places. These include the Minute Man National Historic Park, more than 40 National Register Districts and National Historic Landmarks, the Great Meadows National Wildlife Refuge, Walden Pond State Reservation, Gardener State Park, Harvard Shaker Village and the Shirley Shaker Village.

In addition, there is strong grassroots support for this designation. The people of these communities organized themselves in this effort and have now turned to us for assistance. I hope we can provide it. Supporters include elected officials, people dedicated to preserving a small piece of American and New England history, and local business leaders. It is an honor to help their cause.

Finally, I am very pleased that Senators from both Massachusetts and New Hampshire have embraced this proposal. I thank Senators KENNEDY and GREGG. •

STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 206—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MARCH 17 THROUGH MARCH 23, 2002 AS "NATIONAL INHALANTS AND POISON PREVENTION WEEK"

Mr. MURKOWSKI submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 206

Whereas according to the National Institute on Drug Abuse, inhalant use ranks third in popularity behind use of alcohol and tobacco for all youths through the eighth grade;

Whereas the over 1,000 products that are being inhaled to get high are legal, inexpensive, and found in nearly every home and corner market;

Whereas using inhalants even once to get high can lead to kidney failure, brain damage, or even death;

Whereas inhalants are considered a gateway drug, 1 that leads to the use of harder, more deadly drugs; and

Whereas because inhalant use is difficult to detect, the products used are accessible and affordable, and abuse is so common, increased education of young people and their parents regarding the dangers of inhalants is an important step in our Nation's battle against drug abuse: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of March 17 through March 23, 2002, as "National Inhalants and Poison Prevention Week";

(2) encourages parents to learn about the dangers of inhalant abuse and discuss those dangers with their children; and

(3) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate activities.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I rise to submit a resolution to designate March 17 to March 23, 2002 as "National Inhalants and Poison Prevention Week."

What exactly are inhalants? Inhalants are the intentional breathing of gas or vapors for the purpose of reaching a high. Over 1,400 common products can be abused—such as lighter fluid, pressurized whipped cream, hair spray, and gasoline, the abused product of choice in rural Alaska. These products are inexpensive, easily obtained and legal. An inhalant abuse counselor told me, "If it smells like a chemical, it can be abused." It's a "silent epidemic" because few adults really appreciate the severity of the problem. One in five students has tried inhalants by the time they reach the eighth grade. The use of inhalants by children has nearly doubled in the last 10 years. Further, inhalants are the third most abused substances among teenagers, behind alcohol and tobacco.

These are facts that should trouble every parent, and every American. Inhalants are deadly. Inhalant vapors react with fatty tissues in the brain, literally dissolving them. One time use of inhalants can cause instant and permanent brain, heart, kidney, liver or other organ damage. The user can also suffer from instant heart failure known as "Sudden Sniffing Death Syndrome", this means an abuser can die the first, tenth or hundredth time he or she uses an inhalant. In fact, according to a recent study by the Alaska Native Health Consortium, inhaling has a higher risk of "instant death" than any other abused substance.

That's what happened to Theresa, an 18-year-old who lived in rural Western Alaska. Theresa was inhaling gasoline, shortly thereafter her heart stopped. She was found alone and outside in near zero degree temperatures. Theresa, who was the youngest of five children and just a month shy of graduation, was flown to Fairbanks Memorial Hospital where she was pronounced dead on arrival.

To help combat this, the Yukon-Kuskokwim Health Corporation opened Alaska's first inhalant treatment center last year. It is my hope that someday our treatment facility will only have empty beds. But, if this dream is to be realized, we must stop the abuse before the kids have to go into treatment. My experience has been that prevention through education is the key. As such awareness must be promoted among young people, parents and educators. I hope that a national week of awareness will encourage programs throughout the country, alerting parents and children to the dangers of inhalants.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2836. Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2471 submitted by Mr. DASCHLE and

intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1731) to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers, to enhance resource conservation and rural development, to provide for farm credit, agricultural research, nutrition, and related programs, to ensure consumers abundant food and fiber, and for other purposes.

SA 2837. Mr. HARKIN (for Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. HARKIN)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2835 submitted by Mr. CRAIG and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2471 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE to the bill (S. 1731) supra.

SA 2838. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2471 submitted by Mr. DASCHLE and intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1731) supra.

SA 2839. Mr. BAUCUS proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2471 submitted by Mr. DASCHLE and intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1731) supra.

SA 2840. Mr. REID (for Mr. JEFFORDS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1206, to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

SA 2841. Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1926, to improve passenger automobile fuel economy and safety, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce dependence on foreign oil, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SA 2842. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1731, to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers, to enhance resource conservation and rural development, to provide for farm credit, agricultural research, nutrition, and related programs, to ensure consumers abundant food and fiber, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2836. Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2471 submitted by Mr. DASCHLE and intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1731) to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers, to enhance resource conservation and rural development, to provide for farm credit, agricultural research, nutrition, and related programs, to ensure consumers abundant food and fiber, and for other purposes; as follows:

Beginning on page 86, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 87, line 21, and insert the following:

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) BEET SUGAR.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subparagraph and sections 359c(g), 359e(b), and 359f(b), the Secretary shall make allocations for beet sugar among beet sugar processors for each crop year that allotments are in effect on the basis of the adjusted weighted average quantity of beet sugar produced by the processors for each of the 1998 through 2000 crop years, as determined under this subparagraph.

“(ii) QUANTITY.—The quantity of an allocation made for a beet sugar processor for a crop year under clause (i) shall bear the same ratio to the quantity of allocations made for all beet sugar processors for the crop year as the adjusted weighted average quantity of beet sugar produced by the processor (as determined under clauses (iii) and (iv)) bears to the total of the adjusted weighted average quantities of beet sugar produced by all processors (as so determined).

“(iii) WEIGHTED AVERAGE QUANTITY.—Subject to clause (iv), the weighted quantity of beet sugar produced by a beet sugar processor during each of the 1998 through 2000 crop years shall be (as determined by the Secretary)—

“(I) in the case of the 1998 crop year, 25 percent of the quantity of beet sugar produced by the processor during the crop year;

“(II) in the case of the 1999 crop year, 35 percent of the quantity of beet sugar produced by the processor during the crop year; and

“(III) in the case of the 2000 crop year, 40 percent of the quantity of beet sugar produced by the processor (including any quantity of sugar received from the Commodity Credit Corporation) during the crop year.

“(iv) ADJUSTMENTS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall adjust the weighted average quantity of beet sugar produced by a beet sugar processor during the 1998 through 2000 crop years under clause (iii) if the Secretary determines that, during any such crop year, the processor—

“(aa) opened or closed a sugar beet processing factory;

“(bb) constructed a molasses desugarization facility; or

“(cc) suffered substantial quality losses on sugar beets stored during any such crop year.

“(II) QUANTITY.—The quantity of beet sugar produced by a beet sugar processor under clause (iii) shall be—

“(aa) in the case of a processor that opened a sugar beet processing factory, increased by 1.25 percent of the total of the adjusted weighted average quantities of beet sugar produced by all processors during the 1998 through 2000 crop years (without consideration of any adjustment under this clause) for each sugar beet processing factory that is opened by the processor;

“(bb) in the case of a processor that closed a sugar beet processing factory, decreased by 1.25 percent of the total of the adjusted weighted average quantities of beet sugar produced by all processors during the 1998 through 2000 crop years (without consideration of any adjustment under this clause) for each sugar beet processing factory that is closed by the processor;

“(cc) in the case of a processor that constructed a molasses desugarization facility, increased by 0.25 percent of the total of the adjusted weighted average quantities of beet sugar produced by all processors during the 1998 through 2000 crop years (without consideration of any adjustment under this clause) for each molasses desugarization facility that is constructed by the processor; and

“(dd) in the case of a processor that suffered substantial quality losses on stored sugar beets, increased by 1.25 percent of the total of the adjusted weighted average quantities of beet sugar produced by all processors during the 1998 through 2000 crop years (without consideration of any adjustment under this clause).

“(v) PERMANENT TERMINATION OF OPERATIONS OF A PROCESSOR.—If a processor of beet sugar has been dissolved, liquidated in a bankruptcy proceeding, or otherwise has permanently terminated operations (other than in conjunction with a sale or other disposition of the processor or the assets of the processor), the Secretary shall—

“(I) eliminate the allocation of the processor provided under this section; and

“(II) distribute the allocation to other beet sugar processors on a pro rata basis.

“(vi) SALE OF ALL ASSETS OF A PROCESSOR TO ANOTHER PROCESSOR.—If a processor of beet sugar (or all of the assets of the processor) is sold to another processor of beet sugar, the Secretary shall transfer the allocation of the seller to the buyer unless the

allocation has been distributed to other sugar beet processors under clause (v).

“(vii) SALE OF FACTORIES OF A PROCESSOR TO ANOTHER PROCESSOR.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (v) and (vi), if 1 or more factories of a processor of beet sugar (but not all of the assets of the processor) are sold to another processor of beet sugar during a fiscal year, the Secretary shall assign a pro rata portion of the allocation of the seller to the allocation of the buyer to reflect the historical contribution of the production of the sold factory or factories to the total allocation of the seller.

“(II) APPLICATION OF ALLOCATION.—The assignment of the allocation under subclause (I) shall apply—

“(aa) during the remainder of the fiscal year during which the sale described in subclause (I) occurs (referred to in this clause as the ‘initial fiscal year’); and

“(bb) each subsequent fiscal year (referred to in this clause as a ‘subsequent fiscal year’), subject to subclause (III).

“(III) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—The assignment of the allocation under subclause (I) shall apply during each subsequent fiscal year unless the acquired factory or factories continue in operation for less than the initial fiscal year and the first subsequent fiscal year.

“(bb) REASSIGNMENT.—If the acquired factory or factories do not continue in operation for the complete initial fiscal year and the first subsequent fiscal year, the Secretary shall reassign the temporary allocation to other processors of beet sugar on a pro rata basis.

“(IV) USE OF OTHER FACTORIES TO FILL ALLOCATION.—If the transferred allocation to the buyer for the purchased factory or factories cannot be filled by the production by the purchased factory or factories for the initial fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year, the remainder of the transferred allocation may be filled by beet sugar produced by the buyer from other factories of the buyer.

“(viii) NEW ENTRANTS STARTING PRODUCTION OR REOPENING FACTORIES.—If an individual or entity that does not have an allocation of beet sugar under this part (referred to in this subparagraph as a ‘new entrant’) starts processing sugar beets after the date of enactment of this clause, or acquires and reopens a factory that produced beet sugar during the period of the 1998 through 2000 crop years that (at the time of acquisition) has no allocation associated with the factory under this part, the Secretary shall—

“(I) assign an allocation for beet sugar to the new entrant that provides a fair and equitable distribution of the allocations for beet sugar; and

“(II) reduce the allocations for beet sugar of all other processors on a pro rata basis to reflect the new allocation.

“(ix) NEW ENTRANTS ACQUIRING ONGOING FACTORIES WITH PRODUCTION HISTORY.—If a new entrant acquires a factory that has production history during the period of the 1998 through 2000 crop years and that is producing beet sugar at the time the allocations are made from a processor that has an allocation of beet sugar, the Secretary shall transfer a portion of the allocation of the seller to the new entrant to reflect the historical contribution of the production of the sold factory to the total allocation of the seller.”.

SA 2837. Mr. HARKIN (for Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. HARKIN)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2835 submitted by Mr. CRAIG and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2471 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE to the bill (S. 1731) to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers,