

drug use among young athletes, specifically high school athletes. Steroid use among high school students is on the rise. It more than doubled among high school students from 1991 to 2003, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Furthermore, a study by the University of Michigan shows that the percentage of 12 graders who said they had used steroids some time in their lives rose from 1.9 percent in 1996 to 3.4 percent in 2004. This is unacceptable and a health risk to our children.

In 2004, the Polk County School District became the first in Florida to establish random testing for high school athletes, and the Florida House passed a bill that would have made Florida the first State to require steroid testing for high school athletes. That bill stalled in the Senate, but now Florida and other States are considering a similar law. Currently, less than 4 percent of U.S. high schools test athletes for steroids, and no State requires high schools to test athletes. Schools and States say that cost is usually the reason they don't test.

In response, I am introducing this legislation to help States with the resources they need to curb the use of steroids and other performance-enhancing drugs. My legislation would provide federal grants directly to States so that they can develop and implement performance-enhancing drug testing programs.

The Drug Free Varsity Sports Act of 2007 would authorize \$20 million in grants to States to create statewide pilot drug testing programs for performance-enhancing drugs. States that receive the grants would be required to incorporate recovery, counseling, and treatment programs for those students who test positive for performance-enhancing drugs.

Stopping the use of performance-enhancing drugs goes beyond testing. That is why my legislation also would require States that receive grants to allocate no less than 10 percent of the funding to establish statewide policies to discourage steroid use, through educational or other related means.

There is no simple solution to the issue of steroids in sports. Congress can do its part by enacting the Drug Free Varsity Sports Act of 2007. But the sports leagues, their players, coaches, and parents all must play an active role.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1470

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Drug Free Varsity Sports Act of 2007".

#### SEC. 2. PILOT DRUG-TESTING PROGRAMS FOR PERFORMANCE-ENHANCING DRUGS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to supplement the other student drug-test-

ing programs assisted by the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools of the Department of Education by establishing, through the Office, a grant program that will allow State educational agencies to test secondary school students for performance-enhancing drug use.

(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Education, acting through the Assistant Deputy Secretary of the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, shall award, on a competitive basis, grants to State educational agencies to enable the State educational agencies to develop and carry out statewide pilot programs that test secondary school students for performance-enhancing drug use.

(c) APPLICATION.—A State educational agency that desires to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Education at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(d) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary of Education shall give priority to State educational agencies that incorporate community organizations in carrying out the recovery, counseling, and treatment programs described in subsection (e)(1)(B).

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) DRUG-TESTING PROGRAM FOR PERFORMANCE-ENHANCING DRUGS.—A State educational agency that receives a grant under this section shall use not more than 90 percent of the grant funds to carry out the following:

(A) Implement a drug-testing program for performance-enhancing drugs that is limited to testing secondary school students who meet 1 or more of the following criteria:

(i) The student participates in the school's athletic program.

(ii) The student is engaged in a competitive, extracurricular, school-sponsored activity.

(iii) The student and the student's parent or guardian provides written consent for the student to participate in a voluntary random drug-testing program for performance-enhancing drugs.

(B) Provide recovery, counseling, and treatment programs for secondary school students tested in the program who test positive for performance-enhancing drugs.

(2) PREVENTION.—A State educational agency that receives a grant under this section shall use not less than 10 percent of the grant funds to establish statewide policies that discourage the use of performance-enhancing drugs, through educational or other related means.

(f) REPORT.—For each year of the grant period, a State educational agency that receives a grant under this section shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Assistant Deputy Secretary of the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools on the impact of the pilot program, which report shall include—

(1) the number and percentage of students who test positive for performance-enhancing drugs;

(2) the cost of the pilot program; and

(3) a description of any barriers to the pilot program, as well as aspects of the pilot program that were successful.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms "State educational agency" and "secondary school" have the meanings given the terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

(2) SEPARATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Education shall keep any funds authorized

for this section under paragraph (1) separate from any funds available to the Secretary for other student drug-testing programs.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1166. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, and Mrs. DOLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SPECTER)) to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

SA 1167. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. BAUCUS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1168. Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KYL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SPECTER)) to the bill S. 1348, supra.

SA 1169. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. DODD, and Mr. DURBIN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SPECTER)) to the bill S. 1348, supra.

SA 1170. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. BOND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1171. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1172. Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. CORNYN, and Mrs. DOLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SPECTER)) to the bill S. 1348, supra.

SA 1173. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KYL, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SPECTER)) to the bill S. 1348, supra.

SA 1174. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1175. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1176. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. INOUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1177. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1178. Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1179. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1180. Mr. HAGEL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1181. Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1182. Mr. THOMAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY for himself and Mr. SPECTER) to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1183. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1184. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. NELSON, of Nebraska, and Mr. DEMINT) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY for himself and Mr. SPECTER) to the bill S. 1348, supra.

SA 1185. Mr. OBAMA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1186. Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INOUE, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. CANTWELL) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY for himself and Mr. SPECTER) to the bill S. 1348, supra.

SA 1187. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1188. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1189. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1348, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 1166.** Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, and Mrs. DOLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY for himself and Mr. SPECTER) to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . JUDICIAL REVIEW OF VISA REVOCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)) is amended by striking “There shall be no means of judicial review” and all that follows and inserting the following: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, any other habeas corpus provision, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title, a revocation under this subsection may not be reviewed by any court, and no court shall have jurisdiction to hear any claim arising from, or any challenge to, such a revocation.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to all visas issued before, on, or after such date.

**SA 1167.** Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. BAUCUS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

by her to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . NORTHERN BORDER PROSECUTION REIMBURSEMENT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Northern Border Prosecution Initiative Reimbursement Act”.

(b) NORTHERN BORDER PROSECUTION INITIATIVE.—

(1) INITIATIVE REQUIRED.—From amounts made available to carry out this section, the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the Office of Justice Programs, shall carry out a program, to be known as the Northern Border Prosecution Initiative, to provide funds to reimburse eligible northern border entities for costs incurred by those entities for handling case dispositions of criminal cases that are federally initiated but federally declined-referred. This program shall be modeled after the Southwestern Border Prosecution Initiative and shall serve as a partner program to that initiative to reimburse local jurisdictions for processing Federal cases.

(2) PROVISION AND ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Funds provided under the program shall be provided in the form of direct reimbursements and shall be allocated in a manner consistent with the manner under which funds are allocated under the Southwestern Border Prosecution Initiative.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds provided to an eligible northern border entity may be used by the entity for any lawful purpose, including the following purposes:

- (A) Prosecution and related costs.
- (B) Court costs.
- (C) Costs of courtroom technology.
- (D) Costs of constructing holding spaces.
- (E) Costs of administrative staff.
- (F) Costs of defense counsel for indigent defendants.

(G) Detention costs, including pre-trial and post-trial detention.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) The term “eligible northern border entity” means—

(i) any of the following States: Alaska, Idaho, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin; or

(ii) any unit of local government within a State referred to in clause (i).

(B) The term “federally initiated” means, with respect to a criminal case, that the case results from a criminal investigation or an arrest involving Federal law enforcement authorities for a potential violation of Federal criminal law, including investigations resulting from multi-jurisdictional task forces.

(C) The term “federally declined-referred” means, with respect to a criminal case, that a decision has been made in that case by a United States Attorney or a Federal law enforcement agency during a Federal investigation to no longer pursue Federal criminal charges against a defendant and to refer the investigation to a State or local jurisdiction for possible prosecution. The term includes a decision made on an individualized case-by-case basis as well as a decision made pursuant to a general policy or practice or pursuant to prosecutorial discretion.

(D) The term “case disposition”, for purposes of the Northern Border Prosecution Initiative, refers to the time between a suspect’s arrest and the resolution of the criminal charges through a county or State judicial or prosecutorial process. Disposition does not include incarceration time for sen-

tenced offenders, or time spent by prosecutors on judicial appeals.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$28,000,000 for fiscal year 2008 and such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year.

**SA 1168.** Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KYL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1150 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. KENNEDY for himself and Mr. SPECTER) to the bill S. 1348, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 6, line 11, strike the second period and insert the following: “;

(C) in paragraph (2), as redesignated—

(i) in the header, by striking “SECURITY FEATURES” and inserting “ADDITIONAL FENCING ALONG SOUTHWEST BORDER”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (C) and inserting the following:

“(A) REINFORCED FENCING.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall construct reinforced fencing along not less than 700 miles of the southwest border where fencing would be most practical and effective and provide for the installation of additional physical barriers, roads, lighting, cameras, and sensors to gain operational control of the southwest border.

“(B) PRIORITY AREAS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

“(i) identify the 370 miles along the southwest border where fencing would be most practical and effective in deterring smugglers and aliens attempting to gain illegal entry into the United States; and

“(ii) not later than December 31, 2008, complete construction of reinforced fencing along the 370 miles identified under clause (i).

“(C) CONSULTATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult with the Secretary of Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, States, local governments, Indian tribes, and property owners in the United States to minimize the impact on the environment, culture, commerce, and quality of life for the communities and residents located near the sites at which such fencing is to be constructed.

“(ii) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to—

“(I) create any right of action for a State, local government, or other person or entity affected by this subsection; or

“(II) affect the eminent domain laws of the United States or of any State.

“(D) LIMITATION ON REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), nothing in this paragraph shall require the Secretary of Homeland Security to install fencing, physical barriers, roads, lighting, cameras, and sensors in a particular location along an international border of the United States, if the Secretary determines that the use or placement of such resources is not the most appropriate means to achieve and maintain operational control over the international border at such location.”; and

(D) in paragraph (5), as redesignated, by striking “to carry out this subsection not to exceed \$12,000,000” and inserting “such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection”.

**SA 1169.** Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. DODD, and Mr. DURBIN) proposed an