

MIKULSKI, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BURNS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. BREAUX):

S. 2764. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 to extend the authorizations of appropriations for the programs carried out under such Acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2765. A bill to amend the securities laws to provide for regulatory parity for single stock futures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2760. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to establish performance standards for the reduction of microbiological pathogens in meat and poultry; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

MICROBIOLOGICAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Microbiological Performance Standards Clarification Act of 2000. Passage of this bill is vital because on May 25th, the District Court of the Northern District of Texas struck down the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) authority to enforce its Microbiological Performance Standard for Salmonella. The District Court's decision in *Supreme Beef v. USDA* (Supreme) seriously undermines the sweeping food safety changes adopted by USDA in its 1996 Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point and Pathogen Reduction (HACCP) rule.

The District Court's decision in *Supreme* says that USDA does not have the authority to enforce Microbiological Performance Standards for reducing viral and bacterial pathogens.

The Pathogen Reduction Rule recognized that bacterial and viral pathogens were the foremost food safety threat in America, responsible for 5,000 deaths and 33 million illnesses. To address the threat of foodborne illness, USDA developed a modern inspection system based on two fundamental principles.

The first was that industry has the primary responsibility to determine how to produce the safest products possible. Industry had to examine their plants and determine how to control contamination at every step of the food production process, from the moment a product arrives at their door until the moment it leaves their plant.

The second, even more crucial principle was that plants nationwide must reduce levels of dangerous pathogens in meat and poultry products. To ensure the new inspection system accom-

plished this, USDA developed Microbiological Performance Standards. These standards provide targets for reducing pathogens and require all USDA-inspected facilities to meet them. Facilities failing to meet a standard are shut down until they create a corrective action plan to meet the standard.

To date, USDA has only issued one Microbiological Performance Standard, for Salmonella. The vast majority of plants in the U.S. have been able to meet the new standard, so it is clearly workable. In addition, USDA reports that Salmonella levels for meat and poultry products have fallen substantially. The Salmonella standard, therefore, has been successful. The District Court's decision threatens to destroy this success and set our food safety system back years.

Congress cannot let a court's unfortunate misinterpretation of USDA's authority undermine our efforts to provide the safest food possible and the strongest food safety system available. Whatever the ultimate outcome of the *Supreme Beef* case, it is intolerable to have so much uncertainty about USDA's authority to enforce food safety regulations. The public should not have to worry about whether the products on their table have met food safety standards. This legislation provides the necessary clarification and assurance that if a product bears the USDA stamp of approval, it has met all of USDA's food safety requirements.

I plan to seek every opportunity to get this language enacted. I think it is essential, both to ensuring the modernization of our food safety system, and ensuring consumers that we are making progress in reducing dangerous pathogens.

I hope that both parties, and both houses of Congress will be able to act to pass this legislation before the July 4th weekend. The public's confidence in our meat and poultry inspection system is at stake.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 2761. A bill to fund task forces to locate and apprehend fugitives in Federal, State, and local felony criminal cases and to provide administrative subpoena authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CAPTURING CRIMINALS ACT OF 2000

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as a former prosecutor, I am well aware that fugitives from justice are an important problem and that their capture is an essential function of law enforcement. According to the FBI, nearly 550,000 people are currently fugitives from justice on federal, state, and local felony charges combined. This means that there are almost as many fugitive felons as there are citizens residing in my home state of Vermont.

The fact that we have more than one half million fugitives from justice, a significant portion of whom are convicted felons in violation of probation

or parole, who have been able to flaunt courts order and avoid arrest, breeds disrespect for our laws and poses undeniable risks to the safety of our citizens. We must do better. The Leahy-Kohl "Capturing Criminals Act of 2000," which I introduce today, will provide additional tools and resources to our federal law enforcement agencies to pursue and capture fugitive felons on both federal and state charges.

Our federal law enforcement agencies should be commended for the job they have been doing to date on capturing federal fugitives and helping the states and local communities bring their fugitives to justice. The U.S. Marshals Service, our oldest law enforcement agency, has arrested over 120,000 federal, state and local fugitives in the past four years, including more federal fugitives than all the other federal agencies combined. In prior years, the Marshals Service spearheaded special fugitive apprehension task forces, called FIST Operations, that targeted fugitives in particular areas and was singularly successful in arresting over 34,000 fugitive felons.

Similarly, the FBI has established twenty-four Safe Streets Task Forces exclusively focused on apprehending fugitives in cities around the country. Over the period of 1995 to 1999, the FBI's efforts have resulted in the arrest of a total of 132,292 fugitives, including 64,336, who were state fugitives.

The Capturing Criminals Act would help our law enforcement agencies keep the pressure on fugitives by authorizing the Attorney General to establish regional Fugitive Apprehension Task Forces, to be coordinated by the United States Marshals Service; authorizing administrative subpoenas for use in obtaining records relevant to finding federal and state fugitives; and, finally, requesting a comprehensive report on the administrative subpoena authorities held by federal agencies, which vary in scope, enforcement and privacy safeguards.

"Administrative subpoena" is the term generally used to refer to a demand for documents or testimony by an investigative entity or regulatory agency that is empowered to issue the subpoena independently and without the approval of any grand jury, court or other judicial entity. I am generally skeptical of administrative subpoena power. Administrative subpoenas avoid the strict grand jury secrecy rules and the documents provided in response to such subpoenas are, therefore, subject to broader dissemination. Moreover, since investigative agents issue such subpoenas directly, without review by a judicial officer or even a prosecutor, fewer "checks" are in place to ensure the subpoena is issued with good cause and not merely as a fishing expedition.

Nonetheless, unlike initial criminal inquiries, fugitive investigations present unique difficulties. Law enforcement may not use grand jury subpoenas since, by the time a person is a fugitive, the grand jury phase of an investigation is usually over. Use of

grand jury subpoenas to obtain phone or bank records to track down a fugitive would be an abuse of the grand jury. Trial subpoenas may also not be used, either because the fugitive is already convicted or no trial may take place without the fugitive.

This inability to use trial and grand jury subpoenas for fugitive investigations creates a disturbing gap in law enforcement procedures. Law enforcement partially fills this gap by using the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), which authorizes federal courts to "issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law." The procedures, however, for obtaining orders under this Act, and the scope and non-disclosure terms of such orders, vary between jurisdictions.

Thus, authorizing administrative subpoena power will help bridge the gap in fugitive investigations to allow federal law enforcement agencies to obtain records useful for tracking a fugitive's whereabouts. The Leahy-Kohl Capturing Criminals Act makes clear that the approval of a court remains necessary to obtain an order for non-disclosure of the subpoena and production of the requested records to the subscriber or customer to whom the records pertain.

I am certainly not alone in recognizing the problem this nation has with fugitives from justice. Senators THURMOND and BIDEN have introduced the "Fugitive Apprehension Act," S. 2516, specifically to address the difficulties facing law enforcement in this area. I commend both my colleagues for their leadership. While I agree with the general purposes of S. 2516, aspects of that bill would be problematic. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee to resolve the differences in our bills.

Without detailing all of the differences in the bills, let me provide some examples. As introduced, S. 2516 would limit use of an administrative subpoena to those fugitives who have been "indicted," which fails to address the fact that fugitives flee after arrest on the basis of a "complaint" and may flee after the prosecutor has filed an "information" in lieu of an indictment. The Leahy-Kohl "Capturing Criminals Act," by contrast, would allow use of such subpoenas to track fugitives who have been accused in a "complaint, information or indictment."

In addition, S. 2516 requires the U.S. Marshal Service to report quarterly to the Attorney General (who must transmit the report to Congress) on use of the administrative subpoenas. In my view, while a reporting requirement is useful, the requirement as described in S. 2516 is overly burdensome and insufficiently specific. The Leahy-Kohl "Capturing Criminals Act" would require the Attorney General to report for the next three years to the Judiciary Committees of both the House and Senate with the following information

about the use of administrative subpoenas in fugitive investigations: the number issued, by which agency, identification of the charges on which the fugitive was wanted and whether the fugitive was wanted on federal or state charges.

Although S. 2516 outlines the procedures for enforcement of an administrative subpoena, it is silent on the mechanisms for both contesting the subpoena by the recipient and for delaying notice to the person about whom the record pertains. The Leahy-Kohl "Capturing Criminals Act" expressly addresses these issues.

This legislation will help law enforcement—with increased resources for regional fugitive apprehension task forces and administrative subpoena authority—bring to justice both federal and state fugitives who, by their conduct, have demonstrated a lack of respect for our nation's criminal justice system. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure swift passage of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2761

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 "Capturing Criminals Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. FUGITIVE APPREHENSION TASK FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General is authorized to establish, upon consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and appropriate law enforcement officials in the States, Fugitive Apprehension Task Forces, consisting of Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities in designated regions of the United States, to be coordinated by the Director of the United States Marshals Service, for the purpose of locating and apprehending fugitives, as defined by section 1075 of title 18, United States Code, as added by this Act.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the United States Marshals Service to carry out the provisions of this section \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2003.

(c) OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority under any other provision of Federal or State law to locate or apprehend a fugitive.

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS TO APPREHEND FUGITIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1075. Administrative subpoenas to apprehend fugitives

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term 'fugitive' means a person who—

“(A) having been accused by complaint, information or indictment, or having been convicted of committing, a felony under Federal law, flees from or evades (or attempts to flee from or evade) the jurisdiction of the court with jurisdiction over the felony;

“(B) having been accused by complaint, information or indictment, or having been con-

victed of committing, a felony under State law, flees from or evades (or attempts to flee from or evade) the jurisdiction of the court with jurisdiction over the felony;

“(C) escapes from lawful Federal or State custody after having been accused by complaint, information or indictment, or convicted, of committing a felony under Federal or State law; or

“(D) is in violation of paragraph (2) or (3) of the first undesignated paragraph of section 1073;

“(2) the term 'investigation' means, with respect to a State fugitive described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), an investigation in which there is reason to believe that the fugitive fled from or evaded (or attempted to flee from or evade) the jurisdiction of the court, or escaped from custody, in or affecting, or using any facility of, interstate or foreign commerce, or as to whom an appropriate law enforcement officer or official of a State or political subdivision has requested the Attorney General to assist in the investigation, and the Attorney General finds that the particular circumstances of the request give rise to a Federal interest sufficient for the exercise of Federal jurisdiction under section 1075; and

“(3) the term 'State' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

“(b) SCOPE.—In any investigation with respect to the apprehension of a fugitive, the Attorney General may subpoena witnesses for the purpose of the production of any records (including books, papers, documents, electronic data, and other tangible and intangible items that constitute or contain evidence) that the Attorney General finds, based upon articulable facts, are relevant to discerning the fugitive's whereabouts. A subpoena under this subsection shall describe the records or items required to be produced and prescribe a return date within a reasonable period of time within which the records or items can be assembled and made available.

“(c) JURISDICTION.—The attendance of witnesses and the production of records may be required from any place in any State or any other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States at any designated place where the witness is served with a subpoena, except that a witness shall not be required to appear more than 500 miles distant from the place where the witness was served. Witnesses subpoenaed under this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States.

“(d) SERVICE.—A subpoena issued under this section may be served by any person designated in the subpoena as the agent of service. Service upon a natural person may be made by personal delivery of the subpoena to that person or by certified mail with return receipt requested. Service may be made upon a domestic or foreign corporation, a partnership, or other unincorporated association that is subject to suit under a common name, by delivering the subpoena to an officer, a managing or general agent, or to any other agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process. The affidavit of the person serving the subpoena entered on a true copy thereof by the agent of service shall be proof of service.

“(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) NONCOMPLIANCE.—In the case of the contumacy by or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person, the Attorney General may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the investigation is carried on or of which the subpoenaed person is an inhabitant, or in which he carries on business or may be found, to compel compliance with

the subpoena. The court may issue an order requiring the subpoenaed person to appear before the Attorney General to produce records if so ordered. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punishable by the court as contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in any judicial district in which the person may be found.

“(2) RIGHTS OF A SUBPOENA RECIPIENT.—Not later than 20 days after the date of service of an administrative subpoena under this section upon any person, or at any time before the return date specified in the subpoena, whichever period is shorter, such person may file, in the district court of the United States for the judicial district within which such person resides, is found, or transacts business, a petition to modify or quash such subpoena on grounds that—

“(A) the terms of the subpoena are unreasonable or unnecessary;

“(B) the subpoena fails to meet the requirements of this section; or

“(C) the subpoena violates the constitutional rights or any other legal right or privilege of the subpoenaed party.

“(3) TIME FOR RESPONSE.—The time allowed for compliance with a subpoena in whole or in part shall be suspended during the pendency of a petition filed under paragraph (2). Such petition shall specify the grounds upon which the petitioner relies in seeking relief.

“(f) DELAYED NOTICE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Where an administrative subpoena is issued under this section to a provider of electronic communication service (as defined in section 2510 of this title) or remote computing service (as defined in section 2711 of this title), the Attorney General may—

“(A) in accordance with section 2705(a) of this title, delay notification to the subscriber or customer to whom the record pertains; and

“(B) apply to a court, in accordance with section 2705(b) of this title, for an order commanding the provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service not to notify any other person of the existence of the subpoena or court order.

“(2) SUBPOENAS FOR FINANCIAL RECORDS.—If a subpoena is issued under this section to a financial institution for financial records of any customer of such institution, the Attorney General may apply to a court under section 1109 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3409) for an order to delay customer notice as otherwise required.

“(3) NONDISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General may apply to a court for an order requiring the party to whom an administrative subpoena is directed to refrain from notifying any other party of the existence of the subpoena or court order for such period as the court deems appropriate. The court shall enter such order if it determines that there is reason to believe that notification of the existence of the administrative subpoena will result in—

“(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(B) flight from prosecution;

“(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or undue delay of a trial.

“(g) IMMUNITY FROM CIVIL LIABILITY.—Any person, including officers, agents, and employees, who in good faith produce the records or items requested in a subpoena shall not be liable in any court of any State or the United States to any customer or other person for such production or for non-disclosure of that production to the cus-

tommer, in compliance with the terms of a court order for nondisclosure.

“(h) DELEGATION.—The Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue guidelines governing the issuance of administrative subpoenas. Such guidelines shall mandate that administrative subpoenas may be issued only after review and approval of senior supervisory personnel within the Department of Justice and the Department of the Treasury.

“(i) REPORT.—The Attorney General shall report in January of each year to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the number of administrative subpoenas issued under this section, whether each matter involved a fugitive from Federal or State charges, and identification of the agency issuing the subpoena and imposing the charges. This reporting requirement shall terminate in 3 years after enactment.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1075. Administrative subpoenas to apprehend fugitives.”.

SEC. 4. STUDY AND REPORT OF THE USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS.

Not later than December 31, 2001, the Attorney General shall complete a study on the use of administrative subpoena power by executive branch agencies or entities and shall report the findings to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Such report shall include—

(1) a description of the sources of administrative subpoena power and the scope of such subpoena power within executive branch agencies;

(2) a description of applicable subpoena enforcement mechanisms;

(3) a description of any notification provisions and any other provisions relating to safeguarding privacy interests;

(4) a description of the standards governing the issuance of administrative subpoenas; and

(5) recommendations from the Attorney General regarding necessary steps to ensure that administrative subpoena power is used and enforced consistently and fairly by executive branch agencies.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2762. A bill to establish SHARE Net grants to support the development of a comprehensive, accessible, high-technology infrastructure of educational and cultural resources for nonprofit institutions, individuals, and others for educational purposes through a systematic effort to coordinate, link and enhance, through technology, existing specialized resources and expertise in public and private cultural and educational institutions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SAVING HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION NETWORKING ACT OF 2000 (SHARE NET ACT)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation which will help light the way to a stronger educational system with broader reach and deeper substance—the SHARE Net (Saving Humanities, Arts, and Resources for Education Networking) Act of 2000.

Education is not just about schools and colleges. Education is everything from our very first breath as infants to

our last days. We learn at work, at school, at home and in our cars. We learn from the people around us, from books, newspapers, artwork, radio and television, and, more and more, we learn from the Internet and computers.

Our Nation has been rich in learning and education. We have an impressive system of public education, with fundamentally strong public schools—yes, some need help, but they continue to reach all children and open the doors of learning to over 50 million children each year. The strength of our post-secondary education system is unmatched in the world with an estimated 80 percent of our high school graduates going on to some post-secondary education. We have public libraries across the country that contribute the building blocks of lifelong learning with educational programs and access to books and other educational resources for the public—from the youngest to the oldest. We enjoy significant cultural institutions—museums, art galleries and other centers—that allow us to explore and continue to learn.

This infrastructure of learning has not been achieved without significant effort. From our very first days, leading Americans have dedicated time and resources to developing schools, universities and other institutions of learning. Thomas Jefferson viewed the creation of the University of Virginia as one of his greatest accomplishments. Other Americans are well known for their passion and vision for learning—from Helen Keller to the Little Rock 9.

There have been many here in Congress too who have lead on education issues. We tend to remember the more recent steps—the creation of the Pell Grant program or Head Start. But in fact, our commitment and involvement in these issues began much earlier. I believe one of these most significant, and overlooked, initiatives was the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. These initiatives brought about a sea-change in our Nation's educational system by allocating the proceeds from the sale of federally-held western lands to states for the creation of practical, accessible Land Grant Colleges and Universities. These Land-Grant institutions sparked a revolution in higher education, which had been solely the purview of the wealthy and privileged; Land-Grant institutions focused on reaching real people with helpful knowledge. They focused on agriculture, teaching and research into other practical areas—they encouraged and facilitated broader participation in post-secondary education with low costs and continuing education programs.

Today, Land Grant colleges and universities continue to fulfill their original missions of research, outreach and teaching. They have grown to be the very backbone of post-secondary education—providing access to quality, affordable higher education. These institutions have also emerged as leaders in

advanced research—a vital link in our national economy and one of the keys to our global competitiveness.

Morrill's vision was not only hugely successful, it was also simple—leverage public assets to transform education. Mr. President, I believe another such opportunity confronts us today as rapidly-developing technology offers new potential to expand the reach of education.

The 1996 Telecommunications Act and Balanced Budget Act of 1997 established a framework for the transition from analog to digital television and for the auction of publically-owned analog spectrum. This auction is expected to produce nearly \$6 billion in federal revenue; some believe the figure to be as much as \$18 billion. This valuable publically-owned asset is today's equivalent of the frontier lands of a century ago.

These resources should be tapped to fund the further development of our educational system by utilizing today's technologies to expand the reach and impact of existing high-quality educational and community resources. Advanced Internet, digital spectrum and other telecommunications technologies offer new untapped potential to increase the quality and reach of educational resources.

And the educational resources are abundant in our communities. What is needed is a systematic effort to link these resources, enhance their accessibility and broaden their content. My bill would do just this. It would support the work of local and regional partnerships of educational and cultural organizations. These partnerships would survey existing resources, identify and fill gaps, link these resources together through technology and broaden access to them and, ultimately, develop a comprehensive, accessible high-tech educational infrastructure to benefit all Americans.

Mr. President, there is no question our educational system is strong. But it cannot be neglected. So let's learn from the past success of the Morrill Acts and invest today's public resources in our greatest asset and the very foundation of our future: education.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DODD, Mr. DEWINE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BURNS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. BREAUX):

S. 2704. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 to extend the authorizations of appropriations for the programs carried out under such acts, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

THE NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE
AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2000

• Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce a bill to reauthorize the Corporation for National Service, along with 25 co-sponsors from both sides of the aisle.

In 1993 Congress created the Corporation for National Service to enhance opportunities for all Americans to participate in contributing to their communities by actively engaging in local service programs. Community service should not be an option only for those who can afford to perform an important job without pay. It should be an opportunity for everyone. Every week, I have the privilege of reading with a third grade student in Washington, and I have seen her make very impressive progress during the last three years. I know first-hand that those who engage in community service gain as much as they give when they participate.

The Corporation for National Service is expanding these opportunities for service by offering stipends and education awards to AmeriCorps members, and stipends to senior volunteers. It also offers professional development opportunities to teachers and identified leader schools, who will mentor other schools interested in beginning to pursue service learning. In the last five years, 150,000 adults have given a year of service to communities across the country as AmeriCorps members. 500,000 senior citizens each year provide service to their communities in Foster Grandparent Programs, Senior Companion Programs, and the Retired Senior Volunteer Corps. In addition, over 1 million school children each year participate in service learning programs.

The national service movement has also encouraged businesses to become actively involved in improving their communities. Local business leaders have stepped up to the plate to sponsor service corps programs, to offer technical support for existing programs, and to use community service as a way to work with local schools.

As Robert Kennedy said, in words that became the hallmark of his life, "Some people see things as they are and say why. I dream things that never were, and say why not?" Because of community service, more and more citizens are asking that question every day in communities across the country.

In Massachusetts, under the leadership of Maureen Curley and her talented Board of Directors, the Massachusetts Service Alliance has helped citizens to act against the injustices that they see around them. From City Year and Peace Games in Boston to Greenfield READS and the Barnstable Land Trust, they have created new opportunities to tutor, to provide useful information on health care, to fight domestic violence, to help senior citizens live independent lives, and to repair and revitalize their communities in

many other ways. They have found that many citizens in their communities are eager to be involved and to stay involved, and they have been successful in creating large numbers of opportunities for that involvement. Last year, 180,000 citizens contributed 3.5 million hours of service in 140 communities across the state. Programs such as City Year, which began as a dream of Michael Brown and Alan Khazei in Boston, has a program in 13 sites across the country, engaging over 2,000 Corps members in service. We will welcome their newest site here in Washington in September.

This bipartisan bill that we offer today will allow these programs to continue to grow and enable many more Americans to participate in improving their communities and building a stronger America.

Our former colleague, Dan Coats, has written an eloquent article in support of AmeriCorps. The article appeared in today's edition of *The Hill*, and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD.

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

[From *The Hill*, June 21, 2000]

WHY I CHANGED MY MIND ABOUT AMERICORPS
(By Dan Coats)

When I was in the Senate, I did not support the legislation that created AmeriCorps because of my fundamental belief in private voluntary service and my skepticism about government-based solutions. I thought that government supported volunteers would undermine the spirit of voluntary service and that new federal resources might subvert the mission and the independence of the civic sector.

My faith in the civic sector has not diminished one bit; in fact, it is stronger today than ever before. However, I have changed my mind about AmeriCorps. Instead of distorting the mission of the civic sector, AmeriCorps has proved to be a source of new power and energy for nonprofit organizations across the country.

My changed view about AmeriCorps is in no small measure because of the leadership that Harris Wofford, my Democratic former Senate colleague from Pennsylvania, has given to that program. Wofford and I did not vote on the same side very often in the Senate, and we still differ on many issues. But his leadership of AmeriCorps has convinced me that I should have voted with him on this issue.

First, thanks to Wofford's steadfast commitment to place national service above partisanship, AmeriCorps has not become the political program that some of us initially feared. Second, he shares my belief that the solutions to some of our most intractable problems lie in the civic sector. Accordingly, he has set AmeriCorps to the work of support, not supplanting, the civic sector.

I have seen firsthand how AmeriCorps members have provided a jolt of new energy to the civic sector from my experience as president of Big Brothers Big Sisters of America. As Millard Fuller, founder of Habitat for Humanity and another former skeptic of government-supported volunteers, also discovered, the leadership provided by full-time AmeriCorps members is a key addition for nonprofit and faith-based organizations that are tackling the most difficult community and human problems.

AmeriCorps members, through their idealism, enthusiasm and can-do spirit, have multiplied the impact of organizations like Big Brothers Big Sisters and Habitat, and hundreds of other organizations large and small. The number of Republicans who have changed their mind about AmeriCorps continues to grow.

In the last year, Sens. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Mike DeWine (R-Ohio) and Rep. John Kasich (R-Ohio) have spoken out about the positive role AmeriCorps plays in strengthening the civic sector. Together, we join a growing bipartisan list of present and former federal and state legislators, governors and civic leaders in support of AmeriCorps.

Their support is part of a quiet, yet remarkable, transformation in American politics that has occurred since the white-hot debate that took place a few years ago between those who believed that government should take the lead in solving community problems and those who thought government could accomplish little or nothing, and was even likely to be a negative force.

Now, as evidenced by both major party presidential candidates and by growing bipartisan support in Congress, a new middle ground has emerged, leading to a unique partnership between AmeriCorps, the nonprofit organizations and private and religious institutions that are critical to strengthening our communities. It is these institutions that transmit values between generations that encourage cooperation between citizens, and make our communities stronger.

In a recent speech to the nation's governors, retired Gen. Colin Powell declared himself "a strong supporter of AmeriCorps." After spending two years working with the organization, Powell concluded "[W]hat they do in terms of leveraging other individuals to volunteer is really incredible. So it is a tremendous investment in your people, a tremendous investment in the future. . . ."

Later this month, a bipartisan coalition in the Senate will introduce legislation to reauthorize AmeriCorps and its parent agency, the Corporation for National Service. I hope that Congress will move quickly to enact this legislation so that AmeriCorps can continue to work with the nonprofit and faith-based sectors to strengthen our communities and build a better future for us all.●

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise this today as an original cosponsor of the National and Community Service Act of 2000 and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the reauthorization of the Corporation for National Service through this legislation.

While Americans often wonder what, exactly, it is that the numerous agencies and commissions scattered around town do, it is quite clear what the Corporation for National Service does. It's members tutor and mentor at-risk youth. They build affordable housing and clean up the Nation's rivers, streams and parks. They help seniors live independent and productive lives. They provide assistance to the victims of natural disasters. And perhaps most importantly, they train others to do all of these tasks and dozens more—leveraging their numbers, multiplying their effect, addressing countless community needs. These are important tasks. They empower our citizens. They build our communities. They renew our country. That is what the

Corporation for National Services does in my view—provide a true national service to the citizens of this country.

The Corporation for National Service is one of the most impressive success stories in recent memory. The numbers are simply remarkable. Take the AmeriCorps initiative for example. Since it's inception in 1993, more than 150,000 Americans have served or are currently serving as AmeriCorps members. They have provided much-needed assistance to 33 million of their neighbors in more than 4,000 communities.

Specifically, AmeriCorps members have helped nearly 3 million children succeed in school through tutoring and mentoring initiatives. They have worked with the police and other community organizations to safeguard our neighborhoods—establishing, operating and expanding over 40,000 safety patrols and working with 600,000 at-risk youth in after-school programs. AmeriCorps members have improved the daily lives of Americans by building or rehabilitating over 25,000 homes, working with 340,000 people to find jobs, and providing food, clothing and other necessities to over 2.5 million homeless people. With regard to our natural environmental, AmeriCorps members have planted over 50 million trees and removed 70,000 tons of trash from our neighborhoods. And when I talk about the leverage created through AmeriCorps members recruiting and training others, I am talking about nearly two million volunteers brought to bear on locally generated programs because of the efforts of AmeriCorps members.

The National Senior Service Corps has been another resounding success. What Tom Brokaw has dubbed "The Greatest Generation" is still ready to meet the needs of their communities and they have been energized by the Corporation for National Service. With over 25,000 Foster Grandparents, 15,000 Senior companions and 467,000 Retired and Senior Volunteer Program members, nearly 250,000 children—including, 58,000 with learning disabilities or suffering from abuse and neglect—have been given an invaluable source of loving care. Sixty-two thousand older Americans in need of a little extra help have been paired with Senior Corps members to make daily life more manageable. These Senior Corps members provide a critical bridge to independence for these seniors. Whether by helping with the daily tasks or simply being a friendly companion, these Senior Corps members are making a huge difference.

Learn and Serve, yet another initiative of the Corporation for National service, has served more than 1.5 million students in kindergarten through college and helped them apply academic skills to meet community needs.

It is an admirable track record of accomplishment, Mr. President. One that according to recent study returns \$1.66 to the community for every dollar invested.

While compiling the numbers, however, we often forget the impact this program has on those who dedicate themselves as volunteers. But we must not forget the impact that service has on those who give of themselves—their time and their energy—to make a difference. The personal satisfaction one receives from working for others is a feeling I can speak about personally. Long before AmeriCorps was a reality, I was Peace Corps volunteer in a small town in the Dominican Republic. But whether it is in the Dominican Republic or in my home state of Connecticut—or any state across this nation—there are many small towns that need help sustaining their educational system or providing health care to their neighbors or maintaining their environment or any number of areas. And an honest day's work on behalf of those efforts translates in any language. It is a source of tremendous satisfaction and pride. These are emotions that drive participants in either the PeaceCorps abroad or AmeriCorps here at home, to continue to work and continue to build their communities, something that can't be quantified.

There is also a real period of personal learning that AmeriCorps members go through. A study by Aguirre International determined that "participation in AmeriCorps results in substantial gains in life skills for more than three-quarters of the members" who participate. When we talk about life skills here, we are talking about communications skills, interpersonal skills, analytical problem-solving, organizational skill and using information technology. These are necessary skills for the 21st century. AmeriCorps members take these skills with them after their term of service, back to employers who want them, back to communities who need them.

The Corporation for National Service awakens in its members a strong ethic of civil responsibility and a lifelong desire to serve. By immersing its members in local, state and national issues, and asking them to address and interact with these issues, the Corporation for National Service is a catalyst for civic participation. And regardless of which side of the aisle you sit on, I think we can all agree that an active and involved constituency is what we all hope for.

Across the range of initiatives that I have touched upon today, are a couple of common themes. Primarily, these efforts are initiated from the ground-up. These programs were not crafted by Senators or Congressmen or someone employed here in Washington, they are generated by people within the community they serve and administered at the state level. That allows these programs the flexibility to take advantage of the individual strengths of each community and as a result, better address their needs.

Secondly, these programs harness what we all know is the true strength of America, it's citizens. The corporation for National Service is channeling

a constant flow of human energy, ingenuity, and talent into the states and communities of our country. The Corporation partners with organizations that have a proven track record to provide the necessary human resource to grow and expand these already successful programs. It is a model that works. It is an idea that has captured the imagination and harnessed the energy of this Nation. It is our responsibility to ensure that it continues.

The legislation we offer today will ensure that the Corporation for National Service continues through 2005. It retains the successful structure of the system that has been so effective over the last seven years, but makes allowances for a few improvements in the overall program, including a more responsive effort to ensure an increased participation by people with disabilities and a recognition that Indian tribes are qualified organizations to receive grants. This is a good bill. I hope we can work with our colleagues in the House to ensure that legislation reauthorizing the Corporation for National Service is passed by both houses and sent to the president for signature this year.●

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join a number of my colleagues in introducing the National and Community Service Amendments Act of 2000. This legislation will reauthorize the National and Community Service Act and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act.

The idea of the Federal government becoming a partner in community service originated with President Franklin Roosevelt's creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps. It was continued with President Kennedy's development of the Peace Corps and President Johnson's VISTA initiative. President Nixon contributed to the community service movement by expanding senior volunteer programs. In the 1990s, both a republican president and a democratic president strengthened the community service structure. President Bush established the Points of Light Foundation and President Clinton created the Corporation for National Service. The Corporation for National Service not only incorporated the community service programs previously established, but also created AmeriCorps.

Since AmeriCorps began more than six years ago, over 40,000 individual have become AmeriCorps members, serving local and national organizations. Recently, the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, which I chair, held a hearing regarding the reauthorization of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973. One of the witnesses who testified was Emily Zollo, an AmeriCorps member from Cabot, Vermont. Emily serves with the Northeast Kingdom Initiative AmeriCorps Program in Lyndonville, Vermont. Her assignment involves the Cobleigh Public Library in Lyndonville where she

works with the "Books on Wheels" bookmobile program. Emily drives the bookmobile and as she eloquently stated, "brings books and stories to seven rural villages and towns that vary in population from 350-5,000 residents." Emily Zollo eloquently summed up her AmeriCorps experience by stating: "Although the best part of my AmeriCorps experience has been meeting with kids at the various stops, learning how they see the world and introducing them to books which help them see a wider world, I have also learned some better ways to work and serve in the community. I feel that service has become a part of me and will be incorporated into my life and career. It's great to feel good about what you do, knowing you are making a difference in your community."

Other community service programs include Learn and Serve America which provides assistance to over one million students from kindergarten through college who participate in community service activities that are aligned with the students' academic programs. In my home State of Vermont, Learn and Serve is making a difference in a number of elementary and secondary schools, including vocational technical educational centers. Another service program, the National Senior Service Corps, serves nearly half a million Americans, age fifty-five and older, who use their talents as Foster Grandparents, serving as mentors to young people with special needs. In addition, the Senior Companions program helps other seniors live independently. Retired and Senior Volunteer Program members provide an array of services for unmet community needs. The senior programs are very essential to rural communities. In Springfield, Vermont, the Windsor County Retired and Senior Volunteer Program provides services to isolated seniors and persons with disabilities.

A key aspect of the National and Community Service Act is the State Commissions. The State Commissions decide which programs are to be funded, recruit volunteers, and evaluate and disseminate information about community and domestic service opportunities. The important role of States was also discussed at the hearing by several witnesses who represented various regions of the country. We heard about the positive impact of organizing service activities in a small rural State from Jane Williams, the executive director of the Vermont Commission on National and Community Service. Under Jane's leadership, the Vermont commission has been instrumental in getting 10,000 Vermonters of all ages and backgrounds involved in 31 community service projects. Governor Marc Racicot of Montana gave an excellent presentation regarding the importance of community service in "building unique partnerships between public and private agencies by engaging particularly young people in service to their communities."

Community service is not a democrat, republican, or independent issue—it's an ideal—an ideal that is central to the philosophy of America—neighbor helping neighbor. It is in that spirit that I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the National and Community Service Amendments Act of 2000.●

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today Senator KENNEDY and a bipartisan coalition are introducing the National and Community Service Amendments Act of 2000 to strengthen this program of community service throughout our country. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill because I know how public service has enriched my life. As elected representatives, we are entrusted with preserving the strong democracy and just society that our founders envisioned. The programs supported by this legislation, such as AmeriCorps, extend the opportunity to young people to do something for others.

While working in the Peace Corps, at an Asian desk, I was motivated to accept the challenge made by president Kennedy and I joined VISTA. Through VISTA, I came to West Virginia and a "coal camp," a small, struggling town called Emmons. Working to improve life in Emmons was not easy. But after a lot of effort, I was able to both make friends and work to make some kind of difference. We pulled down an abandoned school house in southern West Virginia and hauled the boards back to Emmons, where we built a community center. We brought a mobile health van for women to get Pap smears for the first time. And we waged a long, hard fight to get the school bus to stop close enough so the teenagers did not have to drop out of school just because the transportation to high school did not exist. Those two years in Emmons, and the experiences gained there, changed me forever. I stayed in West Virginia and chose to make public service my career.

When President Clinton chose to unveil a new domestic civil-service program in 1993, I was proud to stand by him as he announced the creation of AmeriCorps in Princeton, New Jersey. AmeriCorps is an exciting program promoting community service, like VISTA. Under AmeriCorps, members invest their time in community service and earn educational awards that help finance college or pay back student loans.

Since its inception just a few years ago, AmeriCorps has renewed community service across our nation with a network of programs designed to meet the specific needs of an area. In West Virginia, AmeriCorps has established more than a half dozen programs that help children learn how to read, provide them with caring mentors, and promote healthy lifestyles.

In highlighting a few of these programs, I must begin with the AmeriCorps Promise Fellows. These individuals service eighteen West Virginia counties, striving to mobilize

communities to provide children with resources critical to their development. In the same way that I helped the community of Emmons build a center where young people could learn and play, AmeriCorps Promise Fellows work to establish safe places and structured activities in their local areas. Another program, Energy Express, provides balanced meals, an environment that abounds with literature, and the attention of mentors to school-aged children during the summer months. I visited the Energy Express site in Pineville, West Virginia, and read to children there. AmeriCorps programs also aid adult members of the community, as evidenced by the success of Project MOVE in west-central West Virginia that strives to move people from welfare to work. After the first year, the heads of households in twenty families had become employed and had sustained themselves for more than three months.

These three programs are just a sampling of what AmeriCorps does in a rural state like West Virginia. In more urban areas throughout the country, AmeriCorps has programs that address the unique needs of those cities and their populace.

I place an enormous value on public service, and I know that I gained much from my VISTA experience in Emmons. Continuing AmeriCorps, VISTA and our range of community service programs will enhance the lives of Americans, young and old, who join and enrich our communities.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 353

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 353, a bill to provide for class action reform, and for other purposes.

S. 662

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts and the quality and availability of training for judges, attorneys, and volunteers working in such courts, and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

S. 729

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to ensure that Congress and the public have the right to par-

ticipate in the declaration of national monuments on federal land.

S. 1017

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1017, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on the low-income housing credit.

S. 1066

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1066, a bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to encourage the use of and research into agricultural best practices to improve the environment, and for other purposes.

S. 1322

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1322, a bill to prohibit health insurance and employment discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of predictive genetic information or genetic services.

S. 1443

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1443, a bill to amend section 10102 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding elementary school and secondary school counseling.

S. 1805

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1805, a bill to restore food stamp benefits for aliens, to provide States with flexibility in administering the food stamp vehicle allowance, to index the excess shelter expense deduction to inflation, to authorize additional appropriations to purchase and make available additional commodities under the emergency food assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 2018

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise the update factor used in making payments to PPS hospitals under the medicare program.

S. 2045

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2045, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to H-1B nonimmigrant aliens.

S. 2070

At the request of Mr. FITZGERALD, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2070, a bill to improve safety standards for child restraints in motor vehicles.

S. 2071

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Kentucky

(Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2071, a bill to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system.

S. 2271

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2271, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to improve the quality and availability of training for judges, attorneys, and volunteers working in the Nation's abuse and neglect courts, and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

S. 2272

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2272, a bill to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

S. 2299

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2299, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to continue State Medicaid disproportionate share hospital (DSH) allotments for fiscal year 2001 at the levels for fiscal year 2000.

S. 2394

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2394, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 2423

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2423, a bill to provide Federal Perkins Loan cancellation for public defenders.

S. 2505

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2505, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide increased assess to health care for medical beneficiaries through telemedicine.

S. 2528

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2528, a bill to provide funds for the purchase of automatic external defibrillators and the training of individuals in advanced cardiac life support.

S. 2586

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2586, a bill to reduce the backlog in the processing of immigration benefit applications and to make improvements to infrastructure necessary for