

the bill for a vote." I urge my colleagues to heed the cry of the President as he speaks on behalf of the almost 1 million women around this country who face domestic violence each year.

The President called domestic violence "America's problem" and I could not agree with him more. When we talk about reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act we are not just talking about a big bureaucratic government program the effects of which we can't really see. With this bill we are talking about reauthorizing critical programs that have had a tremendous immediate effect on how this Nation handles domestic violence and its victims. We are at risk of jeopardizing what has been one of the most effective vehicles for combating domestic violence if we let this law expire.

I have heard from countless people in Vermont that have benefitted from grant funding through VAWA programs. VAWA II ensures the success of these crucial programs such as the Rural Domestic Violence Grant program. These grants are designed to make victim services more accessible to women and children living in rural areas. I worked hard to see this funding included in the original VAWA in 1994, and I am proud that its success has merited an increased authorization for funding in VAWA II. Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Enforcement Grants have been utilized by the Vermont Network Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, the Vermont Attorney General's Office, and the Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services to increase community awareness, to develop cooperative relationships between state child protection agencies and domestic violence programs, to expand existing multi disciplinary task forces to include allied professional groups, and to create local multi-use supervised visitation centers.

I witnessed the devastating effects of domestic violence when I was the Vermont State's Attorney for Chittenden County. In those days, long before the passage of the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, there were not support programs and services in place to assist victims of these types of crimes. Today, because of the hard work and dedication of those in Vermont and around the country who work in this field every day, an increasing number of women and children are being aided by services through domestic violence programs and at shelters around the Nation. Lori Hayes, Executive Director of the Vermont Center for Crime Victim Services, and Marty Levin, Coordinator of the Vermont Network Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, have been especially instrumental in coordinating VAWA grants in Vermont.

Let the Senate pass S. 2787, the Violence Against Women Act 2000 without further delay before its critical pro-

grams are jeopardized. It was cleared for passage by all Democratic Senators two months ago and should be passed today. It is past time to reauthorize and build upon the historic programs of the Violence Against Women Act and do all that we can to protect children from the ravages and lasting impact of domestic violence.

A Washington Post editorial today called the failure to pass the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, "inexplicable neglect," claiming that "[t]here seems to be no good reason practical or substantive, to oppose reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act." That could not be more true Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the September 26, 2000 edition of the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 26, 2000]
INEXPLICABLE NEGLECT

There seems to be no good reason, practical or substantive, to oppose reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. Originally passed in 1994, the act provides money to state and local institutions to help combat domestic violence. It is set to expire at the end of the month. Its reauthorization has overwhelming bipartisan support. But House and Senate leaders have yet to schedule a vote.

Versions of the bill have been favorably reported by the judiciary committees of both chambers. Both would expand programs that during the past five years have helped create an infrastructure capable of prosecuting domestic violence cases and providing services to battered women. Since the original act was passed, Congress has devoted \$1.5 billion to programs created by it. The House and Senate bills differ, but both would authorize more than \$3 billion in further support during the next five years. There is room to debate the proper funding level relative to other priorities, a matter which will be determined later by appropriators; and the programs won't end immediately if the act lapses, because funds have been approved for the coming year. But failing to reauthorize would send the wrong message on an important issue and, more important, could threaten future appropriations.

With time in the 106th Congress running out, the Violence Against Women Act may become a casualty of neglect rather than of active opposition. But that's no comfort. Congress ought to find the time to pass it before leaving town.

NAKAMURA COURTHOUSE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, today the Washington state Congressional delegation introduced bills in the House and in the Senate to honor a fallen hero, William Kenzo Nakamura, by designating the Seattle federal courthouse in his honor. This brave soldier fought in Italy during World War II, and he died valiantly protecting his battalion. The day he died, Mr. Nakamura had already risked his life and saved his combat team by disarming an enemy machine gun stronghold. Mr. Nakamura should have re-

ceived the Medal of Honor for this act of bravery, but he did not.

Even as this man's family was held in an internment camp in Idaho, he volunteered for duty in the United States military, and he headed to Italy to serve his country. After his heroic and selfless deeds, Mr. Nakamura was posthumously eligible for the Medal of Honor, but in World War II the Army did not award Japanese-Americans the Medal of Honor. I was pleased that earlier this year that twenty-two veterans, in similar circumstances to and including Mr. Nakamura, received Medals of Honor for their brave service in World War II. These men and their families waited too long for proper recognition and appreciation, and these honors are well deserved.

Though military heroes are often given medals for their service, the people of Washington state would like to extend a special tribute to Mr. Nakamura by naming the federal courthouse in Seattle in his honor. This action has not only the support of the entire Washington congressional delegation, but of local communities, veteran and military retiree organizations, and by Medal of Honor recipients in the Senate, my friends DANIEL INOUE and BOB KERREY. To this outpouring, I add my support and commitment to seeing this designation passed through the Senate and acted into law.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read the names of some of those who have lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

September 26, 1999: Robert Coney, 64, Miami, FL; Derrick Edwards, 22, Washington, DC; Philip Harris, 27, Detroit, MI; Samala McGee, 24, New Orleans, LA; Michael D. Miles, 48, Hollywood, FL; David Sexton, 43, Baltimore, MD; and Unidentified Female, 47, Nashville, TN.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The deaths of these people are a reminder to all of us that we need to enact sensible gun legislation now.

THE IDEA FULL FUNDING ACT

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise to make a few remarks concerning the IDEA Full Funding Act of 2000.

Mr. President, before I begin, I would like to take this opportunity to thank

my colleague, Senator GREGG, for his leadership on this important legislation.

I rise today to lend my support to S. 2341, the IDEA Full Funding Act of 2000. One of my top priorities as a United States Senator has been to provide equal access to high quality public education for all children, including those with special needs. My commitment to education for those with special needs began while I was a State legislator and worked with the Oregon Disabilities Council to ensure that children with special needs had equal access to a quality education. I have continued that work here in the Senate, but realize that we have a long ways to go.

This legislation takes a step in the right direction by funding the federal mandates put forth in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These federal funds will free up state and local dollars that can then be used in the classroom for new textbooks, pencils and computers that are necessary for students to learn.

In 1954, the Supreme Court established, in *Brown v. Board of Education*, that all children are guaranteed equal access to education under the 14th Amendment of the Constitution. Despite this decision, it was estimated that one million children with disabilities were being denied access to public education. It was not until 1975, with the passage of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, that equal access to education was extended to children with disabilities.

The purpose of the 1975 IDEA legislation was "[T]o assure that all children with disabilities have available to them, a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet the unique needs, to assure the rights of children with disabilities and their parents or guardians are protected, to assist States and localities to provide for the education of all children with disabilities, and to assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate children with disabilities."

With the passage of IDEA the federal government promised to assist states with 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for disabled children. Based on the national average per pupil expenditure for the year 2000, 40 percent of that average would represent approximately \$2,500 per student. However, since 1975 the federal government has not met this commitment. In fact, the federal government gets an "F" in arithmetic in this instance, currently paying only 12.7 percent of the per pupil expenditure.

But, we are slowly working to improve this grade. In 1997, funding for IDEA was only \$2.6 billion. In the last 3 years, the Republican-controlled Congress has nearly doubled Federal funding on IDEA to approximately \$4.9 billion. Although Congress has allocated more money to IDEA, current funding levels are 3.1 times less than what is

needed to fully fund the forty percent commitment.

The purpose of providing this additional funding to the IDEA program is to free up local and state dollars. Currently state and local education agencies have been forced to divert their precious resources to pay for the additional costs, due to federal mandates, of educating children with disabilities.

As a result, Washington has created an inappropriate and unfair conflict between children with disabilities and children without. We owe it to all children to live up to our responsibility and resolve this conflict.

This important legislation would take a step in that direction by authorizing funding for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to reach the Federal government's goal of providing 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure to assist states and local education agencies with the excess costs of educating children with disabilities.

By steadily working to increase IDEA funding to \$2 billion each year annually until 2010, Congress would increase opportunity and flexibility for local school districts to fund the programs that they feel are best for their students, whether it be school construction, teacher training or smaller classrooms.

I was pleased to see that the House of Representatives passed similar legislation, H.R. 4055, on May 3, 2000 with a 421-3 vote. It is my hope that the Senate can follow the strong lead of the House and work for swift passage of this necessary legislation.

THE CHILDREN'S PUBLIC HEALTH ACT OF 2000 AND THE YOUTH DRUG AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am delighted the Senate has now given final approval to an important bill that will go far toward improving our nation's public health infrastructure. I strongly support the Children's Public Health Act of 2000 and the Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act (H.R. 4365). I hope this measure will soon pass the House as well.

It is obvious that we owe our colleagues on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee a debt of gratitude for their perseverance and dedication in developing this landmark legislation which contains a number of provisions of importance to my home state of Utah.

The Children's Health Act of 2000 authorizes services that will ensure the health and well-being of future generations of America's young people, our most precious resources. I can think of no more important aim for legislation than to focus on our nation's future by providing for our children today.

At the same time, through the Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act, the bill will address serious drug abuse issues that affect our young people, in-

cluding a reauthorization of the important programs of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, SAMHSA.

The SAMSHA reauthorization legislation will improve this vital agency by providing greater flexibility for states and accountability based on performance, while at the same time placing critical focus on youth and adolescent substance abuse and mental health services. SAMHSA, formerly known as the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services Administration, ADAMHA, was created in 1992 by Public Law 102-321, the ADAMHA Reorganization Act. SAMHSA's purpose is to assist states in addressing the importance of reducing the incidence of substance abuse and mental illness by supporting programs for prevention and treatment.

SAMHSA provides funds to states for alcohol and drug abuse prevention and treatment programs and activities, and mental health services through the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment, SAPT, and the Community Mental Health Services, CMHS, Block Grants. SAMHSA's block grants are a major portion of this nation's response to substance abuse and mental health service needs.

As a proud supporter of H.R. 4365, I would like to highlight several provisions that are based on legislation I have introduced.

First, this legislation reauthorizes the Traumatic Brain Injury Act, a law I authored in 1996. By incorporating my bill, S. 3081, H.R. 4365 will extend authority for the critical Traumatic Brain Injury, TBI, programs from fiscal year 2001 through 2005.

Each year, approximately two million Americans experience a traumatic brain injury; in Utah, 2000 individuals per year experience brain injuries. TBI is the leading cause of death and disability in young Americans, and the risk of a traumatic brain injury is highest among adolescents and young adults. Motor vehicle accidents, sports injuries, falls and violence are the major causes. These injuries occur without warning and often with devastating consequences. Brain injury can affect a person cognitively, physically and emotionally.

Important provisions added to the Traumatic Brain Injury Act through this bill include extending the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's, CDC, grant authority so it may conduct research on ways to prevent traumatic brain injury. In addition, the legislation directs the CDC to provide information to increase public awareness on this serious health matter. The bill also calls on the National Institutes of Health, NIH, to conduct research on the rehabilitation of the cognitive, behavioral, and psycho-social difficulties associated with traumatic brain injuries.

Finally, the measure requests the Health Resource Services Administration to provide and administer grants