

crime with grandiose rhetorical statements like harsh treatment and mollicoddling, it is time to address the issue with a commonsense look at the facts.

There is a substantial amount of anecdotal evidence that indicates the juvenile system is in trouble. For example:

In Portland, my hometown, the Oregonian, described a case where a child committed 50 crimes, 32 of which were felonies, before the juvenile justice system took action to protect the community.

According to New York magazine, in New York State, 30,000 juveniles picked up for misdemeanors in 1993 were issued youth division cards and then released—essentially the paperwork was filed and the child walked out.

In Chicago, in the case of Yummy Sandifer, Newsweek reported that he averaged a felony a month for the last year and a half of his life (23 felonies and 5 misdemeanors in all). He was actually convicted of two felonies in juvenile court and nothing ever happened to him. Finally, he killed someone and was killed himself.

A system like this neither serves the children who commit crimes nor the community it is supposed to protect. Nationally, only 50 percent of juvenile cases even go to juvenile court. Most cases are handled by some form of social services division. The majority of juveniles who do go to court are given probation.

While this information indicates a system that is overwhelmed with violent offenders and doesn't have the legal remedies necessary to deal with such an influx, a broad overview of the problem is missing. The Comprehensive Survey of Young Offenders Act, would help Congress, States, and localities fill the holes in our knowledge of juvenile crime and our country's juvenile services. Right now there is little or no comprehensive data on the patterns of crime for young offenders, how many times a young offender goes through the juvenile justice system or which punishments or programs effectively protect the community and reduce recidivism.

This legislation would require the Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS] to look into these issues—to survey available data on the crimes juveniles commit, to examine how young offenders flow through the juvenile justice system, and to report the outcomes of juvenile cases that are both petitioned to juvenile court and those that are handled informally.

Additionally, my legislation would require the BJS to design and estimate costs of a program that will improve data collection on young offenders in the States. While many States are moving in the direction of juvenile reform, few systematically evaluate the outcomes in their juvenile justice programs.

It is obvious that the rate of juvenile crime is climbing. What Congress now needs to do is take a comprehensive look at how our country's juvenile systems are handling that increase in crime and then evaluate where our national policy needs to go to address this enormous challenge.

AGRICULTURE WATER CONSERVATION ACT

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1995

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Agriculture Water Conservation Act.

During 1992, nearly 1.5 million acres of cropland in the United States irrigated by surface/gravity methods, either was converted to more efficient irrigation systems or was removed from production. At the same time, low-flow irrigation acreage increased by 15 percent and sprinkler acreage grew at a pace of 3 percent. An increasing demand on a limited water supply has created a demand in the agriculture community for water conservation.

Over the last several years I have read countless articles in different publications on the need to conserve water, and the role Federal Government has with this mission. While discussing water conservation methods with farmers in my district, I found cost was their overriding concern. The outlays required to implement water conservation systems—i.e., drip irrigation, sprinkler systems, ditch lining—are a tremendous burden on the agriculture industry. While I firmly believe most agriculture interest are genuinely concerned about conserving water, cost has crippled by the ability to implement conservation methods on farms.

My bill is not a mandate for expensive water conservation systems, it is a tool and an option for the farmer. Specifically, it will allow farmers to receive up to a 30 percent tax credit for the cost of developing and implementing water conservation plans on their farm land. The tax credit could be used primarily for the cost of materials and equipment. This legislation would not require them to change their irrigation practices. However, it would allow those farmers who want to move toward a more conservation approach of irrigation but cannot afford to do it during these tough economic times.

I am currently focusing a great amount of effort on reducing the threats to viable agriculture in the United States. The Agriculture Water Conservation Act, which is similar to legislation I introduced in the last two Congresses, is the kind of incentive we need in order to establish conservation measures which enable farmers to assist in solving water shortage problems. I believe providing for the long term water supply needs of environmental, urban, and agricultural users is a critical part of the solution.

The Agriculture Water Conservation Act is not the end all solution. Since I have introduced this bill in 1992 I have consulted with farmers, local irrigation districts, the Department of Interior's Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service. All these groups have given me helpful and beneficial advice on how to improve on this legislation. I believe farmers will contribute to solving water supply problems when given the opportunity, as they already have through conservation transfers and crop changes. This bill will provide yet another vehicle for farmers to contribute toward a solution while offering a modest credit to share the cost with the true beneficiaries—the public.

USDA INSPECTOR GENERAL'S JANUARY 1995 REPORT "APHIS ENFORCEMENT OF THE ANIMAL WELFARE ACT"

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1995

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time supporter of animal welfare legislation and as one of the Members of Congress intimately involved in the 1985 amendments to the Animal Welfare Act [AWA], I have a keen interest in promoting the humane treatment of animals as well as ensuring the strength and enforceability of the Animal Welfare Act.

After an initial review of the USDA inspector general's January, 1995, report, "Animal and Plant Health Inspector Service (APHIS) Enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act," I am deeply concerned with the Agency's ability and willingness to adequately monitor and reasonably ensure the humane care and treatment of animals. The inspector general stated, "APHIS does not have the authority . . . to effectively enforce the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act." While I am pleased to see this unambiguous statement, I am greatly troubled by the USDA's seemingly willful neglect of the law. It took APHIS over 6 years to promulgate regulations based on the amendments to the act that were enacted in 1985. While this delay in responding to the requirements of the amendments was in my view unacceptable, I find it even more disconcerting that the problems associated with the enforcement of this act have not abated.

Lack of adequate resources is part of the problem associated with APHIS's ability to adequately monitor and inspect animals and facilities. In the past I have testified before the Appropriations Committee in favor of increased funding for enforcement of the AWA. I realize that Congress shares the burden of responsibility for not allocating the appropriate resources needed to fully implement this law.

More importantly, however, the inspector general's report indicates that APHIS has been neglecting its statutory obligations and has renewed facility licenses even when cited violations—past and present—had not yet been corrected. Additionally, APHIS is not inspecting research facilities before issuing the initial registrations, therefore noncompliance with the act may go unnoticed until APHIS' first inspection up to a year later.

It was clearly the intent of Congress that facilities should come into compliance before being issued the initial registrations, and that license renewals should be withheld where licenses have been suspended or revoked or in instances where facilities are not in compliance with the provisions of the act. Section 2.3 of the Animal Welfare Act, among others, implicitly gives APHIS the authority to conduct inspections and to deny renewals. The provision reads:

Each applicant must demonstrate that his or her premises and any animals, facilities, vehicles, equipment, or other premises used or intended for use in the business comply with the regulations and standards set forth in parts 2 and 3 of this subchapter. Each applicant for an initial license or license renewal must make his or her animals, premises . . . available for inspection . . . to ascertain the applicant's compliance with the standards and regulations.