

AMENDMENT TO PREVENT GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the support for the Gekas shutdown prevention amendment is growing every minute. It is a simple proposition, one that says that if at the end of a budget period no budget has been negotiated, then there will be an instant replay of last year's budget. Thus we would prevent Government shutdowns that caused so much havoc in the last several years. The most recent level of support has come from the Citizens Against Government Waste who sent me a letter just yesterday which says, among other things, "For too long Americans have watched the Congress and the President wrangle over the annual appropriations process to keep the Government running. Your Government shutdown prevention amendment would eliminate the absurd politics that lead to temporary shutdowns of the Federal Government."

Mr. Speaker, we have had 53 continuing resolutions, temporary funding measures, in the last 15 years. We have had eight Government shutdowns, the worst of which were the last two. Let us prevent it this time by adopting the Gekas amendment to the supplemental appropriations.

□ 1015

GETTING TOUGH ON JUVENILE CRIME

(Mr. BLAGOJEVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. In America, Mr. Speaker, more violent crime is committed by juveniles ages 15 to 19 than in any other age group. If present trends continue, juvenile arrests for violent crime will more than double by the year 2010. Under the juvenile crime control bill, which creates a \$1.5 billion grant, only 12 States would qualify to receive the Federal funds necessary to fight juvenile crime.

In the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, four cities, in four cities one-third of all juvenile crimes occur: in Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and in Detroit. Yet under this juvenile crime bill, Mr. Speaker, grant money would not find its way into the neighborhoods of Chicago, the barrios of Los Angeles, or in downtown Detroit. It could, however, find its way in Jackson Hole, WY, and in Stowe, VT.

Mr. Speaker, major cities in fact will lose money under this legislation. The local law enforcement block grant which provided \$18 million to the city of Chicago could be lost under this legislation. The city credits this program for a 18-percent decrease in homicides, a 19 percent decrease in robberies, and a 24-percent decrease in narcotics.

Mr. Speaker, we need the resources to fight crime at the local level. Those resources ought to be in those areas where crimes occur.

WHAT AMERICANS WANT CON- GRESS TO DO ABOUT EDUCATION

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, what do the American people want Congress to do about education?

Let me quote from a letter from Mrs. Jan Horan of Westminster, MD. And I quote:

Enough is enough, and the American people have had enough. When is the Congress of this country going to realize that the government is the problem and not the solution?

For years, the Congress has continued to throw money at what they perceive to be the 'problem' . . . the government at all levels is throwing money at education, and our educational system continues to deteriorate.

The government to the rescue . . . while creating all of these safety nets . . . a tax burden for the middle class has been created that is to the point of enslavement.

I want my children and grandchildren to have a future free of this tax burden, to be able to live in a country that does not have a substandard public education system

When are you, the elected officials, going to come out of your glass bubble and see what you are doing to this Nation?

Common sense is what it takes from the elected officials. Let's try using it.

Mrs. Horan, I could not agree more. I hope everyone in Congress is listening and will follow that advice.

RESTORE FUNDS TO THE WIC PROGRAM

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, in this body we all talk about putting our families first and about balancing the budget. But I find it very difficult to understand how Republicans have cut \$38 million from the WIC Program when the WIC Program is the single best bipartisan program to help us put our families and our children first and take care of women that are pregnant, to deliver healthy children, and, and to save us money; because for every dollar we invest in WIC we save \$3.50. So cutting \$38 million is probably going to end up costing us over \$120 million in added benefits down the line.

I encourage my Republican colleagues to act in a bipartisan way to restore these very, very important funds to a program that has always had wide bipartisan support.

THE DECLINING INFRASTRUCTURE IN AMERICA'S SCHOOLS

(Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, let me begin today by expressing my appreciation to members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for their efforts in trying to strengthen the Nation's school system. As a former educator, I am interested in the Clinton administration's attention to the declining infrastructure in American schools.

It is clear that the direct assistance is going to be certainly advantageous to the schools, but we cannot overlook some of the costs that are out there, and electricity is one of those expenditures, and the utility companies are the largest nonlabor expense for schools. Under the current system, everything, everything is a negotiable expense for schools except electricity, and in the case of electricity there is no mechanism at all out there that schools have an opportunity to shop around for. Direct savings on electric bills are estimated to range from 25 to 40 percent for inner city schools, districts and States with high electric costs. Such savings, freed up for use in upgrading infrastructure and teacher salaries, are certainly there.

In Dade County in Miami, FL, spent \$30 million; in Chicago, \$40 million; in Fairfax County right across the river here, \$30 million.

We cannot prepare our students for the future without saving some electricity costs. I urge my colleagues to look closely at the restructuring bill that we are coming up with in Congress.

THE FACTS ABOUT THE WIC PROGRAM

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Georgia said earlier let us talk about the facts of WIC. Here are the facts about the Women, Infant and Children Program.

It feeds women, infants, and children. It provides necessary and critical prenatal services to pregnant women in our country. Fact: It works. It has in the past been a bipartisan effort, and the General Accounting Office of this Government has said for every \$1 invested in the WIC Program we save \$3½ in other kinds of expenses. Fact: There is a \$76 million shortfall in the program, meaning that we will not be able to provide for 360,000 women, infants, and children. Fact: The congressional majority, the Republicans in this body, voted to cut, voted only to provide \$38 million for this program, thereby leaving it \$38 million short. Fact is that 180,000 women and children will be removed from the WIC Program if this current bill passes.

This is about our values and our priorities in this country. We should not be passing legislation that denies food, breakfast cereal, formula, to women, infants, and children in this country.

That is not what this great Nation is about. The fact is we ought to make sure that we have \$76 million to continue this working program.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 350, nays 56, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]
YEAS—350

Ackerman	Coburn	Gilman
Aderholt	Combest	Gonzalez
Allen	Condit	Goode
Archer	Conyers	Goodlatte
Army	Cook	Goodling
Bachus	Cooksey	Gordon
Baesler	Coyne	Goss
Baker	Cramer	Graham
Baldacci	Crane	Greenwood
Ballenger	Crapo	Hall (OH)
Barcia	Cummings	Hall (TX)
Barr	Cunningham	Hamilton
Barrett (NE)	Danner	Harman
Barrett (WI)	Davis (IL)	Hastert
Bartlett	Davis (VA)	Hastings (FL)
Barton	Deal	Hastings (WA)
Bass	DeGette	Hayworth
Bateman	Delahunt	Hinchev
Becerra	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Bentsen	DeLay	Hobson
Bereuter	Dellums	Hoekstra
Berman	Deutsch	Holden
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart	Hooley
Bilirakis	Dickey	Horn
Bishop	Dicks	Hostettler
Blagojevich	Dingell	Houghton
Bliley	Doggett	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Dooley	Hunter
Boehrlert	Dreier	Hutchinson
Boehner	Duncan	Hyde
Bonilla	Dunn	Inglis
Bonior	Edwards	Istook
Bono	Ehlers	Jackson (IL)
Boswell	Ehrlich	Jefferson
Boucher	Emerson	John
Boyd	Eshoo	Johnson (CT)
Brady	Etheridge	Johnson (WI)
Brown (FL)	Evans	Johnson, Sam
Brown (OH)	Everett	Jones
Bryant	Ewing	Kanjorski
Bunning	Farr	Kaptur
Burr	Fattah	Kelly
Burton	Fawell	Kennedy (MA)
Buyer	Fazio	Kennelly
Callahan	Flake	Kildee
Calvert	Foglietta	Kilpatrick
Camp	Foley	Kim
Campbell	Ford	Kind (WI)
Canady	Fowler	King (NY)
Cannon	Frank (MA)	Kingston
Capps	Franks (NJ)	Kleccka
Cardin	Frelinghuysen	Klink
Carson	Frost	Klug
Castle	Furse	Knollenberg
Chabot	Gallegly	Kolbe
Chenoweth	Ganske	LaHood
Christensen	Gejdenson	Lampson
Clayton	Gekas	Lantos
Clement	Gilchrest	Largent
Coble	Gillmor	Latham

LaTourette	Olver	Shays
Lazio	Ortiz	Sherman
Leach	Owens	Shimkus
Levin	Oxley	Shuster
Lewis (KY)	Packard	Sisisky
Linder	Pappas	Skaggs
Lipinski	Parker	Skeen
Lofgren	Pastor	Skelton
Lowey	Paul	Smith (MI)
Lucas	Paxon	Smith (NJ)
Luther	Payne	Smith (OR)
Maloney (CT)	Pease	Smith (TX)
Maloney (NY)	Pelosi	Smith, Adam
Manton	Peterson (MN)	Smith, Linda
Manzullo	Peterson (PA)	Snowbarger
Markey	Petri	Snyder
Martinez	Pickering	Solomon
Mascara	Pitts	Spence
Matsui	Pombo	Spratt
McCarthy (MO)	Pomeroy	Stabenow
McCarthy (NY)	Portman	Stark
McColum	Price (NC)	Stearns
McCrery	Quinn	Stenholm
McDade	Radanovich	Stokes
McGovern	Rahall	Strickland
McHale	Rangel	Stump
McHugh	Regula	Sununu
McInnis	Reyes	Talent
McIntosh	Riley	Tanner
McIntyre	Rivers	Tauscher
McKeon	Rodriguez	Tauzin
Meehan	Roemer	Taylor (NC)
Meek	Rogan	Thomas
Metcalf	Rogers	Thornberry
Mica	Rohrabacher	Thurman
Millender-	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
McDonald	Rothman	Tierney
Miller (CA)	Roukema	Torres
Miller (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Minge	Royce	Trafficant
Mink	Rush	Turner
Moakley	Ryun	Upton
Molinar	Sanchez	Vento
Mollohan	Sanders	Walsh
Moran (KS)	Sandlin	Waters
Moran (VA)	Sanford	Watkins
Morella	Sawyer	Waxman
Murtha	Saxton	Weldon (FL)
Myrick	Scarborough	Weldon (PA)
Nadler	Schaefer, Dan	Weygand
Neal	Schaffer, Bob	Whitfield
Nethercutt	Schumer	Wise
Neumann	Scott	Woolsey
Ney	Sensenbrenner	Wynn
Northup	Serrano	Yates
Norwood	Shadegg	Young (AK)
Obey	Shaw	Young (FL)

NAYS—56

Abercrombie	Hill
Berry	Hilleary
Borski	Hilliard
Clyburn	Hulshof
Collins	Jackson-Lee
Costello	(TX)
Cubin	Johnson, E. B.
DeFazio	Kennedy (RI)
English	Kucinich
Ensign	LaFalce
Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Fox	Lewis (GA)
Gephardt	LoBiondo
Gibbons	McDermott
Green	McNulty
Gutierrez	Menendez
Gutknecht	Nussle
Hansen	Oberstar
Hefley	Pallone

NOT VOTING—27

Andrews	Doyle	McKinney
Blunt	Engel	Porter
Brown (CA)	Filner	Riggs
Chambliss	Granger	Schiff
Clay	Hefner	Sessions
Cox	Herger	Souder
Davis (FL)	Jenkins	Wexler
Dixon	Kasich	White
Doolittle	Livingston	Wolf

□ 1044

Mr. WAMP changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I missed the Journal vote this morning due to constituent meetings. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

□ 1045

JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to House Resolution 143 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3) to combat violent youth crime and increase accountability for juvenile criminal offenses, with Mr. KINGSTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 7, 1997, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of an amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3

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 "Juvenile Crime Control Act of 1997".

TITLE I—REFORMING THE FEDERAL JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

SEC. 101. DELINQUENCY PROCEEDINGS OR CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS IN DISTRICT COURTS.

Section 5032 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5032. Delinquency proceedings or criminal prosecutions in district courts

"(a)(1) A juvenile alleged to have committed an offense against the United States or an act of juvenile delinquency may be surrendered to State authorities, but if not so surrendered, shall be proceeded against as a juvenile under this subsection or tried as an adult in the circumstances described in subsections (b) and (c).

"(2) A juvenile may be proceeded against as a juvenile in a court of the United States under this subsection if—

"(A) the alleged offense or act of juvenile delinquency is committed within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States and is one for which the maximum authorized term of imprisonment does not exceed 6 months; or

"(B) the Attorney General, after investigation, certifies to the appropriate United States district court that—

"(i) the juvenile court or other appropriate court of a State does not have jurisdiction or declines to assume jurisdiction over the juvenile