think we should proceed to get the information before we extend NAFTA, especially on a fast track.

## FAMILIES SHOULD HAVE MORE

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, there was a fascinating article on the front page of the Washington Post last week. The article is entitled ''Voters Feeling Remote From Issues In Capital.'' One person is quoted as saying, ''Politics in Washington doesn't seem to affect me directly.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, many people do not realize it but Washington does affect them directly. Political choices made in Washington have a direct impact on the amount of taxes they pay. Perhaps people feel that regardless of what politicians say, they know that the tax bill will keep going up.

That, in fact, is the way things have been going here in Washington. The family tax burden has steadily climbed upwards from 5 percent in 1950 to 25 percent today. Let me remind my colleagues that is only the Federal tax burden. When we add that with hidden taxes, with State and local taxes, it goes to over 50 percent.

Now it is time for a change. It is time for Washington to spend a little less so families can have a little more.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 5 p.m. today.

## JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1818) to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1818

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1997''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:



**TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1974**

**SEC. 101. FINDINGS.**

Section 101 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601) is amended to read as follows:

''FINDINGS

''SEC. 101. (a) The Congress finds the following:

''(1) There has been a dramatic increase in juvenile delinquency, particularly violent crime committed by juveniles. Weapons offenses and homicides are 2 of the fastest growing crimes committed by juveniles. More than ½ of juvenile victims are killed with a firearm. Approximately ⅕ of the individuals arrested for committing violent crime are less than 18 years of age. The increase in both the number of youth below the age of 15 and females arrested for violent crime is cause for concern.

''(2) This problem should be addressed through a 2-track common sense approach that addresses the needs of individual juveniles and society at large by promoting—

''(A) quality prevention programs that—

''(i) work with juveniles, their families, local public agencies, and community-based organizations, and take into consideration such factors as whether or not juveniles have been the victims of family violence (including child abuse and neglect); and

''(ii) are designed to reduce risks and develop competencies in at-risk juveniles that will prevent, and reduce the rate of, violent delinquent behavior; and

''(B) programs that assist in holding juveniles accountable for their actions, including a system of graduated sanctions to respond to each delinquent act, requiring juveniles to make restitution, or perform community service, for the damage caused by their delinquent acts, and methods for increasing victim satisfaction with respect to the penalties imposed on juveniles for their acts.

''(b) Congress must act now to reform this program by focusing on juvenile delinquency prevention programs, as well as programs that hold juveniles accountable for their acts. Without true reform, the criminal justice system will not be able to overcome the challenges it will face in the coming years when the number of juveniles is expected to increase by 30 percent.''.

**SEC. 102. PURPOSE.**

Section 102 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5602) is amended to read as follows:

''PURPOSES

''SEC. 102. The purposes of this title and title II are—

''(1) to support State and local programs that prevent juvenile involvement in delinquent behavior;

''(2) to assist State and local governments in promoting public safety by encouraging accountability for acts of juvenile delinquency; and

''(3) to assist State and local governments in addressing juvenile crime through the provision of technical assistance, research, training, evaluation, and the dissemination of information on effective programs for combating juvenile delinquency.''.

**SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS.**

Section 103 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5603) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking ''to help prevent juvenile delinquency'' and inserting ''designed to reduce known risk factors for juvenile delinquent behavior, provides activities that build on protective factors for, and develop competencies in, juveniles to prevent, and reduce the rate of, delinquent juvenile behavior'',

(2) in paragraph (4) by inserting ''title I of'' before ''the Omnibus'' each place it appears,

(3) in paragraph (7) by striking ''the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,'',

(4) in paragraph (9) by striking ''justice'' and inserting ''crime control'',

(5) in paragraph (12)(B) by striking '', of any nonoffender,'',

(6) in paragraph (13)(B) by striking '', any non-offender,'',

(7) in paragraph (14) by inserting ''drug trafficking,'' after ''assault,'',

(8) in paragraph (16)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by adding ''and'' at the end, and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C),

(9) by striking paragraph (17),

(10) in paragraph (22)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (i), (ii), and (iii) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end,

(11) in paragraph (23) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon,

(12) by redesignating paragraphs (18), (19), (20), (21), (22), and (23) as paragraphs (17) through (22), respectively, and

(12) by adding at the end the following:

''(23) the term 'boot camp' means a residential facility (excluding a private residence) at which there are provided—

''(A) a highly regimented schedule of discipline, physical training, work, drill, and ceremony characteristic of military basic training.

''(B) regular, remedial, special, and vocational education; and

''(C) counseling and treatment for substance abuse and other health and mental health problems;

''(24) the term 'graduated sanctions' means an accountability-based, graduated series of sanctions (including incentives and services) applicable to juveniles within the juvenile justice system to hold such juveniles accountable for their actions and to protect communities from the effects of juvenile delinquency by providing appropriate sanctions for every act for which a juvenile is adjudicated delinquent, by inducing their law-abiding behavior, and by preventing their subsequent involvement with the juvenile justice system;

''(25) the term 'violent crime' means—

''(A) murder or nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, or robbery, or

''(B) aggravated assault committed with the use of a firearm;

''(26) the term 'co-located facilities' means facilities that are located in the same building, or are part of a related complex of buildings located on the same grounds; and

''(27) the term 'related complex of buildings' means 2 or more buildings that share—

''(A) physical features, such as walls and fences, or services beyond mechanical services (heating, air conditioning, water and sewer); or

''(B) the specialized services that are allowable under section 31.303(e)(3)(i)(C)(3) of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on December 10, 1996.''.

**SEC. 104. NAME OF OFFICE.**

Title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5611 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by amending the heading of part A to read as follows:

''PART A—OFFICE OF JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION'',

(2) in section 201(a) by striking ''Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' and inserting ''Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention'', and

(3) in subsections section 299A(c)(2) by striking ''Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' and inserting ''Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention''.

**SEC. 105. CONCENTRATION OF FEDERAL EFFORT.**

Section 204 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5614) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1) by striking the last sentence,

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3) by striking ''and of the prospective'' and all that follows through ''administered'',

(B) by striking paragraph (5), and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively,

(3) in subsection (c) by striking ''and reports'' and all that follows through ''this part'', and inserting ''as may be appropriate to prevent the duplication of efforts, and to coordinate activities, related to the prevention of juvenile delinquency'',

(4) by striking subsection (i), and

(5) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (f).

**SEC. 106. COORDINATING COUNCIL ON JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION.**

Section 206 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5616) is repealed.

**SEC. 107. ANNUAL REPORT.**

Section 207 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5617) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''and'' after ''priorities,'', and

(B) by striking '', and recommendations of the Council'',

(2) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5), and inserting the following:

''(4) An evaluation of the programs funded under this title and their effectiveness in reducing the incidence of juvenile delinquency, particularly violent crime, committed by juveniles.'', and

(3) by redesignating such section as section 206.

**SEC. 108. ALLOCATION.**

Section 222 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5632) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''amount, up to $400,000,'' and inserting ''amount up to $400,000'',

(II) by inserting a comma after ''1992'' the 1st place it appears,

(III) by striking ''the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,'', and

(IV) by striking ''amount, up to $100,000,'' and inserting ''amount up to $100,000'',

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking ''(other than part D)'',

(II) by striking ''or such greater amount, up to $600,000'' and all that follows through ''section 299(a) (1) and (3)'',

(III) by striking ''the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,'',

(IV) by striking ''amount, up to $100,000,'' and inserting ''amount up to $100,000'', and

(V) by inserting a comma after ''1992'',

(B) in paragraph (3) by striking ''allot'' and inserting ''allocate'', and

(2) in subsection (b) by striking ''the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,''.

**SEC. 109. STATE PLANS.**

Section 223 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5633) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the 2nd sentence by striking ''challenge'' and all that follows through ''part E'', and inserting '', projects, and activities'',

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking '', which—'' and inserting ''that—'',

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''not less'' and all that follows through ''33'', and inserting ''the attorney general of the State or such other State official who has primary responsibility for overseeing the enforcement of State criminal laws, and'',

(II) by inserting '', in consultation with the attorney general of the State or such other State official who has primary responsibility for overseeing the enforcement of State criminal laws'' after ''State'',

(III) in clause (i) by striking ''or the administration of juvenile justice'' and inserting '', the administration of juvenile justice, or the reduction of juvenile delinquency'',

(IV) in clause (ii) by striking ''include—'' and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of subclause (VIII), and inserting the following:

''represent a multidisciplinary approach to addressing juvenile delinquency and may include—

''(I) individuals who represent units of general local government, law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies, public agencies concerned with the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency and with the adjudication of juveniles, representatives of juveniles, or nonprofit private organizations, particularly such organizations that serve juveniles; and

''(II) such other individuals as the chief executive officer considers to be appropriate; and'', and

(V) by striking clauses (iv) and (v),

(iii) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''justice'' and inserting ''crime control'',

(iv) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) in clause (i) by inserting ''and'' at the end,

(II) in clause (ii) by striking ''paragraphs'' and all that follows through ''part E'', and inserting ''paragraphs (11), (12), and (13)'', and

(III) by striking clause (iii), and

(v) in subparagraph (E) by striking ''title—'' and all that follows through ''(ii)'' and inserting ''title,'',

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking '', other than'' and inserting ''reduced by the percentage (if any) specified by the State under the authority of paragraph (25) and excluding'' after ''section 222'', and

''(ii) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''paragraphs (12)(A), (13), and (14)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (11), (12), and (13)'',

(D) by striking paragraph (6),

(E) in paragraph (7) by inserting '', including in rural areas'' before the semicolon at the end,

(F) in paragraph (8)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''for (i)'' and all that follows through ''relevant jurisdiction'', and inserting ''for an analysis of juvenile delinquency problems in, and the juvenile delinquency control and delinquency prevention needs (including educational needs) of, the State'',

(II) by striking ''justice'' the second place it appears and inserting ''crime control'', and

(III) by striking ''of the jurisdiction; (ii)'' and all that follows through the semicolon at the end, and inserting ''of the State; and'',

(ii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) contain—

''(i) a plan for providing needed gender-specific services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

''(ii) a plan for providing needed services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency in rural areas; and

''(iii) a plan for providing needed mental health services to juveniles in the juvenile justice system;'', and

(iii) by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D),

(G) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

''(9) provide for the coordination and maximum utilization of existing juvenile delinquency programs, programs operated by public and private agencies and organizations, and other related programs (such as education, special education, recreation, health, and welfare programs) in the State;'',

(H) in paragraph (10)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking '', specifically'' and inserting ''including'',

(II) by striking clause (i), and

(III) redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively,

(ii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) programs that assist in holding juveniles accountable for their actions, including the use of graduated sanctions and of neighborhood courts or panels that increase victim satisfaction and require juveniles to make restitution for the damage caused by their delinquent behavior;'',

(iii) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''juvenile justice'' and inserting ''juvenile crime control'',

(iv) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

''(D) programs that provide treatment to juvenile offenders who are victims of child abuse or neglect, and to their families, in order to reduce the likelihood that such juvenile offenders will commit subsequent violations of law;'',

(v) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and

(II) by striking ''juveniles, provided'' and all that follows through ''provides; and'', and inserting the following:

''juveniles—

''(i) to encourage juveniles to remain in elementary and secondary schools or in alternative learning situations;

''(ii) to provide services to assist juveniles in making the transition to the world of work and self-sufficiency; and'',

(vi) by amending subparagraph (F) to read as follows:

''(F) expanding the use of probation officers—

''(i) particularly for the purpose of permitting nonviolent juvenile offenders (including status offenders) to remain at home with their families as an alternative to incarceration or institutionalization; and

''(ii) to ensure that juveniles follow the terms of their probation;'',

(vii) by amending subparagraph (G) to read as follows:

''(G) one-on-one mentoring programs that are designed to link at-risk juveniles and juvenile offenders, particularly juveniles residing in high-crime areas and juveniles experiencing educational failure, with responsible adults (such as law enforcement officers, adults working with local businesses, and adults working with community-based organizations and agencies) who are properly screened and trained;'',

(viii) in subparagraph (H) by striking ''handicapped youth'' and inserting ''juveniles with disabilities'',

(ix) by amending subparagraph (K) to read as follows:

''(K) boot camps for juvenile offenders;'',

(x) by amending subparagraph (L) to read as follows:

''(L) community-based programs and services to work with juveniles, their parents, and other family members during and after incarceration in order to strengthen families so that such juveniles may be retained in their homes;'',

(xi) by amending subparagraph (M) to read as follows:

''(M) other activities (such as court-appointed advocates) that the State determines will hold juveniles accountable for their acts and decrease juvenile involvement in delinquent activities;'',

(xii) by amending subparagraph (N) to read as follows:

''(N) establishing policies and systems to incorporate relevant child protective services records into juvenile justice records for purposes of establishing treatment plans for juvenile offenders;'',

(xiii) in subparagraph (O)—

(I) in striking ''cultural'' and inserting ''other'', and

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon, and

(xiv) by adding at the end the following:

''(P) a system of records relating to any adjudication of juveniles less than 18 years of age who are adjudicated delinquent for conduct that would be a violent crime if committed by an adult, that is—

''(i) equivalent to the records that would be kept of adults arrested for such conduct, including fingerprints and photographs;

''(ii) submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the same manner as adult records are so submitted;

''(iii) retained for a period of time that is equal to the period of time records are retained for adults; and

''(iv) available on an expedited basis to law enforcement agencies, the courts, and school officials (and such school officials shall be subject to the same standards and penalties that law enforcement and juvenile justice system employees are subject to under Federal and State law, for handling and disclosing such information);

''(Q) programs that utilize multidisciplinary interagency case management and information sharing, that enable the juvenile justice and law enforcement agencies, schools, and social service agencies to make more informed decisions regarding early identification, control, supervision, and treatment of juveniles who repeatedly commit violent or serious delinquent acts; and

''(R) programs designed to prevent and reduce hate crimes committed by juveniles.'',

(I) by amending paragraph (12) to read as follows:

''(12) shall, in accordance with rules issued by the Administrator, provide that—

''(A) juveniles who are charged with or who have committed an offense that would not be criminal if committed by an adult, excluding—

''(i) juveniles who are charged with or who have committed a violation of section 922(x)(2) of title 18, United States Code, or of a similar State law;

''(ii) juveniles who are charged with or who have committed a violation of a valid court order; and

''(iii) juveniles who are held in accordance with the Interstate Compact on Juveniles as enacted by the State;

shall not be placed in secure detention facilities or secure correctional facilities; and

''(B) juveniles—

''(i) who are not charged with any offense; and

''(ii) who are—

''(I) aliens; or

''(II) alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused;

shall not be placed in secure detention facilities or secure correctional facilities;'',

(J) by amending paragraph (13) to read as follows:

''(13) provide that—

''(A) juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent, and juveniles within the purview of paragraph (11), will not be detained or confined in any institution in which they have regular contact, or unsupervised incidental contact, with adults incarcerated because such adults have been convicted of a crime or are awaiting trial on criminal charges; and

''(B) there is in effect in the State a policy that requires individuals who work with both such juveniles and such adults in co-located facilities have been trained and certified to work with juveniles;'',

(K) by amending paragraph (14) to read as follows:

''(14) provide that no juvenile will be detained or confined in any jail or lockup for adults except—

''(A) juveniles who are accused of nonstatus offenses and who are detained in such jail or lockup for a period not to exceed 6 hours—

''(i) for processing or release;

''(ii) while awaiting transfer to a juvenile facility; or

''(iii) in which period such juveniles make a court appearance;

''(B) juveniles who are accused of nonstatus offenses, who are awaiting an initial court appearance that will occur within 48 hours after being taken into custody (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays), and who are detained or confined in a jail or lockup—

''(i) in which—

''(I) such juveniles do not have regular contact, or unsupervised incidental contact, with adults incarcerated because such adults have been convicted of a crime or are awaiting trial on criminal charges; and

''(II) there is in effect in the State a policy that requires individuals who work with both such juveniles and such adults in co-located facilities have been trained and certified to work with juveniles; and

''(ii) that—

''(I) is located outside a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget);

''(II) has no existing acceptable alternative placement available;

''(III) is located where conditions of distance to be traveled or the lack of highway, road, or transportation do not allow for court appearances within 48 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) so that a brief (not to exceed an additional 48 hours) delay is excusable; or

''(IV) is located where conditions of safety exist (such as severe adverse, life-threatening weather conditions that do not allow for reasonably safe travel), in which case the time for an appearance may be delayed until 24 hours after the time that such conditions allow for reasonable safe travel;

''(C) juveniles who are accused of nonstatus offenses and who are detained or confined in a jail or lockup that satisfies the requirements of subparagraph (B)(i) if—

''(i) such jail or lockup—

''(I) is located outside a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget); and

''(II) has no existing acceptable alternative placement available;

''(ii) a parent or other legal guardian (or guardian ad litem) of the juvenile involved consents to detaining or confining such juvenile in accordance with this subparagraph and has the right to revoke such consent at any time;

''(iii) the juvenile has counsel, and the counsel representing such juvenile has an opportunity to present the juvenile's position regarding the detention or confinement involved to the court before the court approves such detention or confinement; and

''(iv) detaining or confining such juvenile in accordance with this subparagraph is—

''(I) approved in advance by a court with competent jurisdiction that has determined that such placement is in the best interest of such juvenile;

''(II) required to be reviewed periodically, at intervals of not more than 5 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays), by such court for the duration of detention or confinement; and

''(III) for a period preceding the sentencing (if any) of such juvenile;'',

(L) in paragraph (15)—

(i) by striking ''paragraph (12)(A), paragraph (13), and paragraph (14)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (11), (12), and (13)'', and

(ii) by striking ''paragraph (12)(A) and paragraph (13)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (11) and (12)'',

(M) in paragraph (16) by striking ''mentally, emotionally, or physically handicapping conditions'' and inserting ''disability'',

(N) by amending paragraph (19) to read as follows:

''(19) provide assurances that—

''(A) any assistance provided under this Act will not cause the displacement (including a partial displacement, such as a reduction in the hours of nonovertime work, wages, or employment benefits) of any currently employed employee;

''(B) activities assisted under this Act will not impair an existing collective bargaining relationship, contract for services, or collective bargaining agreement; and

''(C) no such activity that would be inconsistent with the terms of a collective bargaining agreement shall be undertaken without the written concurrence of the labor organization involved;'',

(O) by amending paragraph (23) to read as follows:

''(23) address juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority groups, who come into contact with the juvenile justice system;'',

(P) by amending paragraph (24) to read as follows:

''(24) provide that if a juvenile is taken into custody for violating a valid court order issued for committing a status offense—

''(A) an appropriate public agency shall be promptly notified that such juvenile is held in custody for violating such order;

''(B) not later than 24 hours during which such juvenile is so held, an authorized representative of such agency shall interview, in person, such juvenile; and

''(C) not later than 48 hours during which such juvenile is so held—

''(i) such representative shall submit an assessment to the court that issued such order, regarding the immediate needs of such juvenile; and

''(ii) such court shall conduct a hearing to determine—

''(I) whether there is reasonable cause to believe that such juvenile violated such order; and

''(II) the appropriate placement of such juvenile pending disposition of the violation alleged;'',

(Q) in paragraph (25) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon,

(R) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (25) as paragraphs (6) through (24), respectively, and

(S) by adding at the end the following:

''(25) specify a percentage (if any), not to exceed 5 percent, of funds received by the State under section 222 (other than funds made available to the state advisory group under section 222(d)) that the State will reserve for expenditure by the State to provide incentive grants to units of general local government that reduce the caseload of probation officers within such units, and

''(26) provide that the State, to the maximum extent practicable, will implement a system to ensure that if a juvenile is before a court in the juvenile justice system, public child welfare records (including child protective services records) relating to such juvenile that are on file in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such court will be made known to such court.'', and

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) If a State fails to comply with any of the applicable requirements of paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (22) of subsection (a) in any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1997, then the amount allocated to such State for the subsequent fiscal year shall be reduced by not to exceed 12.5 percent for each such paragraph with respect to which the failure occurs, unless the Administrator determines that the State—

''(1) has achieved substantial compliance with such applicable requirements with respect to which the State was not in compliance; and

''(2) has made, through appropriate executive or legislative action, an unequivocal commitment to achieving full compliance with such applicable requirements within a reasonable time.'', and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking ''allotment'' and inserting ''allocation'', and

(B) by striking ''subsection (a) (12)(A), (13), (14) and (23)'' each place it appears and inserting ''paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (22) of subsection (a)''.

**SEC. 110. JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.**

Title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5611 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking parts C, D, E, F, G, and H,

(2) by striking the 1st part I,

(3) by redesignating the 2nd part I as part F, and

(4) by inserting after part B the following:

**''PART C—JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM**

**''SEC. 241. AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.**

''The Administrator may make grants to eligible States, from funds allocated under section 242, for the purpose of providing financial assistance to eligible entities to carry out projects designed to prevent juvenile delinquency, including—

''(1) projects that assist in holding juveniles accountable for their actions, including the use of neighborhood courts or panels that increase victim satisfaction and require juveniles to make restitution, or perform community service, for the damage caused by their delinquent acts;

''(2) projects that provide treatment to juvenile offenders who are victims of child abuse or neglect, and to their families, in order to reduce the likelihood that such juvenile offenders will commit subsequent violations of law;

''(3) educational projects or supportive services for delinquent or other juveniles—

''(A) to encourage juveniles to remain in elementary and secondary schools or in alternative learning situations in educational settings;

''(B) to provide services to assist juveniles in making the transition to the world of work and self-sufficiency;

''(C) to assist in identifying learning difficulties (including learning disabilities);

''(D) to prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions;

''(E) to encourage new approaches and techniques with respect to the prevention of school violence and vandalism;

''(F) which assist law enforcement personnel and juvenile justice personnel to more effectively recognize and provide for learning-disabled and other handicapped juveniles; or

''(G) which develop locally coordinated policies and programs among education, juvenile justice, and social service agencies;

''(4) projects which expand the use of probation officers—

''(A) particularly for the purpose of permitting nonviolent juvenile offenders (including status offenders) to remain at home with their families as an alternative to incarceration or institutionalization; and

''(B) to ensure that juveniles follow the terms of their probation;

''(5) one-on-one mentoring projects that are designed to link at-risk juveniles and juvenile offenders who did not commit serious crime, particularly juveniles residing in high-crime areas and juveniles experiencing educational failure, with responsible adults (such as law enforcement officers, adults working with local businesses, and adults working for community-based organizations and agencies) who are properly screened and trained;

''(6) community-based projects and services (including literacy and social service programs) which work with juvenile offenders, including those from families with limited English-speaking proficiency, their parents, their siblings, and other family members during and after incarceration of the juvenile offenders, in order to strengthen families, to allow juvenile offenders to be retained in their homes, and to prevent the involvement of other juvenile family members in delinquent activities;

''(7) projects designed to provide for the treatment of juveniles for dependence on or abuse of alcohol, drugs, or other harmful substances;

''(8) projects which leverage funds to provide scholarships for postsecondary education and training for low-income juveniles who reside in neighborhoods with high rates of poverty, violence, and drug-related crimes;

''(9) projects which provide for an initial intake screening of each juvenile taken into custody—

''(A) to determine the likelihood that such juvenile will commit a subsequent offense; and

''(B) to provide appropriate interventions to prevent such juvenile from committing subsequent offenses;

''(10) projects (including school- or community-based projects) that are designed to prevent, and reduce the rate of, the participation of juveniles in gangs that commit crimes (particularly violent crimes), that unlawfully use firearms and other weapons, or that unlawfully traffic in drugs and that involve, to the extent practicable, families and other community members (including law enforcement personnel and members of the business community) in the activities conducted under such projects;

''(11) comprehensive juvenile justice and delinquency prevention projects that meet the needs of juveniles through the collaboration of the many local service systems juveniles encounter, including schools, courts, law enforcement agencies, child protection agencies, mental health agencies, welfare services, health care agencies, and private nonprofit agencies offering services to juveniles;

''(12) to develop, implement, and support, in conjunction with public and private agencies, organizations, and businesses, projects for the employment of juveniles and referral to job training programs (including referral to Federal job training programs);

''(13) delinquency prevention activities which involve youth clubs, sports, recreation and parks, peer counseling and teaching, the arts, leadership development, community service, volunteer service, before- and after-school programs, violence prevention activities, mediation skills training, camping, environmental education, ethnic or cultural enrichment, tutoring, and academic enrichment;

''(14) to establish policies and systems to incorporate relevant child protective services records into juvenile justice records for purposes of establishing treatment plans for juvenile offenders;

''(15) family strengthening activities, such as mutual support groups for parents and their children;

''(16) programs that encourage social competencies, problem-solving skills, and communication skills, youth leadership, and civic involvement;

''(17) programs that focus on the needs of young girls at-risk of delinquency or status offenses; and

''(18) other activities that are likely to prevent juvenile delinquency.

**''SEC. 242. ALLOCATION.**

''Funds appropriated to carry out this part shall be allocated among eligible States as follows:

''(1) Fifty percent of such amount shall be allocated proportionately based on the population that is less than 18 years of age in the eligible States.

''(2) Fifty percent of such amount shall be allocated proportionately based on the annual average number of arrests for serious crimes committed in the eligible States by juveniles during the then most recently completed period of 3 consecutive calendar years for which sufficient information is available to the Administrator.

**''SEC. 243. ELIGIBILITY OF STATES.**

''(a) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 241, a State shall submit to the Administrator an application that contains the following:

''(1) An assurance that the State will use—

''(A) not more than 5 percent of such grant, in the aggregate, for—

''(i) the costs incurred by the State to carry out this part; and

''(ii) to evaluate, and provide technical assistance relating to, projects and activities carried out with funds provided under this part; and

''(B) the remainder of such grant to make grants under section 244.

''(2) An assurance that, and a detailed description of how, such grant will support, and not supplant State and local efforts to prevent juvenile delinquency.

''(3) An assurance that such application was prepared after consultation with and participation by community-based organizations, and organizations in the local juvenile justice system, that carry out programs, projects, or activities to prevent juvenile delinquency.

''(4) An assurance that each eligible entity described in section 244(a) that receives an initial grant under section 244 to carry out a project or activity shall also receive an assurance from the State that such entity will receive from the State, for the subsequent fiscal year to carry out such project or activity, a grant under such section in an amount that is proportional, based on such initial grant and on the amount of the grant received under section 241 by the State for such subsequent fiscal year, but that does not exceed the amount specified for such subsequent fiscal year in such application as approved by the State.

''(5) Such other information and assurances as the Administrator may reasonably require by rule.

''(b) APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Administrator shall approve an application, and amendments to such application submitted in subsequent fiscal years, that satisfy the requirements of subsection (a).

''(2) LIMITATION.—The Administrator may not approve such application (including amendments to such application) for a fiscal year unless—

''(A)(i) the State submitted a plan under section 223 for such fiscal year; and

''(ii) such plan is approved by the Administrator for such fiscal year; or

''(B) the Administrator waives the application of subparagraph (A) to such State for such fiscal year, after finding good cause for such a waiver.

**''SEC. 244. GRANTS FOR LOCAL PROJECTS.**

''(a) SELECTION FROM AMONG APPLICATIONS.—(1) Using a grant received under section 241, a State may make grants to eligible entities whose applications are received by the State in accordance with subsection (b) to carry out projects and activities described in section 241.

''(2) For purposes of making such grants, the State shall give special consideration to eligible entities that—

''(A) propose to carry out such projects in geographical areas in which there is—

''(i) a disproportionately high level of serious crime committed by juveniles; or

''(ii) a recent rapid increase in the number of nonstatus offenses committed by juveniles;

''(B)(i) agreed to carry out such projects or activities that are multidisciplinary and involve 2 or more eligible entities; or

''(ii) represent communities that have a comprehensive plan designed to identify at-risk juveniles and to prevent or reduce the rate of juvenile delinquency, and that involve other entities operated by individuals who have a demonstrated history of involvement in activities designed to prevent juvenile delinquency; and

''(C) the amount of resources (in cash or in kind) such entities will provide to carry out such projects and activities.

''(b) RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), a unit of general local government shall submit to the State simultaneously all applications that are—

''(A) timely received by such unit from eligible entities; and

''(B) determined by such unit to be consistent with a current plan formulated by such unit for the purpose of preventing, and reducing the rate of, juvenile delinquency in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such unit.

''(2) If an application submitted to such unit by an eligible entity satisfies the requirements specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1), such entity may submit such application directly to the State.

**''SEC. 245. ELIGIBILITY OF ENTITIES.**

''(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Subject to subsections (b) and except as provided in subsection (c), to be eligible to receive a grant under section 244, a community-based organization, local juvenile justice system officials (including prosecutors, police officers, judges, probation officers, parole officers, and public defenders), local education authority (as defined in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and including a school within such authority), nonprofit private organization, unit of general local government, or social service provider, and or other entity with a demonstrated history of involvement in the prevention of juvenile delinquency, shall submit to a unit of general local government an application that contains the following:

''(1) An assurance that such applicant will use such grant, and each such grant received for the subsequent fiscal year, to carry out throughout a 2-year period a project or activity described in reasonable detail, and of a kind described in one or more of paragraphs (1) through (14) of section 241 as specified in, such application.

''(2) A statement of the particular goals such project or activity is designed to achieve, and the methods such entity will use to achieve, and assess the achievement of, each of such goals.

''(3) A statement identifying the research (if any) such entity relied on in preparing such application.

''(b) REVIEW AND SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), an entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under section 244 unless—

''(1) such entity submits to a unit of general local government an application that—

''(A) satisfies the requirements specified in subsection (a); and

''(B) describes a project or activity to be carried out in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such unit; and

''(2) such unit determines that such project or activity is consistent with a current plan formulated by such unit for the purpose of preventing, and reducing the rate of, juvenile delinquency in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such unit.

''(c) LIMITATION.—If an entity that receives a grant under section 244 to carry out a project or activity for a 2-year period, and receives technical assistance from the State or the Administrator after requesting such technical assistance (if any), fails to demonstrate, before the expiration of such 2-year period, that such project or such activity has achieved substantial success in achieving the goals specified in the application submitted by such entity to receive such grants, then such entity shall not be eligible to receive any subsequent grant under such section to continue to carry out such project or activity.''.

**SEC. 111. RESEARCH; EVALUATION; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE; TRAINING.**

Title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5611 et seq.) is amended by inserting after part C, as added by section 110, the following:

**''PART D—RESEARCH; EVALUATION; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE; TRAINING**

**''SEC. 251. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION; STATISTICAL ANALYSES; INFORMATION DISSEMINATION**

''(a) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—(1) The Administrator may—

''(A) plan and identify, after consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Justice, the purposes and goals of all agreements carried out with funds provided under this subsection; and

''(B) make agreements with the National Institute of Justice or, subject to the approval of the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs, with another Federal agency authorized by law to conduct research or evaluation in juvenile justice matters, for the purpose of providing research and evaluation relating to—

''(i) the prevention, reduction, and control of juvenile delinquency and serious crime committed by juveniles;

''(ii) the link between juvenile delinquency and the incarceration of members of the families of juveniles;

''(iii) successful efforts to prevent first-time minor offenders from committing subsequent involvement in serious crime;

''(iv) successful efforts to prevent recidivism;

''(v) the juvenile justice system;

''(vi) juvenile violence; and

''(vii) other purposes consistent with the purposes of this title and title I.

''(2) The Administrator shall ensure that an equitable amount of funds available to carry out paragraph (1)(B) is used for research and evaluation relating to the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

''(b) STATISTICAL ANALYSES.—The Administrator may—

''(1) plan and identify, after consultation with the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the purposes and goals of all agreements carried out with funds provided under this subsection; and

''(2) make agreements with the Bureau of Justice Statistics, or subject to the approval

of the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs, with another Federal agency authorized by law to undertake statistical work in juvenile justice matters, for the purpose of providing for the collection, analysis, and dissemination of statistical data and information relating to juvenile delinquency and serious crimes committed by juveniles, to the juvenile justice system, to juvenile violence, and to other purposes consist with the purposes of this title and title I.

''(c) COMPETITIVE SELECTION PROCESS.—The Administrator shall use a competitive process, established by rule by the Administrator, to carry out subsections (a) and (b).

''(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENTS.—A Federal agency that makes an agreement under subsections (a)(1)(B) and (b)(2) with the Administrator may carry out such agreement directly or by making grants to or contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations.

''(e) INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.—The Administrator may—

''(1) review reports and data relating to the juvenile justice system in the United States and in foreign nations (as appropriate), collect data and information from studies and research into all aspects of juvenile delinquency (including the causes, prevention, and treatment of juvenile delinquency) and serious crimes committed by juveniles;

''(2) establish and operate, directly or by contract, a clearinghouse and information center for the preparation, publication, and dissemination of information relating to juvenile delinquency, including State and local prevention and treatment programs, plans, resources, and training and technical assistance programs; and

''(3) make grants and contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, for the purpose of disseminating information to representatives and personnel of public and private agencies, including practitioners in juvenile justice, law enforcement, the courts, corrections, schools, and related services, in the establishment, implementation, and operation of projects and activities for which financial assistance is provided under this title.

**''SEC. 252. TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**

''(a) TRAINING.—The Administrator may—

''(1) develop and carry out projects for the purpose of training representatives and personnel of public and private agencies, including practitioners in juvenile justice, law enforcement, courts, corrections, schools, and related services, to carry out the purposes specified in section 102; and

''(2) make grants to and contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations for the purpose of training representatives and personnel of public and private agencies, including practitioners in juvenile justice, law enforcement, courts, corrections, schools, and related services, to carry out the purposes specified in section 102.

''(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator may—

''(1) develop and implement projects for the purpose of providing technical assistance to representatives and personnel of public and private agencies and organizations, including practitioners in juvenile justice, law enforcement, courts, corrections, schools, and related services, in the establishment, implementation, and operation of programs, projects, and activities for which financial assistance is provided under this title; and

''(2) make grants to and contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, for the purpose of providing technical assistance to representatives and personnel of public and private agencies, including practitioners in juvenile justice, law enforcement, courts, corrections, schools, and related services, in the establishment, implementation, and operation of programs, projects, and activities for which financial assistance is provided under this title.''.

**SEC. 112. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**

Title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5611 et seq.) is amended by inserting after part D, as added by section 111, the following:

**''PART E—DEVELOPING, TESTING, AND DEMONSTRATING PROMISING NEW INITIATIVES AND PROGRAMS**

**''SEC. 261. GRANTS AND PROJECTS.**

''(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—The Administrator may make grants to and contracts with States, units of general local government, Indian tribal governments, public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals, or combinations thereof, to carry out projects for the development, testing, and demonstration of promising initiatives and programs for the prevention, control, or reduction of juvenile delinquency. The Administrator shall ensure that, to the extent reasonable and practicable, such grants are made to achieve an equitable geographical distribution of such projects throughout the United States.

''(b) USE OF GRANTS.—A grant made under subsection (a) may be used to pay all or part of the cost of the project for which such grant is made.

**''SEC. 262. GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**

''The Administrator may make grants to and contracts with public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals to provide technical assistance to States, units of general local government, Indian tribal governments, local private entities or agencies, or any combination thereof, to carry out the projects for which grants are made under section 261.

**''SEC. 263. ELIGIBILITY.**

''To be eligible to receive a grant made under this part, a public or private agency, Indian tribal government, organization, institution, individual, or combination thereof shall submit an application to the Administrator at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Administrator may reasonable require by rule.

**''SEC. 264. REPORTS.**

''Recipients of grants made under this part shall submit to the Administrator such reports as may be reasonably requested by the Administrator to describe progress achieved in carrying the projects for which such grants are made.''.

**SEC. 113. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

Section 299 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e), and

(2) by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c), and inserting the following:

''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TITLE II (EXCLUDING PARTS C AND E).—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title such sums as may be appropriate for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001.

''(2) Of such sums as are appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this title (other than parts C and E)—

''(A) not more than 5 percent shall be available to carry out part A;

''(B) not less than 80 percent shall be available to carry out part B; and

''(C) not more than 15 percent shall be available to carry out part D.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PART C.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part C such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PART E.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part E, and authorized to remain available until expended, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001.''.

**SEC. 114. ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY.**

Section 299A of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5672) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d) by striking ''as are consistent with the purpose of this Act'' and inserting ''only to the extent necessary to ensure that there is compliance with the specific requirements of this title or to respond to requests for clarification and guidance relating to such compliance'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) If a State requires by law compliance with the requirements described in paragraphs (11), (12), and (13) of section 223(a), then for the period such law is in effect in such State such State shall be rebuttably presumed to satisfy such requirements.''.

**SEC. 115. USE OF FUNDS.**

Section 299C of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5674) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''may be used for'',

(B) in paragraph (1) by inserting ''may be used for'' after ''(1)'', and

(C) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) may not be used for the cost of construction of any facility, except not more than 15 percent of the funds received under this title by a State for a fiscal year may be used for the purpose of renovating or replacing juvenile facilities.'',

(2) by striking subsection (b), and

(3) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

**SEC. 116. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.**

Part F of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671 et seq.), as so redesignated by section 110, is amended adding at the end the following:

**''SEC. 299F. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.**

''None of the funds made available to carry out this title may be used to advocate for, or support, the unsecured release of juveniles who are charged with a violent crime.''.

**SEC. 117. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Part F of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671 et seq.), as so redesignated by section 110 and amended by section 116, is amended adding at the end the following:

**''SEC. 299G. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**

''Nothing in this title or title I shall be construed—

''(1) to prevent financial assistance from being awarded through grants under this title to any otherwise eligible organization; or

''(2) to modify or affect any Federal or State law relating to collective bargaining rights of employees.''.

**SEC. 118. LEASING SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY.**

Part F of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671 et seq.), as so redesignated by section 110 and amended by section 117, is amended adding at the end the following:

**''SEC. 299H. LEASING SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY.**

''The Administrator may receive surplus Federal property (including facilities) and may lease such property to States and units of general local government for use in or as facilities for juvenile offenders, or for use in or as facilities for delinquency prevention and treatment activities.''.

**SEC. 119. ISSUANCE OF RULES.**

Part F of title II or the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671 et seq.), as so redesignated by section 110 and amended by section 118, is amended adding at the end the following:

**''SEC. 299I. ISSUANCE OF RULES.**

''The Administrator shall issue rules to carry out this title, including rules that establish procedures and methods for making grants and contracts, and distributing funds available, to carry out this title.''.

**SEC. 120. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**

(a) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 202(b) by striking ''prescribed for GS–18 of the General Schedule by section 5332'' and inserting ''payable under section 5376'',

(2) in section 221(b)(2) by striking the last sentence,

(3) in section 299D by striking subsection (d), and

(4) by striking titles IV and V, as originally enacted by Public Law 93–415 (88 Stat. 1132–1143).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 5315 of title 5 of the United States Code is amended by striking ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' and inserting ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention''.

(2) Section 4351(b) of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' and inserting ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention''.

(3) Subsections (a)(1) and (c) of section 3220 of title 39 of the United States Code is amended by striking ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' each place it appears and inserting ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention''.

(4) Section 463(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 663(f)) is amended by striking ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' and inserting ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention''.

(5) Sections 801(a), 804, 805, and 813 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3712(a), 3782, 3785, 3786, 3789i) are amended by striking ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' each place it appears and inserting ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention''.

(6) The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 214(b(1) by striking ''262, 293, and 296 of subpart II of title II'' and inserting ''299B and 299E'',

(B) in section 214A(c)(1) by striking ''262, 293, and 296 of subpart II of title II'' and inserting ''299B and 299E'',

(C) in sections 217 and 222 by striking ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' each place it appears and inserting ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention'', and

(D) in section 223(c) by striking ''section 262, 293, and 296'' and inserting ''sections 262, 299B, and 299E''.

(7) The Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 403(2) by striking ''Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' and inserting ''Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention'', and

(B) in subsections (a)(5)(E) and (b)(1)(B) of section 404 by striking ''section 313'' and inserting ''section 331''.

(8) The Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 217(c)(1) by striking ''sections 262, 293, and 296 of subpart II of title II'' and inserting ''sections 299B and 299E'', and

(B) in section 223(c) by striking ''section 262, 293, and 296 of title II'' and inserting ''sections 299B and 299E''.

**SEC. 121. REFERENCES.**

In any Federal law (excluding this Act and the Acts amended by this Act), Executive order, rule, regulation, order, delegation of authority, grant, contract, suit, or document—

(1) a reference to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention shall be deemed to include a reference to the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention, and

(2) a reference to the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention shall be deemed to include a reference to Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention.

## TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT

**SEC. 201. FINDINGS.**

Section 302 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5) by striking ''accurate reporting of the problem nationally'' and inserting ''an accurate national reporting system to report the problem,'', and

(2) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

''(8) services for runaway and homeless youth are needed in urban, suburban and rural areas;''.

**SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS FOR CENTERS AND SERVICES.**

Section 311 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5711) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a)(1) The Secretary shall make grants to public and nonprofit private entities (and combinations of such entities) to establish and operate (including renovation) local centers to provide services for runaway and homeless youth and for the families of such youth.

''(2) Such services—

''(A) shall be provided as an alternative to involving runaway and homeless youth in the law enforcement, child welfare, mental health, and juvenile justice systems;

''(B) shall include—

''(i) safe and appropriate shelter; and

''(ii) individual, family, and group counseling, as appropriate; and

''(C) may include—

''(i) street-based services;

''(ii) home-based services for families with youth at risk of separation from the family; and

''(iii) drug abuse education and prevention services.'',

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2) by striking ''the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,'', and

(B) by striking paragraph (4), and

(3) by striking subsections (c) and (d).

**SEC. 203. ELIGIBILITY.**

Section 312 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5712) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (8) by striking ''paragraph (6)'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)'',

(B) in paragraph (10) by striking ''and'' at the end,

(C) in paragraph (11) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'', and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) shall submit to the Secretary an annual report that includes—

''(A) information regarding the activities carried out under this part;

''(B) the achievements of the project under this part carried out by the applicant; and

''(C) statistical summaries describing—

''(i) the number and the characteristics of the runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of family separation, who participate in the project; and

''(ii) the services provided to such youth by the project;

in the year for which the report is submitted.'', and

(2) by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

''(c) To be eligible to use assistance under section 311(a)(2)(C)(i) to provide street-based services, the applicant shall include in the plan required by subsection (b) assurances that in providing such services the applicant will—

''(1) provide qualified supervision of staff, including on-street supervision by appropriately trained staff;

''(2) provide backup personnel for on-street staff;

''(3) provide initial and periodic training of staff who provide such services; and

''(4) conduct outreach activities for runaway and homeless youth, and street youth.

''(d) To be eligible to use assistance under section 311(a) to provide home-based services described in section 311(a)(2)(C)(ii), an applicant shall include in the plan required by subsection (b) assurances that in providing such services the applicant will—

''(1) provide counseling and information to youth and the families (including unrelated individuals in the family households) of such youth, including services relating to basic life skills, interpersonal skill building, educational advancement, job attainment skills, mental and physical health care, parenting skills, financial planning, and referral to sources of other needed services;

''(2) provide directly, or through an arrangement made by the applicant, 24-hour service to respond to family crises (including immediate access to temporary shelter for runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of separation from the family);

''(3) establish, in partnership with the families of runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of separation from the family, objectives and measures of success to be achieved as a result of receiving home-based services;

''(4) provide initial and periodic training of staff who provide home-based services; and

''(5) ensure that—

''(A) caseloads will remain sufficiently low to allow for intensive (5 to 20 hours per week) involvement with each family receiving such services; and

''(B) staff providing such services will receive qualified supervision.

''(e) To be eligible to use assistance under section 311(a)(2)(C)(iii) to provide drug abuse education and prevention services, an applicant shall include in the plan required by subsection (b)—

''(1) a description of—

''(A) the types of such services that the applicant proposes to provide;

''(B) the objectives of such services; and

''(C) the types of information and training to be provided to individuals providing such services to runaway and homeless youth; and

''(2) an assurance that in providing such services the applicant shall conduct outreach activities for runaway and homeless youth.''.

**SEC. 204. APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.**

Section 313 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5713) is amended to read as follows:

''APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

''SEC. 313. (a) An application by a public or private entity for a grant under section 311(a) may be approved by the Secretary after taking into consideration, with respect to the State in which such entity proposes to provide services under this part—

''(1) the geographical distribution in such State of the proposed services under this

part for which all grant applicants request approval; and

''(2) which areas of such State have the greatest need for such services.

''(b) The Secretary shall, in considering applications for grants under section 311(a), give priority to—

''(1) eligible applicants who have demonstrated experience in providing services to runaway and homeless youth; and

''(2) eligible applicants that request grants of less than $200,000.''.

**SEC. 205. AUTHORITY FOR TRANSITIONAL LIVING GRANT PROGRAM.**

Section 321 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–1) is amended—

(1) in the heading by striking ''PURPOSE AND'',

(2) in subsection (a) by striking ''(a)'', and

(3) by striking subsection (b).

**SEC. 206. ELIGIBILITY.**

Section 322(a)(9) of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–2(a)(9)) is amended by inserting '', and the services provided to such youth by such project,'' after ''such project''.

**SEC. 207. AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS FOR RESEARCH, EVALUATION, DEMONSTRATION, AND SERVICE PROJECTS.**

Section 343 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–23) is amended—

(1) in the heading of such section by inserting ''EVALUATION,'' after ''RESEARCH,'',

(2) in subsection (a) by inserting ''evaluation,'' after ''research,'', and

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2), and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (10) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively.

**SEC. 208. TEMPORARY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO PROVIDE SERVICES TO YOUTH IN RURAL AREAS.**

Section 344 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–24) is repealed.

**SEC. 209. SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM.**

Section 40155 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322; 108 Stat. 1922) is amended to read as follows:

**''SEC. 40155. EDUCATION AND PREVENTION GRANTS TO REDUCE SEXUAL ABUSE OF RUNAWAY, HOMELESS, AND STREET YOUTH.**

''(a) AUTHORITY FOR PROGRAM.—The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

''(1) by striking the heading for part F,

''(2) by redesignating part E as part F, and

''(3) by inserting after part D the following:

**'''PART E—SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM**

**'''SEC. 351. AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.**

'''(a) The Secretary may make grants to nonprofit private agencies for the purpose of providing street-based services to runaway and homeless, and street youth, who have been subjected to, or are at risk of being subjected to, sexual abuse.

'''(b) In selecting applicants to receive grants under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to non-profit private agencies that have experience in providing services to runaway and homeless, and street youth.'.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 389(a) of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5751), as amended by section 213 of the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1997, is amended by adding at the end the following:

'''(4) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part E such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001.' ''.

**SEC. 210. ASSISTANCE TO POTENTIAL GRANTEES.**

Section 371 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714a) is amended by striking the last sentence.

**SEC. 211. REPORTS.**

Section 381 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5715) is amended to read as follows:

''REPORTS

''SEC. 381. (a) Not later than April 1, 1999, and at 2-year intervals thereafter, the Secretary shall submit, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, a report on the status, activities, and accomplishments of entities that receive grants under parts A, B, C, D, and E, with particular attention to—

''(1) in the case of centers funded under part A, the ability or effectiveness of such centers in—

''(A) alleviating the problems of runaway and homeless youth;

''(B) if applicable or appropriate, reuniting such youth with their families and encouraging the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and other services;

''(C) strengthening family relationships and encouraging stable living conditions for such youth; and

''(D) assisting such youth to decide upon a future course of action; and

''(2) in the case of projects funded under part B—

''(A) the number and characteristics of homeless youth served by such projects;

''(B) the types of activities carried out by such projects;

''(C) the effectiveness of such projects in alleviating the problems of homeless youth;

''(D) the effectiveness of such projects in preparing homeless youth for self-sufficiency;

''(E) the effectiveness of such projects in assisting homeless youth to decide upon future education, employment, and independent living;

''(F) the ability of such projects to encourage the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and development of self-sufficient living skills; and

''(G) activities and programs planned by such projects for the following fiscal year.

''(b) The Secretary shall include in the report required by subsection (a) summaries of—

''(1) the evaluations performed by the Secretary under section 386; and

''(2) descriptions of the qualifications of, and training provided to, individuals involved in carrying out such evaluations.''.

**SEC. 212. EVALUATION.**

Section 384 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5732) is amended to read as follows:

''EVALUATION AND INFORMATION

''SEC. 384. (a) If a grantee receives grants for 3 consecutive fiscal years under part A, B, C, D, or E (in the alternative), then the Secretary shall evaluate such grantee on-site, not less frequently than once in the period of such 3 consecutive fiscal years, for purposes of—

''(1) determining whether such grants are being used for the purposes for which such grants are made by the Secretary;

''(2) collecting additional information for the report required by section 383; and

''(3) providing such information and assistance to such grantee as will enable such grantee to improve the operation of the centers, projects, and activities for which such grants are made.

''(b) Recipients of grants under this title shall cooperate with the Secretary's efforts to carry out evaluations, and to collect information, under this title.''.

**SEC. 213. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

Section 385 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5751) is amended to read as follows:

''AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

''SEC. 389. (a)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title (other than part E) such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001.

''(2)(A) From the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve not less than 90 percent to carry out parts A and B.

''(B) Of the amount reserved under subparagraph (A), not less than 20 percent, and not more than 30 percent, shall be reserved to carry out part B.

''(3) After reserving the amounts required by paragraph (2), the Secretary shall reserve the remaining amount (if any) to carry out parts C and D.

''(b) No funds appropriated to carry out this title may be combined with funds appropriated under any other Act if the purpose of combining such funds is to make a single discretionary grant, or a single discretionary payment, unless such funds are separately identified in all grants and contracts and are used for the purposes specified in this title.''.

**SEC. 214. CONSOLIDATED REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.**

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 384 the following:

''CONSOLIDATED REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS

''SEC. 385. With respect to funds available to carry out parts A, B, C, D, and E, nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary from—

''(1) announcing, in a single announcement, the availability of funds for grants under 2 or more of such parts; and

''(2) reviewing applications for grants under 2 or more of such parts in a single, consolidated application review process.''.

**SEC. 215. DEFINITIONS.**

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 385, as added by section 214, the following:

''DEFINITIONS

''SEC. 386. For the purposes of this title:

''(1) The term 'drug abuse education and prevention services'—

''(A) means services to runaway and homeless youth to prevent or reduce the illicit use of drugs by such youth; and

''(B) may include—

''(i) individual, family, group, and peer counseling;

''(ii) drop-in services;

''(iii) assistance to runaway and homeless youth in rural areas (including the development of community support groups);

''(iv) information and training relating to the illicit use of drugs by runaway and homeless youth, to individuals involved in providing services to such youth; and

''(v) activities to improve the availability of local drug abuse prevention services to runaway and homeless youth.

''(2) The term 'home-based services'—

''(A) means services provided to youth and their families for the purpose of—

''(i) preventing such youth from running away, or otherwise becoming separated, from their families; and

''(ii) assisting runaway youth to return to their families; and

''(B) includes services that are provided in the residences of families (to the extent practicable), including—

''(i) intensive individual and family counseling; and

''(ii) training relating to life skills and parenting.

''(3) The term 'homeless youth' means an individual—

''(A) who is—

''(i) not more than 21 years of age; and

''(ii) for the purposes of part B, not less than 16 years of age;

''(B) for whom it is not possible to live in a safe environment with a relative; and

''(C) who has no other safe alternative living arrangement.

''(4) The term 'street-based services'—

''(A) means services provided to runaway and homeless youth, and street youth, in areas where they congregate, designed to assist such youth in making healthy personal choices regarding where they live and how they behave; and

''(B) may include—

''(i) identification of and outreach to runaway and homeless youth, and street youth;

''(ii) crisis intervention and counseling;

''(iii) information and referral for housing;

''(iv) information and referral for transitional living and health care services;

''(v) advocacy, education, and prevention services related to—

''(I) alcohol and drug abuse;

''(II) sexually transmitted diseases, including human immunodeficiency virus (HIV); and

''(III) physical and sexual assault.

''(5) The term 'street youth' means an individual who—

''(A) is—

''(i) a runaway youth; or

''(ii) indefinitely or intermittently a homeless youth; and

''(B) spends a significant amount of time on the street or in other areas which increase the exposure of such youth to sexual abuse.

''(6) The term 'transitional living youth project' means a project that provides shelter and services designed to promote a transition to self-sufficient living and to prevent long-term dependency on social services.

''(7) The term 'youth at risk of separation from the family' means an individual—

''(A) who is less than 18 years of age; and

''(B)(i) who has a history of running away from the family of such individual;

''(ii) whose parent, guardian, or custodian is not willing to provide for the basic needs of such individual; or

''(iii) who is at risk of entering the child welfare system or juvenile justice system as a result of the lack of services available to the family to meet such needs.''.

**SEC. 216. REDESIGNATION OF SECTIONS.**

Sections 371, 372, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, and 386 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714b–5851 et seq.), as amended by this title, are redesignated as sections 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, and 388, respectively.

**SEC. 217. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**

Section 331 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking ''With'' and all that follows through ''the Secretary'', and inserting ''The Secretary''.

**TITLE III—REPEAL OF TITLE V RELATING TO INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR LOCAL DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAMS**

**SEC. 301. REPEALER.**

Title V of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5681 et seq.), as added by Public Law 102–586, is repealed.

**TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

**SEC. 401. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.**

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1997.

**TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS**

**SEC. 501. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER AND CLEARINGHOUSE FOR MISSING CHILDREN.**

(a) ALTERNATIVE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 to operate a national resource center and clearinghouse designed—

(1) to provide to State and local governments, public and private nonprofit agencies, and individuals information regarding—

(A) free or low-cost legal, restaurant, lodging, and transportation services that are available for the benefit of missing children and their families, and

(B) the existence and nature of programs being carried out by Federal agencies to assist missing children and their families,

(2) to coordinate public and private programs which locate, recover, or reunite missing children with their legal custodians,

(3) to disseminate nationally information about innovative and model missing children's programs, services, and legislation, and

(4) to provide technical assistance and training to law enforcement agencies, State and local governments, elements of the criminal justice system, public and private nonprofit agencies, and individuals in the prevention, investigation, prosecution, and treatment of missing and exploited child cases and in locating and recovering missing children.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 404(b) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking '', shall'',

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting ''shall'' after ''(A)'', and

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''coordinating'' and inserting ''shall coordinate'',

(3) in paragraph (2) by inserting ''for any fiscal year for which no funds are appropriated under section 2 of the Missing and Exploited Children Act of 1997, shall'' after ''(2)'',

(4) in paragraph (3) by inserting ''shall'' after ''(3)'', and

(5) in paragraph (4) by inserting ''shall'' after ''(4)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, combating juvenile crime is one of our most important domestic priorities, and it is an issue that has received a great deal of attention in recent months, both in this body and across the land.

Earlier this spring, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed H.R. 3, sponsored by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], my good friend. This was the Committee on the Judiciary bill that focused on the punishment of juvenile offenders through graduated sanctions and greater accountability for those offenders and their parents or guardians. At that time when we were debating the McCollum bill, many Members expressed a need to balance punishment with prevention. The bill before us today on the floor does just that.

Mr. Speaker, I want Members to know at the outset that Republicans want to control juvenile crime using a balanced approach which focuses on prevention and accountability and helping young people turn their lives around. As we have said all along, we have to balance harshness with hope through an approach that is tough on punishment but smart on prevention.

H.R. 1818 will assist States and local communities to develop strategies to combat the juvenile crime wave through a wide range of prevention and intervention programs. This juvenile crime wave has been called by some demographers, some criminologists, a time bomb waiting to go off if we fail to deal with the problem in an adequate manner.

H.R. 1818 is a bipartisan bill. It was the result of many hours of discussions involving the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], ranking member of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families that I chair, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], who played a lead role in crafting this legislation, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] and myself.

The legislation also reflects information gathered during subcommittee hearings, meetings with individuals in the juvenile justice community, and individual visits to juvenile facilities and prevention programs around the country. It draws, as well, from recommendations of the Clinton administration and bills introduced by other Members of both parties. This is good policy. It is a carefully constructed balance among the range of views on this issue.

H.R. 1818 streamlines current law, reduces burdensome State requirements, and provides States and local community-based providers with greater flexibility in addressing juvenile crime. It acknowledges that the most successful solutions to juvenile crime are developed at the State and local level by those who understand the unique characteristics of youth and of the juvenile crime problem in their area.

One of the most important features of this legislation is the creation of a new prevention block grant to States. All of the current discretionary programs, the separate categorical programs, are consolidated into this prevention block grant to the States. States and local communities are provided broad discretion in how to use the funds from this block grant. I would, however, hope that States would continue the same level of active partnership between the State and local governments and private nonprofit community-based organizations that has typified the administration of this act in the past.

For example, H.R. 1818 allows the use of funds for intervention and prevention activities such as antigang programs; mentoring, which we have

found to be one of the most successful means of diverting young people who are already in the juvenile justice system or young people at risk of coming into contact with the system from a life of crime; educational assistance; and job training and employment services. It also allows funds to be used for the development of systems of graduated sanctions and additional probation officers to monitor youth to assure that they abide by the terms of their probation.

Both of these activities are in fact forms of prevention. They are forms of prevention targeted at minor offenders, targeted at diverting those minor offenders from the justice system before they graduate to adult crimes and adult prisons. While the bill outlines a number of successful approaches for reducing and preventing juvenile crime, it does not limit the types of prevention activities carried out by local communities.

Mr. Speaker, another very important part of this legislation is the reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. These effective programs work to protect youth by keeping them off the streets, away from criminal activities and out of desperate circumstances. The act has been successful in meeting the needs of runaway and homeless youth and in reunifying these youth with their families.

□ 1230

I realize concerns have been raised concerning the elimination of the Independent Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The committee report accompanying H.R. 1818 clearly points out that we expect the administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to continue coordinating efforts among Federal departments and agencies which work with at-risk or delinquent youth. The report further states that nothing in the law would prevent the administrator from creating an informal coordinating council.

However, I would like to note that another available mechanism to achieve the creation of an official coordinating council would be for the President to establish such a council through an Executive Order.

Mr. Speaker, many members of our staff and the administration have contributed to our success today in moving this bill forward. The very fact we are able to move this bill forward on the Suspension Calendar, which is normally reserved for noncontroversial legislation, is a testament to the cooperative and bipartisan efforts of all parties involved. While it is impossible to thank everyone who has contributed to this legislation, there are several people who have been instrumental in helping us arrive at a consensus. I particularly want to thank our very dedicated staff members, Lynn Selmser, who is seated next to me, Erika Otto, Dan Dodgen, and Cheryl Johnson of the committee's majority and minority staff, Denise Forte with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] and Judy Borger with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

I also want to acknowledge the strong personal interest that Attorney General Reno took in this juvenile delinquency prevention legislation early on and express my appreciation to her deputy, Shay Bilchik, who, as the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, made a tremendous contribution to this legislation and whose advice was invaluable in crafting this legislation. I also want to extend the same recognition to John Wilson, Deputy Administrator, for his valuable contribution to the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the bill before us today provides the missing link in our efforts to combat juvenile crime. Combined with H.R. 3, it provides a balanced approach to addressing problems related to juvenile crime in our country, and it therefore deserves our strong support and commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, for as long as I have been in Congress, Republicans and Democrats have consistently differed on the right way to combat crime, especially juvenile crime. I experienced this difficulty as the last subcommittee chairman that reauthorized this act back in 1992. Fashioning bills related to crime which can gain the support of both parties was and still is extremely difficult.

The difference of opinion on how we can effectively combat crime, whether through prevention and early intervention or hard sanctions, consistently has divided our parties. As a Member who strongly believed in early intervention and primary intervention, I can attest to the great debate over these differences.

Having said this, though, I must admit I am truly amazed we are here today with a bipartisan bill. When the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the chairman, first proposed to engage Democrats in bipartisan discussions aimed at producing a bill we could all support, I had reservations. However, I believe the strong commitment of the chairman to work with us on the issues that were important to us on this side of the aisle is what truly held this process together. As a result, I strongly believe that this bill shows that we can work together and produce good public policy.

The legislation we are considering today arguably improves the vital provisions of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. The four core mandates of the act are maintained and have been modified in such a way to both strengthen the protections they provide and provide flexibility to deal with the real-life difficulties of dealing with juvenile offenders.

In addition, a dramatic new step is also taken by the creation of the community prevention block grant and the addition of important preadjudication based prevention language. This last point is extremely important, since we all know an ounce of prevention can result in a pound of cure.

Having extolled the virtues of the bill, I would like to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], and others for working through the many, many differences we had on this bill. The hours that we as Members spent and the many more hours which the staff spent have obviously produced the bipartisan and balanced product that we have all been seeking from the beginning and, in my opinion, was, therefore, well worth the efforts. The leadership of my colleagues on both sides of this issue has been essential to working to striking the compromise that we have reached.

Having thanked my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle, I would especially want to thank and single out the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] for being the true leader on this bill and the complex issues surrounding the debates over juvenile delinquency. Congressman Scott's leadership and his driving commitment to ensure that juveniles who commit delinquent acts are fairly treated was invaluable and is reflected in this legislation before us today.

In closing, I want to thank all Members and suggest that Members should realize the importance of this bill and the policies which are reflected in it. The strong primary prevention focus of the bill will give us the tools needed by those in the field to effectively deal with those at risk of committing delinquent acts. With this in mind, I urge all Members to vote for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], chairman of the full Committee on Education and the Workforce.

[Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, when we began this effort, I told the staff to keep working until they could see whether they could satisfy the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], and apparently we have done that, and so we are here today.

Also, when we started, I indicated that we want to deal with juvenile crime using a balanced approach, one of prevention and one of accountability.

In 1995, juveniles accounted for 32 percent of robbery arrests, 23 percent of weapons arrests, 15 percent of rape arrests, 13 percent of aggravated assault arrests and 9 percent of arrests

for murder. Those are pretty serious statistics. We also realized that we could not begin to build enough jails to try to deal with that issue, and it also would not be very wise to do only that.

So today we have before us the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act. It is an important bill which not only supports making juveniles accountable for their actions but which provides funds to States and local communities to design prevention programs to help youths turn their lives around.

Again, we allow the flexibility that we need to allow if local entities are going to do the things that have to be done to bring about the prevention as well as handling of the juveniles who we have difficulty turning around.

So in this bill we have combined many individual programs, many that were so small that they were totally ineffective, many that were duplicative and, above all, as I indicated, we give an opportunity for the local area to design the programs that they believe will work best for that area.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and I rise in strong support of the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act because I believe prevention programs that provide help to our troubled at-risk kids are key to reducing juvenile crime.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], and the staff on both sides for all of the work that they have put into this legislation.

I also support this bill because it retains four core mandates in the current law, especially the mandate that conditions funding under the bill to a bar on incarcerating juveniles in adult facilities.

Overall, children in institutions are five times more likely to be sexually assaulted, twice as likely to be beaten by staff, eight times more likely to commit suicide, and 58 percent more likely to be attacked with a weapon than in a juvenile facility.

Originally the bill provided an exception to that mandate for rural areas that I believe did not have enough safeguards; but because of the extreme dangers juveniles face in adult facilities and the bar placed on this practice for kids in metropolitan areas, I have worked with the subcommittee chairman to ensure that the rural exception is used only after great consideration and caution, and only under limited circumstances.

In that respect, Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the subcommittee chair in a colloquy, and ask of the chairman whether or not I am correct that the chairman's mark incorporates changes that will help us achieve those goals of providing for the safety of these people under the exception?

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I want to thank him for his contributions to the legislation; and, yes, he is correct in his assumption.

I agree with the gentleman that the rural exception should be just that, an exception. The rule under the bill is that a State is in compliance if it bars juvenile incarceration in an adult facility that exceeds a maximum of 48 hours, excluding weekends and holidays.

For rural areas, where there is no existing acceptable alternative, a juvenile may be placed prior to adjudication and sentencing in an adult facility if a number of conditions are met, and the gentleman may want to discuss those conditions.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Again, for a State to be in compliance under the bill, a juvenile in a rural area shall be detained in a juvenile facility unless the judge consults with the juvenile and his attorney and receives the consent of the juvenile's parent, decides that it is in the best interest of the juvenile for that child to be housed in a nearby adult facility.

But such a juvenile may only be incarcerated in an adult facility prior to adjudication and sentencing. Additionally, a parent may withdraw his or her consent to such an incarceration at any time.

Again, we intend for the rural exception to be invoked only in very limited situations.

While we have not detailed in the bill the criteria a judge should consider before invoking the exception, I will submit for the RECORD a list of criteria we believe that the court should consider.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we urge the court to use the rural exception carefully, and these criteria should provide the court with some assistance in rendering a decision on this issue. The committee believes it is important that the court consider the criteria in determining the relationship between the juvenile and their parents or guardian, the conditions in the jail or lockup facility, and the potential impact on the general welfare of the juvenile from being housed in such an adult facility.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have worked with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] to address his concerns.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, once again reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman for his remarks and again I want to thank him very much for his willingness to work on these concerns with both sides of the committee, and I do believe he has reported to the floor a bill that all Members of this House should support.

The criteria mentioned follows:

CRITERIA FOR RURAL EXCEPTION UNDER H.R. 1818

The court, in deciding whether to place a juvenile in an adult jail, should consider the following:

The potential impact on the juvenile's general welfare from being housed in an adult facility;

Whether the nearest juvenile detention facility is so far away as to preclude a parent from visiting the child;

Whether the child would have to be put into solitary confinement in the adult jail in order to comply with the separation requirements of this title;

Whether the staff in the adult jail is able to appropriately supervise the child due to training in the supervision of juveniles, and due to relevant staff/inmate ratios;

Whether, in the adult jail, there are appropriate intake procedures for juveniles, including medical and mental health screening;

Whether the adult jail would provide needed services for the child, especially educational services, social services and mental health services;

Whether there is a classification system in the adult jail that allows vulnerable juveniles to be separated from violent offenders; and

Whether the juvenile's counsel will have access to the juvenile to prepare properly for adjudicatory or other proceedings.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to also recognize Alex Nock, a staff member with the office of the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ]. That was an oversight on my part when we were citing the individuals, particularly at the staff level, who have made real contributions to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides relief for small rural law enforcement offices, while also protecting the rights of juveniles during presentencing.

States are currently required to remove juveniles from adult jails, and often juveniles arrested in rural areas have to be transported at great distances to jails that are far away, or perhaps far away from the families as well, and also at great local cost to taxpayers.

As has been indicated, particularly in the colloquy, under H.R. 1818 juveniles could be held in adult jails for longer periods of time if the parents and the court agree. An attorney for the juvenile can represent the concerns of the juvenile, but the ultimate decision rests, again, with the parents and the court. Now, the bill would continue the current requirement for sight and sound separation from adults.

Rural areas have been struggling for a long time to meet the requirements of existing law, often at the expense of providing needed prevention services to troubled youth. The bill would provide rural areas with flexibility to provide prevention programs and also hold a troubled youth in a local jail during presentencing.

Mr. Speaker, the House should pass H.R. 1818.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues are aware, I have been actively involved in this issue of juvenile crime, both as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and on the House Committee on the Judiciary.

From the outset of this discussion, I have said that Congress has a decision to make in fighting youth violence, and that is we can either play politics or we can reduce juvenile crime. H.R. 1818, I am happy to say, reflects a bipartisan desire not to play politics by codifying sound bites, instead it reflects a bipartisan commitment to reducing crime by funding proven crime prevention programs.

Mr. Speaker, we know that prevention programs work. We know that they often save more money than they cost. Head Start, for example, saves money by reducing the need for remedial education, welfare; in crime, Job Corps saves money by increasing employment and reducing crime; drug rehabilitation programs have been shown to save $7 to $10 for every dollar put in the program by reducing crime in health care expenses.

□ 1245

So we know of prevention programs that work to reduce crime and save money. This bill encourages communities to review the available research, to develop a crime prevention plan and to fund these prevention programs, programs that will help communities in their fight against crime and programs that are cost effective. Communities across the country are already doing this and they are seeing results.

In addition to the emphasis on prevention, H.R. 1818 keeps intact several important principles of juvenile justice. Since 1974, there have been concerted efforts to provide fundamental protections for youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

Many may not know that prior to 1974 it was common practice to lock up youth who commit what are called status offenses, noncriminal acts such as running away or being truant. These children, who had not committed crimes and were often in need of social services and not punishment, they were being locked up, often in adult jails. As a result, kids were increasingly at risk of assault or committing suicide.

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was enacted in 1974 to provide protection for children in these circumstances. The act required States to divert status offenders from the juvenile criminal system and place them in community-based alternatives where they would receive the appropriate interventions and appropriate services.

Due to the enactment of this law, the number of children committing suicide in detention has decreased dramatically. I applaud the cosponsors of the bill for this fundamental protection. This decision did not come easily.

But in May of this year, the House Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families heard unanimous, passionate, and eloquent testimony on this very issue from a bipartisan panel of witnesses. They implored us not to turn the clock back on these children and to maintain the current law, that no status offenders should be locked up.

H.R. 1818 maintains this protection and continues the underlying principle that no juveniles should be locked up with adults. These principles are the heart and soul of the act of 1974, and H.R. 1818 makes sure that there is no change.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for his bipartisan leadership and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], and my other colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] for their contributions and for the contribution of our staffs.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this bill. This is a vote for prevention and a vote to take politics out of the debate on juvenile crime.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], another member of the committee and one of the original bipartisan cosponsors of the legislation, and I want to thank him again for his role in helping to craft the legislation.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the juvenile judges of the juvenile courts in this country face a wide variety of young people. Sometimes brought before them are teenagers who already, because of the brutality of their upbringing, the deprivation of their upbringing, are so violent and vicious and predatory that they may in fact not be able to be redeemed or rehabilitated; and for the benefit and safety of society, they indeed do need to be locked away, sometimes for the rest of their lives.

Other kids come before the courts who, because of their immaturity, because of lack of proper parental guidance, have done some stupid things, got in trouble with the law, and these kids need to be treated firmly, but they need to be treated fairly and we need to see that they are steered away from a life of crime.

Some of the group of kids come before the courts because they have committed status offenses, something that would not be a crime if they were adults, but they are chronic truants, they run away from home. And they do that for a lot of reasons, and the courts need to decide whether this is a child who is simply incorrigible and needs some firmness, or whether this is a kid who is running away from abuse at home and needs to be protected from his or her own parents.

This act needs to thread that needle. This act needs to balance all those considerations, and we in the Congress have to give the State juvenile court judges the latitude they need. I think we have done this, and I would like to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the chairman of the subcommittee, for his excellent work, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and all the others. In all of our deliberations, never once did I feel that any of the participants were grandstanding or trying to politicize the issue. These are all Members who care deeply about children, and this product shows that and I would commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DELAHUNT].

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support this bill because I prosecuted violent criminals for more than 20 years; and unlike the juvenile crime bill we passed last May, I know this bill will work. It will reduce violence because instead of dictating policy from Washington, it relies on balanced, proven local initiatives which have worked in the real world, and it focuses on preventing crime, which is the best use of tax dollars.

In Boston, this balanced approach has already worked. Boston has not had a single juvenile homicide for more than 2 years. Yet the Washington-imposed mandates in the bill passed last May would preclude Boston and most other cities and towns in this Nation from even applying for Federal help.

Our communities do not need Washington telling them how to reduce violence. What they do need is resources to get the job done, and that is what this bill is about. I support it, and I want to extend my congratulations to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] the ranking member, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] for the fine work and the product which they have produced.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime and the author of H.R. 3, which we have referred to before.

(Mr. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for yielding to me, and I want to commend the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the subcommittee for this bill today that I rise to support, H.R. 1818.

It is an excellent bill. I believe that H.R. 3 and H.R. 1818 provide complements to each other in the juvenile justice system. We passed the juvenile crime bill, H.R. 3, back in May. It is designed to fix the broken juvenile system, to help the judges and repair the systems that are broken in terms of providing accountability and consequences to juveniles who commit misdemeanors and who commit even more serious crimes.

Today we are passing a bill which is carefully crafted on the prevention side, one that reauthorizes and revitalizes the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and I think it is a very excellent product.

I would like to remind my colleagues that, unfortunately, one out of every five violent crimes in this country are committed by juveniles, that more murders are committed by 18-year-olds than any other age group the last time that data was collected, and more rapes by 17-year-olds. Yet we see many young people who come in contact with the juvenile justice system who do not have those kinds of crimes. We have the truants that we heard about. We have lots who commit misdemeanor crimes that are not getting sanctions.

This bill today would modify some of the onerous burdens that were placed on the States in previous law, particularly that with regard to sight and sound separation, which resulted in some really unusual circumstances where you could not even have a juvenile walk past a booking desk where an adult prisoner might be seen; or you could not have the same cook, cook the food for juveniles who might cook for an adult, even though the child was separated completely from the adult prisoner, in a situation like that for presentencing periods or whatever it might be. I commend the committee for doing that.

I also think that the block grant program in this bill is a good improvement over the existing law, many kinds of categorical grants that were confusing. I believe that more flexibility for the States would allow for better results.

I want to make it explicitly clear that neither H.R. 3, the crime bill that passed in May, nor this bill, in any way authorizes or encourages housing juveniles with adults. There is a great myth out there in some of the op-ed pieces recently that says to the contrary. That is simply not true. There is nothing in the Federal system that has been changed with regard to current law in this regard.

To the extent that the language that is used in this bill is any different than that which has been used in the past, that is nonsense. No regular contact between juveniles and adult criminals during any stage of the justice process, pretrial, presentencing, or postsentencing, is allowed by H.R. 1818 or H.R. 3.

Furthermore, I would like to point out that in H.R. 3 we tried to get at putting consequences back into the system, the most important part of it being consequences for early juvenile delinquent acts, such as vandalizing a home or store or spray painting graffiti upon a warehouse. Right now, the system is overtaxed and overworked. There are not enough probation officers, judges, or detention facilities, and these early delinquent acts are not getting the kind of attention they need to get.

In many cases, the law enforcement officers are not even taking those vandals and misdemeanor juveniles before juvenile authorities, and when they do go before a judge, they do not get any kind of punishment until the 10th or 12th appearance. That is wrong. We need to put consequences in the act. We need to repair that broken system. It is badly broken right now.

For violent juvenile offenders, less than 10 percent of the violent offenders serve a single day in any institutionalized form of incarceration outside of the home. That is wrong, and that is what H.R. 3 is about repairing, as the primary thrust of that bill, not to treat juveniles as adults or house them with adults or whatever so much the language is about.

On the other hand, it needs to be complemented, that money, that $500 million a year in H.R. 3 for helping those juvenile justice systems to be repaired in the States needs to be complemented by the prevention programs that are here in this bill, to get at those youth primarily before they get involved in the juvenile court, and those options that are there for juvenile courts to prefer for prevention.

That is why this bill is so important. It provides that balance that is so carefully crafted, as part of $4 billion for at-risk youth that is available today in the Federal system. I urge the passage and adoption of H.R. 1818, and I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for yielding.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for yielding me the time.

Let me compliment everyone who has worked so long and hard on this bill to finally bring forth a juvenile justice bill which will focus on prevention, early prevention, and early detention if necessary.

I rise in support of this legislation, and in my support of this legislation I have a word of caution for the U.S. Congress, because I believe this bill is really a day late and a dollar short. This bill is a step in the right direction, although being a small juvenile step. It is in the right direction because this bill will address early prevention, early detection of juvenile crime.

Thus far in this Congress what we have seen with the Republican majority was H.R. 3, which was passed in May 1997 over strong objection on this side of the aisle, because what we did was put $1.5 billion over 3 years to lock up everybody.

Now the Federal Government really has no role in locking up juveniles when we only handle about 197 juveniles every year anyway. Where the focus should be, and we know these statistics, one out of every five juveniles are involved in serious juvenile crime, should be at the local level, the local initiative to try to have early prevention and early detention.

It is necessary that we have this type of bill. I wish we would have had it earlier. I wish this bill had money placed in it instead of just a sum certain, because it is necessary. The only way for people to feel safe in their homes and their communities is to prevent crime in the first place, prevent it before it occurs, prevent it before the juvenile is caught up in a never-ending juvenile justice system, and this bill will address that through early intervention.

So H.R. 1818 takes a step and one of the first steps in prevention and early intervention, but it is only a step. When it comes to funding it, it just says a sum certain. I am certain, after 12 years of working the streets and highways of Michigan in law enforcement, that we will never arrest our way out of juvenile crime. We must address it at the early initiatives and give flexibility to local units of government for local concerns and local needs and local issues.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the chairman, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], the ranking member, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman of the full Committee on Education and the Workforce. This is a bipartisan effort, and it is a recognition that one of the most important things we can do is to have preventive programs for our young people.

I serve a district with 10 communities. There are three major cities, the cities of Stamford, Norwalk, and Bridgeport, where we have serious juvenile crime problems. If you meet with the chiefs of police of any of those three cities, they will tell you one basic thing: ''Give us prevention programs for our kids.''

I attended a Memorial Day parade in Fairfield, CT, a suburban community next to Bridgeport, CT. The parade route was lined with people and lots of

kids. Then came the Indian Princesses, the Indian Guides, the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the soccer team, the high school band, the junior high school band. It went on for almost 2 hours.

□ 1300

That kind of parade in the city of Bridgeport would have lasted about 10 minutes. I think that sometimes, those of us who live in the suburbs take these extra curricular programs for granted. In the town of Fairfield, the challenge for kids is what don't you do after school. They have a tremendous overload of choices. But in the neighboring city of Bridgeport, the question is what do you do. A kid in many of our urban areas, when 2 o'clock is out, they are out, without adult supervision, without the kind of programs we need. I am absolutely convinced that preventative programs are the best way to combat crime. The city of Bridgeport has a program in Longfellow School. On Saturdays they bring kids in to do academic programs and to have some recreational programs. All are adult supervised, with discipline and rules. The kids hunger for this. They show up in droves. They want to be in school on Saturdays. In addition to this kind of program, we clearly need to make better use of our schools, before school and after school, and that is what this legislation allows as well.

I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for what he has done, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for what he has done. This is just the beginning. Such sums as are necessary. Now we have to go to the Committee on Appropriations and make sure that the real sums that are necessary are appropriated.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands [Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN].

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for yielding me this time to speak in support of H.R. 1818.

Just a few months ago, Mr. Speaker, this Congress missed an opportunity to pass a bill that would have controlled and prevented juvenile crime, and voted instead for a misguided, punitive one which ignored input from experts and communities and which sought to employ measures that have been proven not to work in preventing juvenile crime and delinquency.

In H.R. 1818 we are given something rare today, another chance to do the right thing. The bill I rise to support today, H.R. 1818, incorporates key programs which we have been implored to implement by a broad cross-section of America, prosecutors, corrections officers, police, community organizations, public health officials, family oriented groups, young people and, most poignantly and convincingly, parents of murdered children.

H.R. 1818 contains funding for States and communities to support prevention programs. It provides for research and technical assistance to those communities. It understands and treats children as children and protects them from incarceration with adults. It recognizes that minorities are disproportionately incarcerated and in part funds States based on their initiatives to address this inequity.

During debate on H.R. 3, our Republican colleagues said time and time again that they would support this prevention bill when it came to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to speak in support of H.R. 1818, and I urge all of my colleagues, including those on the other side of the aisle who said they would, to vote yes for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it breaks my heart that this bill would come too late for young people like Albert Nicholas and Rashawn Lewis from my district. But if we pass H.R. 1818 today, it will not be too late for millions of our other children who cry out for our help. The time is now for us to reclaim our children and our neighborhoods rather than to allow our future leaders to become victims of a system that has failed them.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as vigorously as I rose in opposition to the juvenile crime bill, H.R. 3, do I rise in support of this bill, which authorizes prevention programs that will prevent juvenile crime rather than reacting after the fact when it is too late.

My colleagues should understand that this is just the first step. This is an authorizing bill that has no money in it. So the challenge going forward will be to make sure that moneys are devoted to fund the programs in this bill instead of taking all of the money and putting it in support of H.R. 3, the crime prevention bill, which would provide more jails and more punitive sanctions against young people. If we do not pay the price in advance to prevent crime, we can never build enough prisons to accommodate it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] for a commendable job on recognizing that juvenile crime can be prevented and can be reduced. The Rand study says in fact that early intervention programs can prevent as many as 250 crimes per $1 million spent. Therefore, I rise to support vigorously H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1997, which will help Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue this discussion by entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. I wish to engage in this colloquy because I appreciate that this bill reaches out to communities and States on the issue of juvenile crime prevention. In particular, in Texas there is now a center devised for the study and prevention of juvenile crime and delinquency at Prairie View A&M University. This center will have an impact on Houston, the surrounding community, and Texas. According to the center's key objectives, they want to conduct and evaluate research, provide degree programs, continuing education, training, and serve as an information source, along with collaborating with communities, State agencies, and private entities to implement programs and policies to target prevention of juvenile crime.

I see this bill as a light at the end of the tunnel because its provisions on juvenile delinquency and crime prevention, block grant programs, research evaluation, technical assistance training, and training in technical assistance are the kind of provisions that would allow this center to apply for grants under this particular legislation. That will move our communities closer to really solving juvenile crime by early intervention and prevention.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and I appreciate her bringing to our attention the good work that Prairie View A&M University is doing. The gentlewoman is exactly right. What they are proposing would fulfill some very important functions under this legislation, such as conducting academic programs, conducting policy research and developing and assisting with community outreach programs focused on the prevention of juvenile violence, crime, drug use, and gang-related activities. The gentlewoman is correct. We look forward to working with her and with Prairie View A&M as this legislation is implemented.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] for this innovative legislation, and as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, and a member of the Democratic Caucus Juvenile Task Force, I believe this bill is the right direction that should be taken for long-lasting solutions to the problem of rising juvenile crime.

I commend Mr. RIGGS, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SCOTT for their outstanding work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1997. As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I believe that promoting the solution for preventing juvenile crime is the most valid approach. My colleagues, reducing and preventing juvenile

crime is one of the most critical issues facing our Nation today. H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1997 is important to helping us address the rising crime problem facing our America's youth. It is a balanced bill which provides the States with the tools they need to help troubled youth.

H.R. 1818 is a step in answering the need for effective prevention programs to stop young people from engaging in delinquent activities in the first place and to prevent those youths already in the juvenile justice system from committing additional, more serious offenses. By investing in strong prevention programs, we can help our young people turn their lives around. The vast majority of at-risk and delinquent youth, if provided early with care, support, appropriate discipline and real opportunities, can grow up to be responsible citizens.

Earlier this year, the House considered and passed H.R. 3, directed at increasing the penalties for juvenile crime. H.R. 1818 is the critical companion to H.R. 3. It helps in providing a more balanced approach to juvenile crime and provides the prevention component of a comprehensive approach to addressing juvenile crime.

Across America, violent crime committed by and against juveniles is a crisis that threatens the safety and security of communities and the future of our children. In 1995, law enforcement agencies in the 50 States made approximately 2 million arrests of persons under age 18. This is a 28-percent increase from the more than 1.5 million arrests made in 1985. During this period, juvenile arrests for both violent and nonviolent offenses increased significantly

Sanctions are only one part of the solution to this crisis. As one parent who had just lost his 10-year old daughter to murder recently stated, ''stopping crime by using more prisons is like trying to cure death by using more cemeteries.''

Most public policy analysts argue that early prevention programs offer the best hope to stem juvenile crime. They emphasize the importance of better schools and more job training, recreation, and mentoring programs. Such initiatives provide children with positive role models and increase economic opportunities.

Dozens of crime prevention programs across the country have been held up as successful models. An ongoing program in Orange County, CA—the 8 Percent Early Intervention Program—has proven remarkably successful in reducing repeat offenses. The Orange County program calls for screening delinquents to identify children likely to go on to more serious crime. This is typically 8 percent of the children who pass through the juvenile system. The program targets resources to those children—including intensive delinquency supervision and such services as mentoring and tutoring. Over the last few years in Orange County, this program is credited with reducing repeat offenses by 50 percent—at one-third the cost of incarceration.

In Dallas, police noted a 26-percent decrease in juvenile arrests due to a Cooperative Gang Prevention Program that focuses on education, counseling, recreation services, and job training to reduce crime. In Fort Worth, TX after implementing a Gang Prevention and Intervention Program city-wide gang related crimes declined 30 percent from the previous year. In Yakima, WA, increases in youth violence led to the creation of a Gang Intervention/Intervention Coalition to provide positive opportunities for youth through community centers. In the neighborhoods where the coalition is active, youth violence has decreased by 80 percent in a 3 year period.

In fact, studies show that prevention not only works but is far more cost-effective than incarceration in reducing the rates of juvenile crime. A study by the Rand Corp., titled ''Diverting Children from a Life of Crime, Measuring Costs and Benefits,'' is the most recent comprehensive study done in this area. The Rand study determined that early intervention programs can prevent as many as 250 crimes per $1 million spent. In contrast, the report said investing the same amount in prisons would prevent only 60 crimes a year. In California, research on delinquency programs in California indicated that $1.00 spent on prevention programs resulting in savings of $1.40 to the juvenile justice and law enforcement systems alone.

My colleagues, all the evidence highlights the fact that prevention is effective in reducing and preventing juvenile crime. Juvenile crime and violence can be reduced and prevented, but doing so will require a long-term vigorous investment. H.R. 1818 is an excellent first installment in that investment. I urge my colleagues to support this very important legislation.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAMPSON].

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1818. I bring the attention of this body to title 5 of the bill. The bill will provide $5 million per year for the next 4 years for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The National Center has done many things that I discovered after the loss of a child to a murder in my district. The National Center uses pictures of missing children and family members to create age progression likenesses to help locate growing children who have been missing for years. It has an international office to work with law enforcement overseas to locate children taken to other nations. Their Internet site has a comprehensive data base of missing children including pictures. That site is hit over a half-million times a day.

Since its inception in 1984, the National Center has helped recover over 35,000 missing children and reunited them with their families. The stories of these recoveries are absolutely overwhelming. As chairman of the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus, I can assure my colleagues that funding for the National Center is money well spent. I thank the committee for its support and I ask my colleagues to please support this bill.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this legislation. I will place in the RECORD an editorial that was in the local Minnesota papers concerning the importance of prevention.

It is time to quit putting the problems on the conveyor belt and quit reacting. I think this provides an opportunity for proactive focused activities for the Boys and Girls Clubs for a myriad of different programs. It is interesting to note that so many of our professionals in law enforcement today, whether first prosecutors, whether police officers, cops on the beat, are recognizing the importance of prevention in terms of dealing with our escalating juvenile crime problems.

Prevention works. Let's invest in kids—the extended school day and year, the extracurricular activities, sports programs, summer jobs—and keep them on the positive path and off the conveyor belt of juvenile delinquency by enacting H.R. 1818.

[From the Star Tribune, July 15, 1997]

JUVENILE CRIME—DON'T WAIT FOR KIDS TO STRAY

The bleeding hearts have been saying it for years: If you want to curb crime, you can't just punish the guilty. You've also got to invest in the innocent. But that proposition can no longer be dismissed as liberal claptrap, and it's no longer just a theory. The vast majority of America's police chiefs believe that helping children get a good start in life prevents crime, and hard evidence shows they're right.

This truth deserves mention now because Congress is on the verge of ignoring it. Lawmakers in both chambers are pushing juvenile-crime bills that would pour a torrent of money into prisons, punishment and prosecution, and only a dribble into crime prevention.

That unbalanced recipe may feed the public appetite for retribution, but it won't be satisfying over the long haul. A flood of research points to the folly of putting so many eggs in the punishment basket. A Rand Corp. study released last year, for instance, found that imprisonment is among the lamest and least economical of crime-fighting strategies.

A new lobbying group called Fight Crime: Invest in Kids insists that riding that lame horse amounts to being soft on crime. Led by some of the nation's top police chiefs and prosecutors—as well as crime survivors like Marc Klaas, father of young murder victim Polly Klaas—the group is pushing anticrime approaches proven to work well. The list includes enrolling at-risk kids in Head Start, matching up troubled parents with parenting coaches, assigning mentors to delinquent teens, nudging damaged families into therapy and luring restless latchkey kids into meaningful after-school activities.

Practical souls that they are, you'd think lawmakers would seize upon such tactics. No such luck. The House juvenile-crime measure, passed in May, expressly forbids the use of its funds for crime prevention. And though a similar bill now spinning through the Senate Judiciary Committee would allow some block-grant spending on prevention, it so far does nothing to require such investment. The upshot, some onlookers fear, could be a net reduction in federal dollars spent on prevention—and a consequent upturn in youth crime.

Certainly Congress intends no such calamity. That is why its members should take a lesson from the nation's leading law-enforcers, who know a thing or two about fighting crime. In a poll of police chiefs conducted

last year by Northeastern University's Center for Criminal Justice Policy Research, nine of 10 favored investing more in prevention programs.

No thoughtful person would dispute the need to lock up violent lawbreakers. But only an ostrich would settle for a juvenile-crime bill that serves that need alone. What is missing from the congressional approach is balance. To fight juvenile crime effectively, this country must focus not just on its most dangerous young people, but also on its most vulnerable.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out again to my colleagues that not only does this bill have bipartisan support in the House, it has the support of numerous organizations interested in the prevention of juvenile crime including the National District Attorneys Association, the National Collaboration for Youth representing American Red Cross, Big Brothers, Big Sisters, the Boys and Girls Club of America, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA, YWCA of America, the National Association of Homes and Services for Children, One-to-One, the National Mentoring Partnership, and the National Network for Youth.

This is a bipartisan bill that also has the support of the administration, as I indicated earlier. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. This is the important prevention component, the missing piece, if you will, to our national effort to reduce juvenile crime and help youth turn their lives around so they can go on to lead a successful and prosperous adult life.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to support H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1997. This reauthorization bill is based on well-founded public policy. The bill balances the needs of juveniles and society at large by promoting quality prevention programs and programs that assist in holding juveniles accountable for their actions.

Most importantly, the bill retains a fundamental tenet of the juvenile justice system, namely that juvenile delinquents shall not be jailed with adult criminals. Not surprisingly, research demonstrates that juveniles jailed in adult prisons are more likely to commit serious crimes after their release. In separating juveniles from adult criminals, we not only save children from life-threatening circumstances, we also reduce crime.

This reauthorization bill strengthens the mandate requiring States to reduce the disproportionate number of minorities confined in jails and other secure facilities. State are required to reduce minority overrepresentation by addressing both the lack of prevention programs in minority communities and by addressing racial bias within the juvenile systems.

In addition, the bill provides that employees shall be treated in a fair and equitable manner, and that there shall be no diminution of employment rights, including the continuation of collective bargaining rights. The American people deserve assurances that taxpayer funds will not be used to undermine existing labor standards.

I would like to thank Chairman RIGGS, ranking member MARTINEZ, and Representative SCOTT for their many hours of work toward producing this truly balanced legislation. Given the choice between playing politics and reducing crime, I am glad that my colleagues chose to reduce crime.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act.

This bipartisan legislation provides us with a balanced approach to addressing juvenile crime, and endorses the concept of holding juveniles accountable for their crimes while also providing for prevention programs that can help young people turn their lives around.

This legislation is particularly important for States that have large rural areas like Delaware.

Under current law, States are required to remove juveniles from facilities which also house adult prisoners. While present law provides a limited exception for rural areas, in some instances it requires juveniles in rural areas to be transported great distances to facilities far from their families.

Under this legislation, juveniles can be held for longer periods of time if their parents and the court agree and the judge believes the placement is in the best interest of the juvenile. Though this provision will probably see limited use, it provides long-needed relief for rural areas like those in my State.

This bill also contains a provision that I am particularly proud of.

H.R. 1818 incorporates a bill I sponsored to give the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children funds to serve as the Nation's primary resource center for child protection.

For more than 13 years, the National Center has been instrumental in locating and recovering missing children and preventing child abductions, molestations, and sexual exploitations.

The center has worked with clearinghouses in all 50 States in locating over 35,000 children and preventing child abductions, molestations, and sexual exploitations.

One of the National Center's success stories hit very close to my home. Just last month it assisted local authorities in the recovery of two missing Delawareans, who were located in Florida.

Mr. Speaker, by adequately funding the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, we can solidify our resources, hone our message and assure every family and every law enforcement agency that we are committeed to long-term child protection.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1818.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1818 provides States with needed flexibility in addressing juvenile crime, and for that reason, it has my support.

But this bill is, at best, a partial solution. In a country where kids and guns are a deadly combination, any juvenile justice bill which fails to deal with access to guns is seriously flawed.

Earlier this year, the House had a chance to pass meaningful legislation that would have addressed this problem. By adding a simple child safety lock provision to the juvenile crime bill, we would have taken a significant step toward reducing access to guns and to dramatically reducing the number of accidental gun deaths in this country.

But that vote never happened, thanks to pressure on the Republican leadership from the national gun lobby. And so a gun lock amendment, supported by 80 percent of the American people, still has yet to be directly voted upon by this House.

This is an astonishing failure for this House. Shootings are now the fourth leading cause of accidental death of children, and for every child killed, four more are wounded. This is a national tragedy, and the House is doing nothing about it.

While the House continues to bury its head in the sand, a group of concern citizens in my district is taking matters into their own hands. Together, we've organized the Oregon Safe Handgun Storage Coalition, composed of people and organizations concerned about this problem. Partnering with a similar coalition in King County, WA, the Oregon coalition is made up of a highly unusual mix of doctors, nurses, law enforcement officials, sporting good stores, neighborhood associations, gun safety advocates, and gun owner organizations. These organizations may disagree on some issues relating to gun ownership, but they all agree on these points: Guns and kids don't mix, and gun owners need to child proof their homes by safely securing firearms.

The Oregon Safe Handgun Storage Coalition has the support of people and organizations across the political spectrum who are willing to work together in an attempt to reduce violence in our community. It is uniting parties on both sides of the gun control issue, by stressing one common concern—the safety of our children.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully this House will vote on a gun lock amendment this year, but failing that, I encourage Members to start similar coalitions in their districts. By working together, we can do more than merely address the problem of juvenile crime, we can prevent it in the first place.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, juvenile crime is a problem that should concern all Americans. As a doctor of obstetrics I have enjoyed the privilege of bringing more than 3,000 new lives into the world, I know there are few things more tragic than when a young person disregards the rights of their fellow citizens and jeopardizes their own future by engaging in criminal activity. Furthermore, as the number and severity of crimes committed by juvenile offenders increase, juvenile crime becomes a greater threat to the social order.

Therefore, no one can argue the need for action taken to discourage juveniles from embarking on criminal careers. However, the voluntary actions of private individuals, supported by local communities and State governments, are much more capable of preventing juvenile crime than the Federal Government. Individuals acting at the local level know the needs of the youths in their community much better than Washington bureaucrats, so they can best develop programs that effectively prevent children from engaging in criminal activity.

Unfortunately, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act—H.R. 1818—furthers Congress' unconstitutional interference in crime control and prevention by dictating the nature and shape of juvenile crime programs for each of the 50 States. Therefore, Congress should reject H.R. 1818 and instead repeal all mandates that interfere with the States' sovereign right to conduct juvenile prevention programs, and defund all Federal crime control and prevention programs, in order to return money and, at the same time authority, for juvenile crime prevention where it

constitutionally belongs: To the States or to the people.

H.R. 1818 provides States with—two Federal block grants for juvenile crime, a formula—part B—grant and a prevention—part C grant. Some proponents of the act claim that this bill is worthy of support as it loosens the chains on State juvenile prevention programs imposed by previous Congresses. However, any federally imposed mandate, no matter how flexible, violates the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The 10 amendment limits the Federal Government to those functions explicitly enumerated in the Constitution. Other than in these few areas, the States are sovereign. Therefore the Federal Government has no authority to finance or manage State programs regarding social problems such as juvenile crime.

Block grants may appear to allow for greater State autonomy than programs directly controlled by Washington, but they still involve Federal control and, more importantly, financing. Taxing the people of Texas to pay for programs in New York or Montana is an insult to the Constitution and the donor States.

Under the part B mandate, States must comply with four core Federal mandates to receive Federal tax dollars. The Federal Government would have the power to reduce a State's funding if a State failed to comply with one of these mandates. When the Federal Government assumes the power to reduce funding according to the State's level of compliance with the Federal mandates, it transforms the relationship between the States and the Federal Government from one of two sovereign entities into one resembling that of a teacher scolding a disobedient pupil.

Furthermore, Federal mandates employ a one-size-fits-all model, which ignores differences between individual States and between various areas within a State. For example, there may be areas that will incur tremendous costs in removing a juvenile from an adult facility within 48 hours. Complying with this Federal mandate may thus divert an area's resources from other projects that may better serve the needs of that particular jurisdiction's youth.

H.R. 1818 also lists permissible uses for which the States may expend their federally provided funds. One of these permissible uses of Federal funds is for programs aimed at preventing hate crimes by juveniles. Preventing crimes based on prejudice is certainly a worthy goal, however, by punishing certain crimes more harshly than others because of this motivation, the government is, in effect, punishing people for holding certain views. Punishment for one's thoughts, as distinct from one's actions, is in conflict with the constitutional guarantees against government restrictions on freedom of speech and thought. Federal tax money certainly should not be spent to encourage localities to disregard the first amendment in the name of crime control.

H.R. 1818 also encourages States to create a system of records for juvenile criminals similar to that kept by each State on adult criminals, including the transmission of those records to the FBI. Given the recent controversy over the misuse of FBI files, all citizens should be wary of expanding the records kept on private citizens by the FBI, particularly given the conspicuous lack of language in the bill guarantying that someone who committed a crime as a juvenile but reformed oneself to become a respected member of the community will not be haunted by his past because some vengeful person acquired his FBI file.

H.R. 1818 also provides States with a second block grant, not contingent upon compliance with the four Federal mandates. Under this block grant, States distribute their funds to local governments and private organizations to run prevention programs. While States do not have to comply with any specific Federal mandates to receive these funds, they do have to submit a plan to the Federal Government for approval.

States may distribute funds only to those local governments that have taken the time and effort to prepare a comprehensive plan for combating juvenile crime. Organizations with prevention programs that wish to receive Federal funding must submit a plan to their local unit of government. Organizations must meet the goals of the local plan and include the goals of the program, the means of measuring their goals, and any research relied upon in developing their application. Before they can begin serving children, after the local government approves the plan, it must be submitted to the State government for approval. If the State government approves the plan, the operations may begin. Surely, States, communities, and local citizens could design a less bureaucratic system to help get funds to worthy programs serving juveniles than the system outlined in this bill.

Among the organizations that may apply for funding under H.R. 1818 are faith-based organizations. I have little doubt that instilling a child with a deep and abounding faith is, second to a loving family, the best way to ensure that child refrains from criminal activities. However, allowing faith-based organizations access to Federal taxpayer dollars may change those organizations into lobbyists who will compromise their core beliefs rather than risk alienating Members of Congress and thus losing their Federal funds. Thus, allowing faith-based organizations to receive Federal funds may undermine both future attempts to reduce the Federal role in juvenile crime and undermine America's tradition of nonestablishment of religion.

The drafters of the Bill of Rights knew quite well that it would be impossible for a central government to successfully manage juvenile prevention programs for as large and diverse a country as America. The founders also understood that Federal involvement in crime prevention and control would lead to a loss of precious liberty.

The current system of sending money to Washington, only to return it, in part, to the States, local communities, and individual citizens, serves only to drain resources away from those best able to create and manage effective juvenile crime programs; people at the local level who know best the needs of the children in that area.

Forcing States to comply with Federal mandates and forcing local providers to comply with Federal paperwork requirements is a further waste of valuable resources that could be used to directly benefit the area's youth.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1818 insults the constitutional sovereignty of the individual State, and continues Federal involvement in crime prevention and control. Therefore, all Representatives who support the Federal system as specified in the original Constitution should oppose the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Juvenile Crime Control and Deliquency Act of 1997, a bill that comprehensively addresses the rise in youth-related violence.

I am pleased to join the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. RIGGS of California, as an original cosponsor of this measure. The result of bipartisan efforts, H.R. 1818 is a balanced bill that combines firm efforts to hold youths accountable for theie actions, while promoting measures that work toward the prevention of juvenile delinquency. The combination of accountability measures and promising new prevention programs is, in my view, the proper approach to take.

As juvenile crime has increased throughout communities across the Nation, including some of the communities in my congressional district, it is the emphasis on prevention that will truly reduce the number of youths who commit acts of violence. In this way, H.R. 1818 puts forth measures that genuinely address the social and economic root causes of youth crime.

H.R. 1818 assists State and local governments by providing them with the resources and the flexibility to effectively face the challenge of youth crime through the development of programs for runaway and homeless youth, as well as programs for the recovery of missing and exploited children.

However, while it is important to intervene in the lives of at-risk youth before they become involved with the criminal justice system, it is also essential to address the needs of those juveniles already in the system.

Mr. Speaker, this bill places the responsibility for developing intervention programs on local communities. The potential for innovatible community based programs for rehabilitation of youth, as provided by this bill, is critical to the prevention and control of juvenile crime. These programs include treatment for victims of child abuse, mentoring services, youth clubs, recreation, peer counseling and teaching, educational programs, as well as job training and employment, in addition to numerous other anticrime related services.

Intervention programs for at-risk youth have been proven in several studies to be cost-effective in reducing crime rates. They clearly reduce crime and save taxpayers' money.

That, Mr. Speaker, should be the bottom line for this reauthorization legislation; reduce crime and save taxpayers' money.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with regard to H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1997. Recently I was contacted by local officials from Lyon County, MN, who wish to build a juvenile detention center with four beds. Lyon County is a rural community in my district that is populated by approximately 25,211 people in 708 square miles with the closest metropolitan area, Minneapolis and St. Paul, located about 150 miles away.

It is economically infeasible for Lyon County to build a juvenile detention center unless staff can be shared and the juvenile detention center can be co-located with the jail. Under current law, the sharing of staff between these two types of institutions is prohibited. The county officials have been frustrated by this law, because it is inefficient and costly for the county to hire individuals to deal solely with juvenile offenders, as the county rarely needs to house more than two juvenile as a time.

Transporting juveniles to beds in other areas has also proven inefficient. It is estimated that Lyon County will spend about $50,000 in programming and transport costs to send minors to other detention centers in Minnesota next year. Lyon County sheriff deputies are known to spend up to 8 hours a day transporting juveniles from their proper facilities to court appearances, as these facilities can be as far as 188 miles away. Costs accumulate with overtime and mileage for the deputy who is unable to provide law enforcement while on the road. The juvenile in transport spends time in transport that could be spent in treatment.

I am pleased that H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1997, establishes greater flexibility for States in dealing with juvenile crime. H.R. 1818 gives the State authority from the Federal level to permit a co-located jail and juvenile detention center to share staff if the personnel have been trained to deal with both adults and juveniles by a legitimate State program and parental consent and court approval have been given. I believe this legislation provides the flexibility needed to help America's rural communities address juvenile crime appropriately.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act. This bill will give States the flexibility and resources they need to best address the problem of juvenile crime.

Earlier this year, we passed a bill intended to strengthen the penalties for those juveniles who have committed crimes. I supported that legislation because I believe the rising rate of serious crimes committed by juveniles warrants tougher penalties and strengthened prosecution and some States, such as Florida, have already demonstrated success in expediting the prosecution of juvenile criminals. That bill, however, only addressed those juveniles who have already committed crimes. This bill aims to prevent youth from entering the justice system in the first place.

H.R. 1818 recognizes that the solutions to the problem of juvenile crime are best designed at the State and local level. The role of the Federal Government should be to provide communities with the information, flexibility, and resources they need to craft comprehensive prevention plans which include education, mentoring, work, boot camps, or other programs which would best address particular community's needs. In my conversations at home with police officers and not for profits, I hear over and over again that the Federal Government shouldn't micromanage this issue, we should work in concert with State and local governments, providing them the resources and flexibility they need to continue their efforts.

This bill will do exactly that and as a cosponsor, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1818.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1997. Earlier this year, the House considered and passed H.R. 3, the Juvenile Crime Control Act of 1997, which is directed at increasing the Federal penalties for violent juvenile crime. H.R. 1818 provides a complement to H.R. 3. It provides the prevention component of a comprehensive approach to addressing juvenile crime. This bill proves that both sides can work together and craft a balanced approach to juvenile crime. I am proud to be a cosponsor of it.

H.R. 1818 makes a number of changes to current law to increase the flexibility of States to treat status offenders in the most appropriate manner. For example, it retains the four core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 and slightly modifies three of them. The core requirement mandating States to reduce the disproportionate number of minorities confined in secure facilities was strengthened and clarified. H.R. 1818 requires States to reduce disproportionate minority confinement by addressing both delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts. However, it prohibits the establishment of numerical standards or quotas. The measure tries to ensure that prevention efforts are targeted to communities where a disproportionate number of minorities are committed to the juvenile justice system. H.R. 1818 also altered the sight and sound separation requirement to prohibit regular contact, but allow for supervised, incidental contact such as passing in a hallway. This does not mean that Congress is reducing its focus on this important core requirement.

Last, the core requirement that prohibits the housing of juveniles in adult facilities was modified to build additional flexibility into the law by extending the period of time for which juveniles can be held in a facility with adults, prior to an initial court appearance, to 48 hours, excluding weekends and holidays. States must still enforce the sight and sound separation requirement. In addition, it allows juveniles to be held for longer periods of time in facilities with adults in rural areas as long as there is no existing acceptable alternative placement, the parent or legal guardian of the juvenile involved consents, and it is approved in advance by the court. Such placement is, however, required to be reviewed periodically, at intervals of not more than 5 days for the duration of the detention or confinement to ensure it is the appropriate placement for such youth. Also, courts are urged to use this exception carefully.

Compliance with the four core requirements is still Congress' goal. H.R. 1818 tries to make it easier for States to comply with the core requirements by allowing States to receive 50 percent of the formula money and the other 50 percent depending on their compliance with the four requirements. Under current law, if a State is not in compliance with the four requirements, then it loses all of the formula money.

In addition, H.R. 1818 consolidates current discretionary programs into a flexible block grant program entitled the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Block Grant Program. In order for a State to receive any money under the prevention block grant, States must participate in the formula grant program and agree to use 95 percent of the funds they receive to fund local projects. H.R. 1818 also requires States to develop a plan to reduce and prevent juvenile crime with the assistance of community-based organizations and organizations in the local juvenile justice system which carry out programs, projects, or activities to prevent juvenile delinquency.

The block grants will be allocated in the following manner: 50 percent on the basis of how many people in the State are under the age of 18, and the other 50 percent on the annual average number of arrests for serious crimes committed in the eligible State by juveniles. The prevention block grant will help juvenile justice officials in Hawaii and in other States fund prevention programs, substance abuse programs, support programs for children who have little or no family life, and programs that would give State court judges an alternative program to deal with certain juvenile offenders instead of sending them to correctional facilities.

Everyone here knows that the nature of juvenile crime has changed drastically over the years. We have only to look through the paper to see younger people committing more violent crimes. Today's youths need to understand that they will be punished accordingly for crimes committed. However, that is only half of the battle. It is our duty to reach to our children, to get them involved in their communities, and to prevent them from taking part in dangerous activities in the first place. H.R. 1818 is an important component in our fight to meet this new challenge. It will help States prevent, reduce, and control juvenile crime. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1818.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act. Juvenile crime is one of the most serious problems facing our communities, especially law enforcement officers. No population poses a larger challenge to public safety than juvenile criminals. Between 1965 and 1993, the number of 12-year-olds arrested for violent crimes rose 211 percent, the number of 13- and 14-year-olds rose 301 percent, and the number of 15-year-olds rose 297 percent.

This dramatic increase has put a severe strain on our States' juvenile crime system because the overwhelming majority of juvenile offenses are handled by State, not Federal authorities. Very few juveniles who commit crimes wind up in the Federal courts. This legislation is a good step toward empowering States with more tools to fight this growing problem, while also ensuring that we do not give up on young offenders by exposing them to hardened adult convicts.

H.R. 1818 would consolidate the various Department of Justice juvenile programs into one State block grant program. Texas and other States would have the ability and flexibility to target at-risk youth to deter them from entering a life of violence and crime. I believe this is the right approach to addressing the very difficult problem of juvenile crime. There is no single answer to this problem, and we must provide States with both the resources and the flexibility to develop their own approaches so that we can test various strategies and determine what works best. Harris County, TX, for example, is using a $1.4 million Federal grant to expand a boot camp program designed to reform at-risk, nonviolent juvenile offenders in the Houston area and free up prison and jail space for the most violent criminals. Such boot camps have proven to be successful and cost-effective alternatives to reduce criminal behavior and get young people back on the right track.

This legislation will strengthen the Federal Government's role as a partner in these innovative State and local efforts to fight crime and help high-risk youth. It will give States and localities necessary assistance with a range of programs, including prevention and effective

punishment and rehabilitation targeted to getting young people back on track to productive lives.

Again, I rise in strong support of this bill and I urge my colleagues to support this valuable piece of crime legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1818, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1818.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill, S. 768.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## AUTHORIZING TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2035) to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2035

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

**SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER NAVAL VESSELS.**

(a) BRAZIL.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Brazil the ''HUNLEY'' class submarine tender HOLLAND (AS 32).

(b) CHILE.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Chile the ''KAISER'' class oiler ISHERWOOD (T–AO 191).

(c) EGYPT.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Egypt the ''KNOX'' class frigates PAUL (FF 1080), MILLER (FF 1091), JESSE L. BROWN (FFT 1089), and MOINESTER (FFT 1097), and the ''OLIVER HAZARD PERRY'' class frigates FAHRION (FFG 22) and LEWIS B. PULLER (FFG 23).

(d) ISRAEL.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Israel the ''NEWPORT'' class tank landing ship PEORIA (LST 1183).

(e) MALAYSIA.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Malaysia the ''NEWPORT'' class tank landing ship BARBOUR COUNTY (LST 1195).

(f) MEXICO.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Mexico the ''KNOX'' class frigate ROARK (FF 1053).

(g) TAIWAN.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (which is the Taiwan instrumentality designated pursuant to section 10(a) of the Taiwan Relations Act) the ''KNOX'' class frigates WHIPPLE (FF 1062) and DOWNES (FF1070).

(h) THAILAND.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the Government of Thailand the ''NEWPORT'' class tank landing ship SCHENECTADY (LST 1185).

(i) FORM OF TRANSFERS.—Each transfer authorized by this section shall be on a sales basis under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761; relating to the foreign military sales program).

**SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION WITH THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States and the Republic of the Philippines have a long tradition of international cooperation and mutual support.

(2) The United States strongly desires to continue mutual cooperation as a partner in matters of international security and scientific research.

(3) The President and the Department of Defense possess assets which can contribute positively to international security and scientific research.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the President should use the authority under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761) to transfer on a sales basis, subject to vessel availability, to the Republic of the Philippines, not more than one ''STALWART'' or ''VICTORIOUS'' class ocean surveillance ship (T–AGOS).

**SEC. 3. COSTS OF TRANSFERS.**

Any expense of the United States in connection with a transfer authorized by this Act shall be charged to the recipient.

**SEC. 4. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**

The authority granted by section 1 shall expire at the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 5. REPAIR AND REFURBISHMENT OF VESSELS IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARDS.**

The Secretary of the Navy shall require, to the maximum extent possible, as a condition of a transfer of a vessel under this Act, that the country to which the vessel is transferred have such repair or refurbishment of the vessel as is needed, before the vessel joins the naval forces of that country, performed at a shipyard located in the United States, including a United States Navy shipyard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides for the transfer by sale of certain surplus naval vessels. It would authorize the transfer of 14 vessels, in all, to 8 countries: Brazil, Chile, Egypt, Israel, Malaysia, Mexico, Thailand, and Taiwan.

This legislation was approved unanimously by our Committee on International Relations on June 25.

I would like to underscore that none of these proposed transfers is a grant. As a result of these sales, our Treasury will be receiving $162.6 million. These 14 ships involve 5 classes: 7 *Knox* class frigates, 3 *Newport* class tank landing ships, 2 *Perry* class guided missile frigates, 1 *Hunley* class submarine tender and 1 *Kaiser* class oiler.

It is important to note that our Navy expects that by proceeding with these sales, our Nation will realize an additional $195 million for training, for supplies, for support, and for repair services.

I would also like to note to my colleagues that the proposed legislation includes language similar to that included in prior ship transfer legislation requiring the Secretary of the Navy to the maximum extent feasible to require that any repair or reactivation work be done in the United States in our own shipyards. It is my understanding from the Navy that each of the recipient countries have agreed to that proviso with respect to these proposed transfers.

Finally, I understand that our Navy strongly supports the transfer of these vessels to advance the valuable cooperative relationships that we have developed with each of these nation's navies. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2035. I want to extend my commendation and congratulations to the chairman for bringing what I consider to be an excellent bill before the House.

☐ 1315

I believe because of the gentleman's leadership and the work of the Committee on International Relations the Congress, over a period of months, has been able to effect an important change in ship transfer policy.

Now the clear emphasis, as the gentleman from New York has said, in U.S. policy today is on the sale of naval vessels instead of grants. All 14 naval vessels in this package are sales, and the bill will result in $162.6 million in revenues to the United States Treasury. The United States Navy will also save money not spent on storage or scrapping costs. Work in the U.S. shipyards prior to ship transfer will result in an additional $190 million in contracts for American workers. Now this package also benefits U.S. foreign policy and U.S. defense policy through enhanced navy-to-navy ties and improved interoperability.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the bill has positive benefits for the United States