

local police officer while they were chasing a car at a high speed, they basically had to call in to headquarters and have the headquarters call out to the other police car. They could not talk to each other. It was a turf issue.

Unfortunately, that gets magnified hundreds and hundreds of times in innumerable circumstances. What we are trying to do is break down those barriers of communication so that we will have better communication between Federal, State, and local law enforcement on a two-way-street effort for information.

Fifth, we have attempted to increase the technological information and capability of the FBI. This is very important. We all know that we are dealing in a technological world and there are in the area of communications, in the area of detection, in the area of crime prevention, huge technological advances being made, and we have to stay current. So we are going to significantly increase that effort.

Sixth, it is our desire to make sure that our key facilities in the law enforcement and international community, international stage, are protected. So we have increased the funding for security at our courthouses, and, very important in my mind, we have increased the funding for security for our personnel who are serving overseas in our State Department.

I cannot and will not tolerate—and I do not think anybody in this body would tolerate—putting American citizens who are working for our Government in a post that has a fair amount of risk to it at an unnecessary risk. There are simple things that need to be done to help these people and protect their security and, equally important, protect their family security.

There is no reason why an American who is working for the State Department who has his or her family with him or her should feel that that family is not getting adequate protection from our Government if there is a threat occurring in that country to Americans. So we needed to increase that security effort. And we have done that.

So this bill, this State-Commerce-Justice bill, is a major step, in my opinion, but not a final step, hardly even a midway step really. It is just a part of the beginning steps, but a major thrust in the beginning steps toward getting together our counterterrorism effort. But as I mentioned earlier, it all depends to a great extent on the capacity of the administration to pull together these various agencies. And that has to start at the top.

Also in this bill were two pieces of language—three actually—that have been passed by the Senate relative to terrorism in order to give our police and law enforcement community more flexibility and more capability, which passed this body by 90 to 0. They were a multipoint wiretapping and another wiretapping right and also a study on taggants relative to tracing explosives

and the institution of that. That language is also in this bill.

So it is a bill that has a lot of activity in the area of trying to address the terrorist threat. Specifically, the international terrorist threat is, I mentioned, the true concern, should be our true concern, in the area of trying to get ahead of this wave of potential violence directed at the United States. Now, on that score, the Government cannot do everything. The Government has never been able to do everything, in my opinion. It certainly cannot do everything in this arena. It is the primary player. The agencies which we have responsibility for have been described as the Defense Department in this area of counterterrorism. But there still has to be a responsibility among the communities of our citizenship. There still has to be a responsibility in our corporate community.

On that point, I have written, along with some of my colleagues who wish to join me, a letter to the companies who manage Internet access. As I mentioned yesterday, we all recognize that the Internet is the Wild West of information. I, for one, have absolutely no interest in regulating it. I think it would be a mistake. I think it would undermine the great potential of the new medium of education.

The fact is certain people are abusing the Internet. When you punch in the word “explosive” and trace that word on the Internet, you come up with something like 32,000 designations, of which 6,000—6,000—involve directions on how to make an explosive device, directions titled, such as, “How to make a pipe bomb and leave it at your favorite airport or Federal office building.” That is wrong.

What I have suggested in writing the leaders of these various entrepreneurial groups who are driving the economy of information, the information economy which is doing so much for our country, what I suggest to them, maybe it is time they gave a little thought here as to what type of access they are affording people relative to the Internet. Maybe they should create some sort of self-policing mechanism which says if something is clearly, clearly, on the Net for the purpose of explaining how to kill people, such as making a pipe bomb and leaving it at your favorite airport or Federal office building, that accessing that information should not be easy. It should not just involve typing in the word “explosive.”

When they index these items, maybe they decide not to index some items, recognizing that is a type of censorship they may not want to participate in. In this instance, it may be appropriate. In any event, when they index these systems, whether it is Yahoo, Magellan, or Netscape, generally, or America Online or CompuServe or some Microsoft system, they ought to make it more difficult to get that type of information, that you ought to go through more hoops before you can access. Granted,

that might not stop the truly committed individual, but it will certainly make it more difficult for the casual pursuer of this information. That is why I am sending this letter.

I am not sure what processes could be put in place. I think there ought to be some thought given. It should not come from the Government—in other words, the Government saying, “You do this,” as managers of the Internet, as people who create the access systems for the Internet. That will lead to all sorts of, in my opinion, more significant issues of freedom of speech and officiousness of Government.

This should be a self-policing exercise. These folks should have the common sense and the civic attitude to proceed to try to develop something. These are creative and imaginative people that have come up with these systems. If put in a room, I suspect they could come up with creative and imaginative solutions to this problem.

That is a brief summary—not that brief, actually—but a summary of where we stand in the counterterrorism exercise relative to the FBI, especially, but it is my concern relative to this administration and how it should pursue it and the Internet, and how it should be addressed in that arena.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have sought recognition to discuss briefly one of the aspects of the immigration conference report which will come before the Senate either today or shortly after we return from recess. I think that it is very important that we reform our laws to provide increased resources to protect our borders and combat illegal immigration.

Nevertheless, I have been very much concerned about a number of provisions of the immigration bill. The provision which concerns me the most is the so-called Gallegly amendment, which would give the States the option to limit education opportunities to children of illegal immigrants. In my opinion, it is unthinkable in America to deny education to any children, regardless of their status, whether their parents are illegal immigrants.

That is something I feel particularly strongly about because both of my parents were immigrants. My mother came to this country as a child of 5 with her parents from a small town on the Russian-Polish border. My father came from Ukraine Russia, literally walked across Europe with barely a ruble in his pocket, sailed steerage—the bottom of the boat—to come to America to make a better life for himself. He did not know at the time he had a return trip ticket to France, not to Paris but to the Argonne Forest, where he fought in World War I as a buck private, to make the world safe

for democracy, and carried shrapnel in his legs until the day he died.

My parents had legal status as immigrants, but sometimes that is a hard thing to determine. I do not think any child ought to be deprived of educational opportunities because of the status of his parents, even if they are illegal immigrants.

I have been strongly opposed to the Gallegly amendment. I have agreed to sign the conference report, however, because of a significant change which I have insisted upon. That change is that, in addition to some other modifications which have already been made for a child in the first grade to complete the sixth grade and a child in the seventh grade to complete the 12th grade, the modifications I pressed to have included, and I think have been included by agreement, would provide for a comprehensive study to be conducted by GAO, the General Accounting Office, at the end of 2½ years, which would determine what impact the Gallegly amendment had on the children who were excluded from education, what impact it had with respect to juvenile delinquency, the crime rate, what impact it had on their educational status, what impact it had on their family status, and what impact it had on reducing illegal immigration. Following release of the study there will be a mandatory vote on repeal of the Gallegly provision in the Congress, both Houses, within a very short period of time, whatever the results of the GAO report may have been.

If the Gallegly amendment was not repealed on that vote, then there will be a similar study after 5 years, and then another mandated automatic vote on the repeal of the Gallegly provision by the Congress.

It is my judgment, Madam President, that if the Gallegly amendment is subjected to a vote at 2½ or 5 years, it would be repealed by the Congress and signed by whomever might be the President. Whether it is President Clinton or Senator Dole, the then President would sign it. I think if the Gallegly amendment were standing alone now, it would be rejected by the Congress.

I do not think that the entire immigration conference report ought to be rejected because of this single provision, considering the modification that I have presented, which, as I say, I think is being accepted and will be in the conference report. I wanted to make that brief explanation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THE STALKING BILL

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I know the majority leader will be here shortly. I look forward to the opportunity to discuss the schedule for the remainder of the day with him when he comes.

Let me just say that I apologize for not having the opportunity to have been here this morning. I know there have been a number of discussions underway with regard to the schedule and individual issues.

The distinguished Senator from Texas, the Presiding Officer, made a number of points this morning regarding the stalking bill that she has made in the past. I am told she suggested that her stalking legislation, which passed the Senate last week after an amendment to the bill was worked out, is being held up in the House and that she referred to a commitment I made to her to try to help her get it passed. I am told she suggested that, because the bill has not cleared the House in the last week, that I have not lived up to that commitment.

As several Senators pointed out earlier this morning, sometimes it takes more than a week for the other body to act. At any rate, I understand that the problem is not as dire as earlier suggested—and that the circumstances surrounding this stalking legislation certainly do not warrant objections to action on the Executive Calendar. I wanted to confirm this, but I can now say with authority—I have the references before me—that the entire language of the Senator's stalking bill, word-for-word, is currently in the defense authorization conference report that is in the Senate. This language was apparently accepted by the House and Senate conferees. She was one of those conferees, so I am sure she understood that.

I am confused as to why that was not recognized this morning, yesterday, or at some point, because she made quite a point of saying that we had not worked in good faith. Well, clearly, the conferees were there and could have objected to the inclusion of that language, and they did not. So the language is in the defense authorization conference report, and I hope that she feels that that represents a fairly significant development in terms of getting her policy accomplished. I am very disappointed that the other half of the stalking legislation that passed last week—the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey that she praised so strongly and so appropriately the other night—was not included. The Senator from Texas has given me her word, as has the majority leader, that they would work with us to get that legislation enacted as well. I know that she will live up to that commitment, just as the majority leader and I have attempted to work in good faith to live up to ours.

The reference, I might point out, to the Senator from Texas's stalking language is section 1069 of the defense authorization conference report. The page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated July 30, 1996, was page 9055, in the House section.

I ask unanimous consent that that section of the conference report be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEC. 1069. PUNISHMENT OF INTERSTATE STALKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 110A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2261 the following new section:

“§ 2261A. Interstate stalking

“Whoever travels across a State line or within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States with the intent to injure or harass another person, and in the course of, or as a result of, such travel places that person in reasonable fear of the death of, or serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365(g)(3) of this title) to, that person or a member of that person's immediate family (as defined in section 115 of this title) shall be punished as provided in section 2261 of this title.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Title 18, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2261(b) is amended by inserting “or section 2261A” after “this section”.

(2) Sections 2261(b) and 2262(b) are each amended by striking “offender's spouse or intimate partner” each place it appears and inserting “victim”.

(3) The chapter heading for chapter 110A is amended by inserting “AND STALKING” after “VIOLENCE”.

(4) The item relating to chapter 110A in the table of chapters at the beginning of part I is amended to read as follows:

“110A. Domestic violence and stalking 2261”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 110A of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2261 the following new item:

“2261A. Interstate stalking.”.

THE SENATE'S SCHEDULE

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, let me just say that while I did not hear all of the discussion this morning, I heard about it. I only say that we are prepared this afternoon to work with the majority leader to pass the conference report on minimum wage, to pass the conference report on health care, with the understanding that the last-minute, nonauthorized addition of a provision dealing with a certain drug patent would be removed from the conference report, and to pass the conference report on safe drinking water. We would be prepared to do that, along with the CFTC nominations, and the item on the Executive Calendar dealing with the nominee for the district judgeship in Minnesota.

So that is a good deal of work this afternoon. I see that the majority leader is here. We had the opportunity to discuss this matter earlier, and I look forward to resolving the matters I have just mentioned with him. We are prepared to enter into a colloquy at this time. I yield the floor for that purpose.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I apologize to the minority leader for not being here. I got waylaid by the Secretary of Defense, who is anxious about some nominations, particularly the Chief of Naval Operations. I talked