

Mr. COCHRAN. Emergency trade provisions, humanitarian assistance, cooperator program, for a total of \$988 million; is that what the Senator is saying the CBO has verified the cost to be?

Mr. HARKIN. That is the amount of money we specifically provide in the amendment.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I am delighted to yield, and I want to thank the Senator from North Dakota with whom I serve on the agriculture appropriations subcommittee.

I appreciate the very strong help in putting this package together. It has been a very difficult year for farmers in North Dakota as well as Iowa and I can say without fear of contradiction the Senator from North Dakota has been one of the instrumental people in actually putting this package together.

I appreciate the support.

Mr. DORGAN. I want to address the question to the Senator from Iowa. The discussion we had about income support for family farmers in the nature of a disaster program being income support in the form of a transition payment or AMTA, the whole notion of a transition payment is to transition farmers out of a farm program into the free market.

This chart shows what has happened to the price of wheat since 1996. This chart is similar to the corn chart and the price of corn which the Senator from Iowa shared. This is what has happened to the so-called "free market" for wheat. The price of wheat has collapsed. The notion of a transition was philosophically by those in this Chamber who said let's transition people out of a farm program.

Isn't that the base of an AMTA payment?

Mr. HARKIN. As I read the debate and all the talk on the Freedom to Farm bill when it passed, the idea was that we would transition out of farm programs with AMTA payments.

Mr. DORGAN. This is the right subject and the right time; we are debating the right issues. The Senator said it well. We have an economy that is growing and prospering, more people are working, fewer people are unemployed, fewer people on welfare, inflation is down. So many good things are going on in this country, but in rural America family farmers are in desperate trouble through no fault of their own.

If any group of Americans found their income had collapsed, or if the salary for Members of Congress had fallen where income for family farmers had fallen, we would have dealt with this immediately and a long time ago. The same is true with corporate earnings.

However, we are here through no fault of the family farmers but because they are trying to do business in a

marketplace where prices have just collapsed. If we don't take action soon, we won't have many family farmers left across the bread basket of the country.

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator is absolutely correct. The Freedom to Farm bill was premised that we would put farmers on the free market. As the Senator from Kansas said, they would have high net income for the next several years. However, Freedom to Farm ripped the safety net out from agriculture.

As I pointed out, our exports are up. We are exporting more of our key commodities, but there is no price. The safety net has been taken out from underneath agriculture. Farmers all across America recognize that Freedom to Farm has been a total and absolute disaster when it comes to protecting farm income, and it has to be changed. That is why the first thing we need to do is get the emergency package, but then we have to address the end-of-the-line problem of Freedom to Farm.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I have a question.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I actually have three quick questions. First of all, dealing with the urgency of now, is it not true that the Senator from Iowa and other Democrat Senators have tried to pass an emergency assistance package and we have been working on this for some time? Would the Senator from Iowa give a little bit of a historical background? I think farmers are wondering how much more has to happen to them before there is some assistance.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank my friend from Minnesota. I also thank him for his help in putting this package together.

The Senator is right. We started this spring, in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, trying to add some money. We got beat on a nearly straight party-line vote. All but one Republican voted no; Democrats voted yes.

We then came back, as the Senator from Minnesota knows, and tried it again in the subcommittee on this bill. We again lost on a straight party-line vote.

Now we are on the floor. I will say we are making some progress. At least now our friends on the other side recognize there is a problem. At least they are willing to address it somewhat. The amendment that the Senator from Mississippi sent to the desk is better than nothing, but it is not going to do enough to help get our farmers through this winter. It is only a little more than half of what is needed.

Mr. WELLSTONE. If I might ask my colleague from Iowa a second question to be clear about what is at stake—we will all have a chance to speak later. My colleague from Iowa says that what the Senator from Mississippi intro-

duces is an emergency assistance package for farmers to try to get some income out there to families, and my colleague says it does about half the job.

Mr. HARKIN. A little bit over half. Give them the benefit of the doubt—about half, though.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Where are the gaps? In other words, I think people assume, if we pass something that we say is going to enable them to continue to stay on the farm until we deal with the structural problems, it is going to help them. Again, could the Senator emphasize the difference?

Mr. HARKIN. I will be delighted to respond to the Senator, but I understand our time is up.

Madam President, if I might inquire what the parliamentary situation is right now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate resumes consideration of S. 335 in 15 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. I understand there is a vote at 5:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Further parliamentary inquiry. After that vote is over, will we return then to the Agriculture appropriations bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of that vote, when we return to this bill, the Senator from Iowa be recognized to complete his statement. It will not take very long to complete my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

DECEPTIVE MAIL PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to vote on S. 335, after recognizing Senator EDWARDS for 10 minutes, Senator LEVIN for 5 minutes, and Senator COLLINS for 5 minutes.

The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, I rise today in support of S. 335, the Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act, legislation authored by my colleague from Maine, Senator SUSAN COLLINS. I applaud her leadership on this issue as chair of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. I believe that this legislation strikes an important balance between consumer protection and over-regulation of the sweepstakes industry.

This issue has long been a priority for me. In the late 1980s, while in the House of Representatives, I began working on initiatives to curb deceptive mailings, and during the 101st Congress, I co-authored H.R. 2331, the Deceptive Mailings Prevention Act of

1989, which was signed into law by President Bush on November 6, 1990. H.R. 2331 prohibited solicitations by private entities for the purchase of products or services or the contribution of funds or membership fees, which imply false federal government connection or endorsement.

At the time, our main focus was on mailings that led one to believe that they were endorsed by the government—for example, offers that promise consumers information on federal benefits for which they may be eligible for a fee, when in fact such information is available at no cost directly from federal agencies.

The legislation barred the use of any seal, insignia, trade or brand name, or other symbol designed to construe government connection or endorsement. Today, I am pleased to support S. 335, which builds on the foundation laid by the 1990 law, in recognition of the problems that have emerged as sweepstakes offers have proliferated, with all of the accompanying abuses we have witnessed.

How many times have each of us received an offer in the mail promising enormous sweepstakes payoffs or other prizes? These promises are a clever way to market magazine subscriptions and other products. The old adage—"if it's too good to be true, it probably is"—comes to mind. Regrettably, for many, such offers seem too good to pass up particularly when the are accompanied by dire warnings such as "urgent advisory," "don't risk losing your multi-million dollar prize," or "don't risk forfeiture now!" Many consumers are misled by this type of advertising, which is deliberately designed to mislead.

Many offers are designed to entice the consumer into believing that he or she has already won a valuable prize, for example, or is on the verge of winning, when in fact, the odds against winning may be astronomical.

The sad truth is that companies use deceptive advertising because it works—it sells more product. And the tragic problem facing us today is this: all too often, the consumer who is being victimized is a senior on a fixed income or is disabled.

We have all heard the horror stories about unwitting victims on fixed incomes who have purchased hundreds or thousands of dollars worth of magazine subscriptions—sometimes multiple subscriptions to the same magazine, thinking they would improve their chances of winning a prize. We have heard the tragic accounts of individuals flying to another city or state to claim a prize, genuinely believing that they had been selected as the winner, only to find that they have become a victim. Some have squandered life savings on misleading offers. When these types of incidents become commonplace, I think, we have a good indica-

tion that there is a problem. And we have a responsibility to correct the problem.

What I find most troubling about this issue is that many unscrupulous companies intentionally target the most vulnerable consumers, knowing full well how devastating the results can be. S. 355 is designed to target these those companies that have demonstrated that they will not police themselves.

Among other things, S. 335 requires sweepstakes mailings to display rules clearly and state explicitly that no purchase is necessary to increase one's chance of winning. It requires the sponsor of an offer to clearly state the odds of winning and the value of the prize, and prohibits companies from making false statements, such as an individual is a winner, unless they have actually won a prize. It also strengthens safeguards to protect those who have requested not to receive sweepstakes mailings and other such offers, and enhances the Postal Service's authority to investigate, penalize, and stop deceptive mailings.

S. 335 does not prohibit legitimate offers. Rather, it puts fair, common sense restrictions in place in order to protect consumers, particularly those most at risk, such as seniors, or the disabled.

This week, the Senate Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, is scheduled to hold a hearing on fraud against seniors. It is a serious problem, and one that is not going to go away on its own. We must address the problem, and the deceptive mailings which S. 335 seeks to curb are certainly a component of this problem.

I am pleased that S. 335 has generated so much debate on this issue, because I believe that in addition to government action, the key to this challenge is increased awareness and personal responsibility—on the part of companies and individual consumers and families.

Companies should police themselves. Likewise, there are steps that consumers can take to protect themselves. For example, always read the rules for any offer very carefully, especially if it sounds too good to be true. And if it sounds too good to be true, it probably is. If you receive a letter in the mail informing you that you have won a prize, and it solicits a shipping or handling fee, be wary. This type of offer should raise a red flag, and could be a fraud. Finally, make sure you know the company is a reputable one, and don't give out your bank account or credit card number.

I hope this legislation will be a constructive step forward in this important effort, and I hope that it sends a strong message that government takes its responsibility as a watchdog and regulator of anti-consumer practices very seriously.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, today the Senate is taking another im-

portant step toward enacting sweepstakes reform legislation.

Today we continue the good fight that was launched nearly fourteen months ago when the Senate first began consideration of sweepstakes reform legislation. I was pleased to lead the fight for sweepstakes reform on June 5th, 1998, in the 105th Congress, when I introduced S. 2414, the Honesty in Sweepstakes Act of 1998. This was the first legislation of its kind.

A few months later, on September 1st, 1998, a high-impact Senate hearing focusing on the Honesty in Sweepstakes Act of 1998 attracted national attention and widespread public support. That hearing, followed by a series of hearings chaired by Senator COLLINS this year, was the turning point in the battle for sweepstakes reform and helped generate the powerful momentum that has carried sweepstakes reform forward.

I was prompted to fight for Honesty in Sweepstakes when I heard far too many horrible stories about how consumers, especially our seniors, were being taken advantage of, and all too often seriously financially harmed by sweepstakes promotions that prey upon people's hopes and dreams by making convincing yet false promises of riches. They use massive mailing lists to deliberately target our most vulnerable consumers with false promises of riches and then bombard them again and again.

Since I first introduced the Honesty in Sweepstakes Act I have been contacted by many people from Colorado and all over the country with stories of their unfortunate experiences with sweepstakes promotions. They told stories of how their loved ones, often their elderly parents, had squandered many thousands of dollars after having been lured in by cleverly presented promotions promising instant riches. Many people from all over the country have also sent me large envelopes stuffed full of examples of the misleading sweepstakes promotions they and their loved ones have received.

I am pleased to be an early cosponsor of the bill we consider today, S. 335, the Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act, which was introduced by my colleague Senator COLLINS. This bill includes a number of provisions similar to those I included in the Honesty in Sweepstakes Act. There are two additional provisions included in S. 335 that I believe will be especially beneficial in the fight against misleading sweepstakes. The first calls for establishing centralized and easy to access toll free phone numbers where consumers' questions can be answered. The second provision makes it much easier for people to have their names removed from mailing lists.

Our nation's seniors and other vulnerable consumers are clearly being taken advantage of, and in some cases

seriously financially harmed, by intentionally misleading sweepstakes promotions. Something needs to be done. I support passage of this legislation to bring this harmful practice to a halt.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 335, the Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act. I am proud to be one of the co-sponsors of this important legislation.

I commend Senators COLLINS and LEVIN for their efforts in addressing the serious problems with deceptive mailings involving sweepstakes, skill contests, facsimile checks, and mailings made to look like government documents. The investigation and hearings of the Senate Governmental Affairs Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations have shed light on sweepstakes and other mailings that promise extravagant prizes in order to entice individuals to make unnecessary purchases.

Far too many of these mailings are full of deceptive and misleading statements, which lead unsuspecting recipients to believe that they must purchase various items in order to be a winner or in order to improve their chances of winning. In too many cases, the prizes and awards are never granted. In many instances, the customer receives a trinket or coupon book of little value. Those consumers who respond to these mailings are then bombarded with additional mailings seeking more money for the same or similar items.

The effect on many consumers can be devastating. One of my constituents wrote about his 88-year-old father, who had spent thousands of dollars in hopes of receiving a large cash prize.

This legislation would set new standards for mailings that use sweepstakes, skill contests, and facsimile checks as promotions to sell merchandise. More disclosures would be required, disclosures which are clear and conspicuous, displayed in a manner that is readily noticeable, readable and understandable. Sweepstakes mailings must include prominent notice that no purchase is necessary to win, and that a purchase will not increase the chances of winning. In addition, the mailing must state the estimated odds of winning.

While S. 335 will probably not put a stop to all of the egregious practices that the unscrupulous companies employ, I am hopeful that this bill will result in fewer deceptive mailings and that fewer consumers will lose their hard-earned savings and retirement funds.

One important provision of this bill would require each company that sends these mailings to have a toll-free number that consumers may call to have their names removed from that company's mailing list. This is a first step in making it possible for individuals to have their names removed from mail-

ing lists. However, this particular system places an undue burden on the consumer to call each company that sends him a mailing. The unscrupulous companies could circumvent the intent of this provision by forming a new company that would then use the old mailing lists.

To minimize this risk, I encourage the industry groups to establish a system whereby consumers would have one toll-free number to call which would serve as the mechanism to remove their names from all mailing lists for all sweepstakes, skill contests, facsimile checks and government look-alike mailings. This system has worked in other areas, and I believe that it would work here, as well.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the sweepstakes legislation, which is S. 335, the Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act.

Let me say first, I thank my colleague, Senator LEVIN—I do not see him on the floor right now—also, my colleague, Senator COLLINS. They worked so hard and so long on this remarkably important piece of legislation.

Let me start by telling a story. It is a story I have told before, but I think it goes to the very heart of what this legislation is about.

There is an elderly man in North Carolina who lives in Raleigh, NC, I believe—right outside of Raleigh—named Bobby Bagwell. Bobby Bagwell is an elderly man who was watched over by his family, his daughter-in-law. Although he lived alone, he had a difficult time living alone.

His daughter-in-law went over to his house one day. When going through his various belongings, she discovered boxes and boxes of sweepstakes mailings. She came to discover in addition to that, in response to these sweepstakes mailings, Mr. Bagwell had purchased thousands and thousands of dollars of devices—goods that were basically useless. They were of no value to him at all. When she questioned her father-in-law about why he had bought these goods, the response was that he believed it would increase his chances of winning the sweepstakes. He had spent, I think, something on the order of \$20,000, which was basically his life's savings, on purchasing this useless, worthless material.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Bagwell was an elderly man. For that reason, he was vulnerable. But there is an even worse part to this story. Mr. Bagwell, as it turns out, suffers from dementia. So he could not remember from day to day what he had bought, how much money he had spent, or why he had spent it. His daughter-in-law, doing ev-

erything in her power to do something about this very sad situation, contacted the sweepstakes companies, asking them to take him off the mailing lists. She got no response. She then sent a doctor's order to the sweepstakes companies saying, "My father-in-law suffers from dementia. I ask you, take him off your lists for sweepstakes mailings because he is buying all these goods, he doesn't remember that he is spending his life's savings, and we need to take him off the lists so he does not continue to engage in this kind of behavior." For the second time, she got no response.

Finally, when they contacted me and I became aware of the situation and I contacted the sweepstakes companies, they responded appropriately and took him off the lists.

The sad part of this story is that in this country, in this day and time, it was necessary for a Senator to contact the sweepstakes companies in order to get this accomplished. That goes to the very heart of what this sweepstakes legislation is about. It is the reason Senator COLLINS has done such a remarkable job in conducting hearings and bringing this matter to the attention of the American people so something can be done about it. It is something for which I believe we have broad bipartisan support, support on both sides of the aisle. Everyone knows and recognizes something needs to be done about this problem.

I do want to discuss one specific feature. The bill has many wonderful provisions, including provisions that require the sweepstakes companies, for example, to tell people that buying these goods does not increase their chances of winning. That would save a man such as Bobby Bagwell from being taken advantage of.

One specific provision I worked on awfully hard, with Senator COLLINS and Senator LEVIN, basically provides that sweepstakes companies be required to provide a vehicle for people to be taken off these mailing lists so someone such as Bobby Bagwell, who has dementia, an elderly person who is being taken advantage of, who is vulnerable, can be protected and can be taken off the lists. In addition to that, it helps every North Carolinian—in my case—and every American who simply does not want to continue to receive these sweepstakes mailings.

We all recognized during the course of the hearings there are some reputable, legitimate companies that engage in these sweepstakes techniques as a marketing tool. But people need to have a way to get off these lists if they want to get off the lists. One of the provisions in this legislation specifically provides for that.

The bottom line is this. This legislation goes a long way toward eliminating any sort of deceptive, misleading sweepstakes mailings. It allows

people who do not want to receive these mailings to no longer receive them. Ultimately, what it does is it empowers American families who want to make sure the elderly members of their families—their parents, their in-laws—are taken care of. It empowers them to make sure they are not taken advantage of with these sweepstakes mailings, and in fact, if they so choose, that they no longer continue to receive these mailings.

This is a wonderful piece of legislation. As I mentioned earlier, it has bipartisan support. I am very proud to have worked with Senator COLLINS and Senator LEVIN, who have done a tremendous job for the American people in connection with this legislation.

Lastly, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the American Association of Retired Persons be printed in the RECORD. They specifically provide their strong support for this legislation.

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

AARP,

Washington, DC, July 28, 1999.

Hon. JOHN EDWARDS,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR EDWARDS: AARP thanks you for including a provision to the Managers Amendment to S. 335, the Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act, to institute a notification system. As drafted, the notification system would provide consumers with numbers to call to have their names removed from the mailing lists of companies that promote products and services through sweepstakes. The ability to have one's name removed from mailing lists is an important consumer protection, and facilitating such removal through the use of a toll free number is even better for consumers.

AARP has supported the use of toll free helplines to respond to questions or concerns in the telemarketing area, and the requirement that companies provide such a service to slow the proliferation of deceptive mailings is a logical extension. Further, we applaud the amendment's strong civil penalty provisions imposed on companies that violate a consumer's request.

AARP appreciates your efforts on behalf of consumers to eradicate the practice of fraudulent sweepstakes mailings through this provision to the Manager's Amendment to S. 335. We strongly support the "notification system" provisions that you authored, and hope that this section of the bill will be retained as it works its way through conference. We look forward to working with you and other Members on a bi-partisan basis to ensure that this issue is resolved in the 106th Congress.

Sincerely,

HORACE B. DEETS,
Executive Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I again commend Senator COLLINS for her really strong leadership of our subcommittee in so many consumer protection measures. This is just the latest of many on which Senator COLLINS has been the leader. That leadership is

critically important to the American people. I commend her on it.

I also want to single out Senator EDWARDS. He made a major contribution to this bill by making it possible for people who no longer want to receive these sweepstakes to call a phone number to stop the deluge of mail which is received in so many homes. As in so many other areas, he is already making a great contribution to this Senate. I especially thank him for his contribution to this bipartisan bill. That part of this bill is a very important part. It is a very creative part of the bill. Again, it makes it possible, in a very practical way, for people who get sick and tired of the swamping of their mailboxes with these sweepstakes offers, to end that.

This bill attempts to end these sweepstakes swindles which are swamping our Nation. The sweepstakes scams are part of a \$1 billion industry, an industry which is too often based on deception, an industry which too often tells people they have won a prize, dangles in front of them that promised prize, and then, of course, encloses the promotional materials that create the impression that buying a product will help to get that prize.

Most people are skeptical when they get this mail. They realize there could be 100,000 people who are told they have just won a huge amount of money, but there is a significant percentage of our people who are misled. The companies that do this prey on some of the most vulnerable among us and they take special advantage of our seniors. This is shown, in particular, when somebody responds to one of these promotions and then they are frequently inundated with followup targeted promotions. In fact, according to one of our witnesses, one person could get as many as 144 mailings from one company in 1 year and that, by the way, is one of the larger companies that does that, one of the so-called legitimate companies.

Our bill is aimed at ending the abuses and the deceptions and the scams. It will require the companies that are using these sweepstakes to display clearly and conspicuously and in a prominent place and in a prominent manner a statement that no purchase is necessary to enter the contest and, even more important, in my judgment at least, a statement saying that a purchase will not improve their chances of winning.

There are other requirements in this bill, and they are important requirements, but I think those are two of the most important requirements that we do now impose on an industry to see if we can clean up some of these abuses.

We also give the Postal Service some long-needed tools to put the scam artists out of business. The Postal Service will have subpoena authority. The Postal Service will no longer have to take two steps before clamping down

on the deception; they will be able to do it in one step. If the representation is deceptive and violates our bill, the Postal Service will be able to end it directly and not have to first go through an order which, in turn, will have to be violated as is the current law.

If someone violates the law, they should not need two steps. One step ought to be enough to stop the violation and punish the perpetrator. This bill is intended to close the loopholes in our law, to end the deceptions that permit too many of these sweepstakes to take in too many people, usually too many vulnerable people, raising hundreds of millions of dollars from people who usually cannot afford the dollars they are scammed into sending to the deceptive mailers of some of these sweepstakes.

Madam President, again, I commend the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, for her very strong leadership, and the other members of our committee who have participated, including Senator COCHRAN who has been a leader in this and, again, Senator EDWARDS for his major contribution to this bill.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Chair. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator DOMENICI and Senator FEINGOLD be added as cosponsors to the pending legislation S. 335.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, let me start by expressing my deep appreciation to the members of the subcommittee and the full committee who worked so closely with me on this legislation. In particular, I recognize the enormous contributions of the Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN; the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. EDWARDS; and the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. COCHRAN. Without their help, we would not have been able to craft such an effective bill. I am very grateful for their assistance and support.

We have heard very eloquent statements from a number of Senators today about the need for this legislation. In closing this debate, let me quote from a 74-year-old woman who wrote to me about how deceptive sweepstakes put her deeply into debt. In her letter, she said:

My only source of income is a monthly Social Security check totaling \$893. I estimate that I have spent somewhere between \$10,000 and \$20,000 in the last 19 years. What money I did not have, I borrowed from my daughter who is now responsible for my total financial support. I am deeply in financial debt. Their mailings were worded in such a way that I was certain I was going to win anywhere from \$1 million to \$10 million. I truly wish I could recoup the moneys that I squandered in the hope that a real payoff would come my way.

Unfortunately, it is too late for this woman, but today the Senate can act

to avoid financial hardship, wasted savings, and a great deal of heartache for countless other vulnerable citizens by passing this legislation.

It is my hope that we will have a very strong vote today and that it will prompt the House to act and we will see this important legislation signed into law before we adjourn this year.

I yield back the remainder of my time. I ask for the yeas and nays. I think they have already been ordered, but if they have not, I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. I believe the vote is slated for 5:30 p.m. Seeing no other speakers requesting time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, be added as a cosponsor of the bill S. 335.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Without objection, the substitute amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would vote "yea."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), is absent attending a funeral.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) would vote "aye."

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 248 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Abraham	Feingold	Lott
Akaka	Feinstein	Lugar
Allard	Fitzgerald	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Baucus	Gorton	Mikulski
Bayh	Graham	Moynihan
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grams	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nickles
Breaux	Gregg	Reed
Brownback	Hagel	Reid
Bryan	Harkin	Robb
Bunning	Helms	Roberts
Burns	Hollings	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hutchinson	Roth
Campbell	Hutchison	Santorum
Chafee	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Cleland	Inouye	Schumer
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Collins	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kennedy	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerrey	Specter
Craig	Kerry	Stevens
Crapo	Kohl	Thomas
Daschle	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Landrieu	Thurmond
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dorgan	Leahy	Voinovich
Durbin	Levin	Warner
Edwards	Lieberman	Wellstone
Enzi	Lincoln	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Biden	Hatch	Shelby
Bond	McCain	
Domenici	Sessions	

The bill (S. 335), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 335

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act".

SEC. 2. RESTRICTIONS ON MAILINGS USING MISLEADING REFERENCES TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

Section 3001 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (h)—

(A) in the first sentence by striking "contains a seal, insignia, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol that reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval or endorsement" and inserting the following: "which reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval, or endorsement through the use of a seal, insignia, reference to the Postmaster General, citation to a Federal statute, name of a Federal agency, department, commission, or program, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol; or contains any reference to the Postmaster General or a citation to a Federal statute that misrepresents either the identity of the mailer or the protection or status afforded such matter by the Federal Government"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking "or" at the end and inserting "and"; and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

"(C) does not contain a false representation implying that Federal Government benefits or services will be affected by any purchase or nonpurchase; or";

(2) in subsection (i) in the first sentence—

(A) in the first sentence by striking "contains a seal, insignia, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol that reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval or endorsement" and inserting the following: "which reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval, or endorsement through the use of a seal, insignia, reference to the Postmaster General, citation to a Federal statute, name of a Federal agency, department, commission, or program, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol; or contains any reference to the Postmaster General or a citation to a Federal statute that misrepresents either the identity of the mailer or the protection or status afforded such matter by the Federal Government"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking "or" at the end and inserting "and"; and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

"(C) does not contain a false representation implying that Federal Government benefits or services will be affected by any purchase or nonpurchase; or";

(3) by redesignating subsections (j) and (k) as subsections (m) and (o), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

"(j)(1) Matter otherwise legally acceptable in the mails described under paragraph (2)—

"(A) is nonmailable matter;

"(B) shall not be carried or delivered by mail; and

"(C) shall be disposed of as the Postal Service directs.

"(2) Matter that is nonmailable matter referred to under paragraph (1) is any matter that—

"(A) constitutes a solicitation for the purchase of any product or service that—

"(i) is provided by the Federal Government; and

"(ii) may be obtained without cost from the Federal Government; and

"(B) does not contain a clear and conspicuous statement giving notice of the information under subparagraph (A) (i) and (ii)."

SEC. 3. RESTRICTIONS ON SWEEPSTAKES AND DECEPTIVE MAILINGS.

Section 3001 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (j) (as added by section 2(4) of this Act) the following:

"(k)(1) In this subsection, the term—

"(A) 'clearly and conspicuously displayed' means presented in a manner that is readily noticeable, readable, and understandable to the group to whom the applicable matter is disseminated;

"(B) 'facsimile check' means any matter designed to resemble a check or other negotiable instrument that is not negotiable;

"(C) 'skill contest' means a puzzle, game, competition, or other contest in which—

"(i) a prize is awarded or offered;

"(ii) the outcome depends predominately on the skill of the contestant; and

"(iii) a purchase, payment, or donation is required or implied to be required to enter the contest; and

“(D) ‘sweepstakes’ means a game of chance for which no consideration is required to enter.

“(2) Matter otherwise legally acceptable in the mails that is nonmailable matter described under paragraph (3) shall not be carried or delivered by mail and may be disposed of as the Postal Service directs.

“(3) Matter that is nonmailable matter referred to under paragraph (2) is any matter (except matter as provided under paragraph (4)) that—

“(A)(i) includes entry materials for a sweepstakes or a promotion that purports to be a sweepstakes; and

“(ii)(I) does not contain a statement that prominently discloses in the mailing, in the rules, and on the order or entry form, that no purchase is necessary to enter such sweepstakes;

“(II) does not contain a statement that prominently discloses in the mailing, in the rules, and on the order or entry form, that a purchase will not improve an individual’s chances of winning with such entry;

“(III) does not state all terms and conditions of the sweepstakes promotion, including the rules and entry procedures for the sweepstakes;

“(IV) does not disclose the sponsor or mailer of such matter and the principal place of business or an address at which the sponsor or mailer may be contacted;

“(V) does not contain sweepstakes rules that state—

“(aa) the estimated odds of winning each prize;

“(bb) the quantity, estimated retail value, and nature of each prize; and

“(cc) the schedule of any payments made over time;

“(VI) represents that individuals not purchasing products may be disqualified from receiving future sweepstakes mailings;

“(VII) requires that a sweepstakes entry be accompanied by an order or payment for a product previously ordered;

“(VIII) represents that an individual is a winner of a prize unless that individual has won a prize; or

“(IX) contains a representation that contradicts, or is inconsistent with sweepstakes rules or any other disclosure required to be made under this subsection, including any statement qualifying, limiting, or explaining the rules or disclosures in a manner inconsistent with such rules or disclosures;

“(B)(i) includes entry materials for a skill contest or a promotion that purports to be a skill contest; and

“(ii)(I) does not state all terms and conditions of the skill contest, including the rules and entry procedures for the skill contest;

“(II) does not disclose the sponsor or mailer of the skill contest and the principal place of business or an address at which the sponsor or mailer may be contacted; or

“(III) does not contain skill contest rules that state, as applicable—

“(aa) the number of rounds or levels of the contest and the cost to enter each round or level;

“(bb) that subsequent rounds or levels will be more difficult to solve;

“(cc) the maximum cost to enter all rounds or levels;

“(dd) the estimated number or percentage of entrants who may correctly solve the skill contest or the approximate number or percentage of entrants correctly solving the past 3 skill contests conducted by the sponsor;

“(ee) the identity or description of the qualifications of the judges if the contest is judged by other than the sponsor;

“(ff) the method used in judging;

“(gg) the date by which the winner or winners will be determined and the date or process by which prizes will be awarded;

“(hh) the quantity, estimated retail value, and nature of each prize; and

“(ii) the schedule of any payments made over time; or

“(C) includes any facsimile check that does not contain a statement on the check itself that such check is not a negotiable instrument and has no cash value.

“(4) Matter that appears in a magazine, newspaper, or other periodical and contains materials that are a facsimile check, skill contest, or sweepstakes is exempt from paragraph (3), if the matter—

“(A) is not directed to a named individual; or

“(B) does not include an opportunity to make a payment or order a product or service.

“(5) Any statement, notice, or disclaimer required under paragraph (3) shall be clearly and conspicuously displayed.

“(6) In the enforcement of paragraph (3), the Postal Service shall consider all of the materials included in the mailing and the material and language on and visible through the envelope.

“(1)(1) Any person who uses the mails for any matter to which subsection (h), (i), (j), or (k) applies shall adopt reasonable practices and procedures to prevent the mailing of such matter to any person who, personally or through a conservator, guardian, individual with power of attorney—

“(A) submits to the mailer of such matter a written request that such matter should not be mailed to such person; or

“(B)(i) submits such a written request to the attorney general of the appropriate State (or any State government officer who transmits the request to that attorney general); and

“(ii) that attorney general transmits such request to the mailer.

“(2) Any person who mails matter to which subsection (h), (i), (j), or (k) applies shall maintain or cause to be maintained a record of all requests made under paragraph (1). The records shall be maintained in a form to permit the suppression of an applicable name at the applicable address for a 5-year period beginning on the date the written request under paragraph (1) is submitted to the mailer.”

SEC. 4. POSTAL SERVICE ORDERS TO PROHIBIT DECEPTIVE MAILINGS.

Section 3005(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “or” after “(h),” both places it appears; and

(2) by inserting “, (j), or (k)” after “(i)” in both such places.

SEC. 5. TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER FOR DECEPTIVE MAILINGS.

Section 3007 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a)(1) In preparation for or during the pendency of proceedings under sections 3005 and 3006, the Postal Service, in accordance with section 409(d), may apply to the district court in any district in which mail is sent or received as part of the alleged scheme, device, lottery, gift enterprise, sweepstakes, skill contest, or facsimile check or in any district in which the defendant is found, for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction under the procedural re-

quirements of rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

“(2)(A) Upon a proper showing, the court shall enter an order which shall—

“(i) remain in effect during pendency of the statutory proceedings, any judicial review of such proceedings, or any action to enforce orders issued under the proceedings; and

“(ii) direct the detention by the postmaster, in any and all districts, of the defendant’s incoming mail and outgoing mail, which is the subject of the proceedings under sections 3005 and 3006.

“(B) A proper showing under this paragraph shall require proof of a likelihood of success on the merits of the proceedings under section 3005 or 3006.

“(3) Mail detained under paragraph (2) shall—

“(A) be made available at the post office of mailing or delivery for examination by the defendant in the presence of a postal employee; and

“(B) be delivered as addressed if such mail is clearly shown not to be the subject of proceedings under sections 3005 and 3006.

“(4) No finding of the defendant’s intent to make a false representation or to conduct a lottery is required to support the issuance of an order under this section.

“(b) If any order is issued under subsection (a) and the proceedings under section 3005 or 3006 are concluded with the issuance of an order under that section, any judicial review of the matter shall be in the district in which the order under subsection (a) was issued.”

SEC. 6. CIVIL PENALTIES AND COSTS.

Section 3012 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking “\$10,000 for each day that such person engages in conduct described by paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection.” and inserting “\$50,000 for each mailing of less than 50,000 pieces; \$100,000 for each mailing of 50,000 to 100,000 pieces; with an additional \$10,000 for each additional 10,000 pieces above 100,000, not to exceed \$2,000,000.”;

(2) in subsection (b) (1) and (2) by inserting after “of subsection (a)” the following: “, (c), or (d)”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d), as subsections (e) and (f), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c)(1) In any proceeding in which the Postal Service may issue an order under section 3005(a), the Postal Service may in lieu of that order or as part of that order assess civil penalties in an amount not to exceed \$25,000 for each mailing of less than 50,000 pieces; \$50,000 for each mailing of 50,000 to 100,000 pieces; with an additional \$5,000 for each additional 10,000 pieces above 100,000, not to exceed \$1,000,000.

“(2) In any proceeding in which the Postal Service assesses penalties under this subsection the Postal Service shall determine the civil penalty taking into account the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation or violations of section 3005(a), and with respect to the violator, the ability to pay the penalty, the effect of the penalty on the ability of the violator to conduct lawful business, any history of prior violations of such section, the degree of culpability and other such matters as justice may require.

“(d) Any person who violates section 3001(1) shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty not to exceed \$10,000 for each mailing to an individual.”; and

(5) by amending subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section) to read as follows:

“(e)(1) From all civil penalties collected in the administrative and judicial enforcement of this chapter, an amount equal to the administrative and judicial costs incurred by the Postal Service in such enforcement, not to equal or exceed \$500,000 in each year, shall be—

“(A) deposited in the Postal Service Fund established under section 2003; and

“(B) available for payment of such costs.

“(2) Except for amounts deposited in the Postal Service Fund under paragraph (1), all civil penalties collected in the administrative and judicial enforcement of this chapter shall be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury.”

SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR THE POSTAL INSPECTION SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§3016. Administrative subpoenas

“(a) AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF SUBPOENAS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL.—In any investigation conducted under this chapter, the Postmaster General may require by subpoena the production of any records (including books, papers, documents, and other tangible things which constitute or contain evidence) which the Postmaster General finds relevant or material to the investigation.

“(b) SERVICE.—

“(1) SERVICE WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—A subpoena issued under this section may be served by a person designated under section 3061 of title 18 at any place within the territorial jurisdiction of any court of the United States.

“(2) FOREIGN SERVICE.—Any such subpoena may be served upon any person who is not to be found within the territorial jurisdiction of any court of the United States, in such manner as the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure prescribe for service in a foreign country. To the extent that the courts of the United States may assert jurisdiction over such person consistent with due process, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have the same jurisdiction to take any action respecting compliance with this section by such person that such court would have if such person were personally within the jurisdiction of such court.

“(3) SERVICE ON BUSINESS PERSONS.—Service of any such subpoena may be made by a Postal Inspector upon a partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity by—

“(A) delivering a duly executed copy thereof to any partner, executive officer, managing agent, or general agent thereof, or to any agent thereof authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process on behalf of such partnership, corporation, association, or entity;

“(B) delivering a duly executed copy thereof to the principal office or place of business of the partnership, corporation, association, or entity; or

“(C) depositing such copy in the United States mails, by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, duly addressed to such partnership, corporation, association, or entity at its principal office or place of business.

“(4) SERVICE ON NATURAL PERSONS.—Service of any subpoena may be made upon any natural person by—

“(A) delivering a duly executed copy to the person to be served; or

“(B) depositing such copy in the United States mails, by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, duly addressed to such person at his residence or principal office or place of business.

“(5) VERIFIED RETURN.—A verified return by the individual serving any such subpoena setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of such service. In the case of service by registered or certified mail, such return shall be accompanied by the return post office receipt of delivery of such subpoena.

“(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever any person, partnership, corporation, association, or entity fails to comply with any subpoena duly served upon him, the Postmaster General may request that the Attorney General seek enforcement of the subpoena in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which such person resides, is found, or transacts business, and serve upon such person a petition for an order of such court for the enforcement of this section.

“(2) JURISDICTION.—Whenever any petition is filed in any district court of the United States under this section, such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the matter so presented, and to enter such order or orders as may be required to carry into effect the provisions of this section. Any final order entered shall be subject to appeal under section 1291 of title 28. Any disobedience of any final order entered under this section by any court may be punished as contempt.

“(d) DISCLOSURE.—Any documentary material provided pursuant to any subpoena issued under this section shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5.”

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Postal Service shall promulgate regulations setting out the procedures the Postal Service will use to implement this section.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“3016. Administrative subpoenas.”

SEC. 8. REQUIREMENTS OF PROMOTERS OF SKILL CONTESTS OR SWEEPSTAKES MAILINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code (as amended by section 7 of this Act) is amended by adding after section 3016 the following:

“§3017. Nonmailable skill contests or sweepstakes matter; notification to prohibit mailings

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term—

“(1) ‘promoter’ means any person who—

“(A) originates and mails any skill contest or sweepstakes, except for any matter described under section 3001(k)(4); or

“(B) originates and causes to be mailed any skill contest or sweepstakes, except for any matter described under section 3001(k)(4);

“(2) ‘removal request’ means a request stating that an individual elects to have the name and address of such individual excluded from any list used by a promoter for mailing skill contests or sweepstakes;

“(3) ‘skill contest’ means a puzzle, game, competition, or other contest in which—

“(A) a prize is awarded or offered;

“(B) the outcome depends predominately on the skill of the contestant; and

“(C) a purchase, payment, or donation is required or implied to be required to enter the contest; and

“(4) ‘sweepstakes’ means a game of chance for which no consideration is required to enter.

“(b) NONMAILABLE MATTER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Matter otherwise legally acceptable in the mails described under paragraph (2)—

“(A) is nonmailable matter;

“(B) shall not be carried or delivered by mail; and

“(C) shall be disposed of as the Postal Service directs.

“(2) NONMAILABLE MATTER DESCRIBED.—Matter that is nonmailable matter referred to under paragraph (1) is any matter that—

“(A) is a skill contest or sweepstakes, except for any matter described under section 3001(k)(4); and

“(B)(i) is addressed to an individual who made an election to be excluded from lists under subsection (d); or

“(ii) does not comply with subsection (c)(1).

“(c) REQUIREMENTS OF PROMOTERS.—

“(1) NOTICE TO INDIVIDUALS.—Any promoter who mails a skill contest or sweepstakes shall provide with each mailing a statement that—

“(A) is clearly and conspicuously displayed;

“(B) includes the address or toll-free telephone number of the notification system established under paragraph (2); and

“(C) states that the notification system may be used to prohibit the mailing of all skill contests or sweepstakes by that promoter to such individual.

“(2) NOTIFICATION SYSTEM.—Any promoter that mails or causes to be mailed a skill contest or sweepstakes shall establish and maintain a notification system that provides for any individual (or other duly authorized person) to notify the system of the individual's election to have the name and address of the individual excluded from all lists of names and addresses used by that promoter to mail any skill contest or sweepstakes.

“(d) ELECTION TO BE EXCLUDED FROM LISTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual (or other duly authorized person) may elect to exclude the name and address of that individual from all lists of names and addresses used by a promoter of skill contests or sweepstakes by submitting a removal request to the notification system established under subsection (c).

“(2) RESPONSE AFTER SUBMITTING REMOVAL REQUEST TO THE NOTIFICATION SYSTEM.—Not later than 35 calendar days after a promoter receives a removal request pursuant to an election under paragraph (1), the promoter shall exclude the individual's name and address from all lists of names and addresses used by that promoter to select recipients for any skill contest or sweepstakes.

“(3) EFFECTIVENESS OF ELECTION.—An election under paragraph (1) shall remain in effect, unless an individual (or other duly authorized person) notifies the promoter in writing that such individual—

“(A) has changed the election; and

“(B) elects to receive skill contest or sweepstakes mailings from that promoter.

“(e) PROMOTER NONLIABILITY.—A promoter shall not be subject to civil liability for the exclusion of an individual's name or address from any list maintained by that promoter for mailing skill contests or sweepstakes, if—

“(1) a removal request is received by the promoter's notification system; and

“(2) the promoter has a good faith belief that the request is from—

“(A) the individual whose name and address is to be excluded; or

“(B) another duly authorized person.

“(f) PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL USE OF LISTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) PROHIBITION.—No person may provide any information (including the sale or rental of any name or address) derived from a list described under subparagraph (B) to another person for commercial use.

“(B) LISTS.—A list referred to under subparagraph (A) is any list of names and addresses (or other related information) compiled from individuals who exercise an election under subsection (d).

“(2) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be assessed a civil penalty by the Postal Service not to exceed \$2,000,000 per violation.

“(g) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any promoter—

“(A) who recklessly mails nonmailable matter in violation of subsection (b) shall be liable to the United States in an amount of \$10,000 per violation for each mailing to an individual of nonmailable matter; or

“(B) who fails to comply with the requirements of subsection (c)(2) shall be liable to the United States.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The Postal Service shall assess civil penalties under this section.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 3016 the following:

“3017. Nonmailable skill contests or sweepstakes matter; notification to prohibit mailings.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. STATE LAW NOT PREEMPTED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in the provisions of this Act (including the amendments made by this Act) or in the regulations promulgated under such provisions shall be construed to preempt any provision of State or local law that imposes more restrictive requirements, regulations, damages, costs, or penalties. No determination by the Postal Service that any particular piece of mail or class of mail is in compliance with such provisions of this Act shall be construed to preempt any provision of State or local law.

(b) EFFECT ON STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS.—Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prohibit an authorized State official from proceeding in State court on the basis of an alleged violation of any general civil or criminal statute of such State or any specific civil or criminal statute of such State.

SEC. 10. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as provided in section 8, this Act shall take effect 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, to provide for the nonmailability of certain deceptive matter relating to sweepstakes, skill contests, facsimile checks, administrative procedures, orders, and civil penalties relating to such matter, and for other purposes.”.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I understand the parliamentary situation is that we are now back on the Agriculture appropriations bill. The pending amendment is the Cochran amendment to the Daschle amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Senator from Iowa asked unanimous consent before we permitted discussion of the Collins bill that he be recognized following the vote.

I am rising to clarify the situation, and also to inquire how long the distinguished Senator is planning to speak at this point. I am hopeful that there will be time for the distinguished Senator from Indiana, Mr. LUGAR, who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to speak for about 30 minutes. He has to chair a committee hearing in the morning beginning at 9 o'clock and won't be available tomorrow morning. I am hopeful the Senator will either let Senator LUGAR proceed now or after a reasonable time for the Senator to then be recognized for 30 minutes.

That is the purpose of my inquiry of the Senator from Iowa. I did not object when the Senator sought unanimous consent to be recognized because I thought I had talked about 15 minutes and the Senator had talked about the same period of time, or maybe a little longer. That is the purpose of my inquiry.

Mr. HARKIN. I appreciate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Traci Parmenter, an intern in my office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the debate on the Agriculture appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Mississippi that I don't intend to talk too much longer. I did want to engage in a colloquy with a couple of Senators who wanted to do so. I don't imagine it will take that long—a little bit of time, not that long.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator for his clarification.

Mr. HARKIN. We will not take that long. As the Senator knows, I have tremendous respect for my chairman of the Agriculture Committee. But I wanted to wrap up our presentation with a short colloquy with my fellow Senators prior to yielding the floor. If I might, Mr. President, let me try to conclude the remarks that I had earlier.

Did the Senator have a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. No. My question of the Senator was how much longer he thought he would take. This is for the purpose of advising my friend from Indiana how long he would sit on the floor and listen to your colloquy, or whatever it is the Senator intends to do, or for how long the Senator intends to do it. It is just a question. I am not suggesting the Senator does not have the right to talk all night, if he wishes.

Mr. HARKIN. I am not going to talk all night.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Senator from Iowa has the floor. I am just curious about how much time he might take, or could we interrupt the remarks and let the Senator from Indiana proceed?

Mr. HARKIN. About 15 minutes—perhaps not that long.

Let me conclude my earlier remarks. Quite frankly, I find myself in a very uncomfortable position. This is extremely uncomfortable for me. I think the pending amendments are the ultimate statement on the failure of the current farm policy. Why do I say it is uncomfortable for me? Because I don't like it when farmers have to rely on government payments because they are not getting enough from the marketplace.

I am uncomfortable with an amendment that provides above \$10 billion in support for our farmers. I find myself extremely uncomfortable. That is why I view what we are doing here as part of a two-step process. First, we must get the emergency money; but second, we have to change the underlying failures of the Freedom to Farm bill or we will be right back where we are again next year, asking for billions more in emergency payments to deal with the crisis in the farm economy.

Our farm policy now is based on cash payments. Now we are back here talking about even more cash payments. We are forced into this situation because the underlying farm policy is wrong. And that is how the Republicans' proposal is shaped. It is a stop-gap gesture based on AMTA payments. So naturally, the larger farmers with the larger base acreages are going to get the most money. This policy goes against what government programs ought to be. Government programs ought to be for those who are in need. This amendment stands that principle on its head. The Republican proposal will give most of the money to the biggest farmers under the so-called AMTA payments. Our proposal offers a more equitable distribution by providing the assistance to producers who are actually on the farm right now and in relation to what they are growing now—not what they grew 20 or more years ago. That is a big difference between the two approaches.

The Republicans' said they wanted to get rid of the old farm programs when they passed Freedom to Farm, but