

come up at the time of the vote on Tuesday, because that would be, in effect, a debate cloture on the part of the Republican side that would say even if it was a serious matter they would only get 2.5 minutes of debate.

I know the distinguished senior Senator from Utah is a fair person. I think he would perhaps agree that 2.5 minutes debate is not quite enough on major amendments. I hope they will find in their heart to allow the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey to bring up his amendment. Clearly, he is going to be allowed to bring it up sometime prior to the vote on it.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, when I suggested equal time, it was on those particular amendments because of the need for certain Senators to be here on those particular amendments. Earlier this morning, Senator LAUTENBERG desired to call up his amendment and I respectfully requested that he reserve bringing it up until Monday because there are people gone who will not have an opportunity, who have asked me—who believed these amendments would not be brought up, who asked me to protect their right to be here when the amendments are brought up. As a courtesy, I ask him not to bring up the amendment. So I have no alternative other than to object to it.

We have had six amendments brought up. It is our turn on our side to present an amendment. I think we are making progress. But we should honor, to the best of our abilities on each side—the request of some of our colleagues that they might be here on amendments they consider to be important to them, especially since this is a Friday and almost everybody left believing we would not do much more today.

Be that as it may, that is why I have to object. I have objected and I will object to certain amendments where I have to protect people on our side, as I would expect the distinguished Senator from Vermont to object if we tried to bring up an amendment when Senators on his side could not be here to respond.

I have another amendment for our side to bring up at this time. It is an amendment on the part of Senator SESSIONS and Senator ROBB and Senator ALLARD. I send the amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. LEAHY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

#### Y2K ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I call for the regular order with respect to the motion to proceed to S. 96.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed to S. 96 is the regular order.

The Senator from New Jersey.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, while we were on the motion to proceed, taking a cue from earlier speeches—the distinguished Senator from Colorado spoke at some length earlier. I would just like to take a few minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. LEAHY. I just note two things. First is that even though the last amendment brought up by the Republican side is vehemently opposed by a Member on this side who could not be present, we made no objection to that, knowing he would have time to debate later on. Mr. President, we did this to try to comply with the request of the majority leader and the distinguished Senator from Utah, who said they wanted to move forward with this. We did it in good faith. Frankly, for one of the very few times in my 25 years in the Senate, I find my faith shaken because it is very obvious nobody intended to go forward; they just wanted to go right back to Y2K and block anything else.

If their side wants to bring up something even if our side is not here to debate it, that is fine. If our side wants something similar, that is not fine. It is like the Democratic amendments being voted down over here so a day or so later they can be brought up as Republican amendments and voted up over there. And in between we hear complaints about this is taking too long.

I will repeat what I have said before: Every single Democrat wants a juvenile justice bill with everything from the prevention of crime to education to helping our juveniles. I question whether the same thing can be said for the other side of the aisle.

The Senator from New Jersey had the floor. I yield back to him.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HATCH. He can't yield the floor to another person—or did he have the floor? I don't know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can only yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me just answer that and then I will be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Look, the games are over as far as I am concerned. When a Senator stands on the floor and says he is protecting

Members of his side and extends the same courtesy to the other side to protect Members on their side, all they have to do is tell us. If the distinguished Senator believes somebody on his side has to be protected, all he has to do to be protected is tell me and I will honor that. I asked for that same courtesy on our side because there are Senators who cannot be here who want to be here when Senator LAUTENBERG brings up his amendment. It is a fair request, a fair statement; it is a fair position. I really do not think people should try to make political points or political hay out of it.

I might also add, nobody wants this bill more than I do. I have been working on it for 2 solid years. I have been working on it every day on the floor. I am going to do everything in my power to get it passed. I have to admit I have had a lot of cooperation from our distinguished ranking minority leader on the Judiciary Committee, for which I am very grateful. But there is no reason to play these games here. It is unreasonable for anybody to suggest that because somebody is protecting his side, because I am protecting my side, there is something untoward about that. I would not suggest it if the Senator wanted to protect his side.

Naturally, I am going to yield the floor to my friend from New Jersey. I wish I could accommodate him, frankly, because I care for him. I know he is sincere on this amendment. But it is not unreasonable to ask that Senators, on something they feel very deeply about, since everybody left here today other than a few of us, that they be protected so they can be here when the amendment is brought up.

Also, I note the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is on the floor. She wants to make a statement that is unrelated to the bill, as I understand it, or to either of the bills—the current bill that is on the floor or the prior bill we were debating.

So I yield the floor for the distinguished Senator, and of course, hopefully the Senator from Arkansas will then make her statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Utah for his consummate interest in issues that matter, even though at times we differ. He did request a courtesy that I would like to have yielded to, except for the fact that we have allowed some on that side to be protected while not enabling this Senator to be able to obtain the same protection. I am bound, at 3:30, for Albania, Macedonia, Hungary, and Bulgaria.

I plan to visit with our people in Aviano, Italy, and Brussels headquarters and be back here Monday night. This is not intended to be a world endurance record. That is not why I am doing this. I am doing it because I have had a deep interest in

what takes place there and am shocked by the horror of the deeds that the Serbian Government is perpetrating on these people.

I have had a chance to meet some of the refugees at Fort Dix. I was there last week with the First Lady to greet the first of the refugees who arrived in America. I did serve in World War II—not in this area, but I was in Europe during the war. The horrors we are witnessing are too much for a civilized world to bear.

I salute the leadership of the President, the courage and the commitment of our troops who are there for long hours each and every day working to the best of their ability, which ability is very good.

There have been mistakes made, and that happens in a wartime environment. Mistakes are made because we are trying to make sure our casualties are few.

That is where I am going, and I will not be here then on Monday to bring up this amendment. I would have offered the amendment without debate.

The fact of the matter is that everyone is pretty much aware of what my amendment is. It helps to further close the loopholes, which I know the Senator from Utah wanted to do. I do not think the amendment we voted on this morning does it. It does not close the loopholes. That is my judgment, and I am prepared to defend that judgment.

I want to correct it. I want to see all the loopholes closed, and so do the vast majority of Americans. Eighty-seven percent, as a matter of fact, in a national poll said they want the loopholes at the gun shows closed.

I take a second seat to no one in wanting to get a juvenile justice bill in place. I want to see if we can help our young people avoid the violence that seems to permeate our society. But the fact of the matter is that each of us in this parliamentary structure that we operate under is entitled to offer amendments.

I had hoped I would have been able to, as they say in the vernacular here, lay it down, put it at the desk and have it saved for debate at a later time. The Senator from Utah tried very hard to be cooperative, as he always does with me—we have a good relationship, and I respect that enormously—to say: All right, we can have some time. We will arrange not a lot of time on Tuesday for a discussion and a vote.

The inability to offer that amendment is decidedly a disadvantage, though it will be offered by one of my colleagues. I had hoped, since I authored it in the first place, to send it up. That may be a red flag to some over there, but the fact of the matter is that I know the Senator from Utah does not disagree with me in principle; in approach perhaps, in principle certainly not.

I ask once again if it is possible just to send it up. It does need unanimous

consent. I will not force any objections. I take the liberty of asking the distinguished manager whether it is possible just to send it up and lay it down.

Mr. HATCH. We are no longer on that bill. I really cannot do that because of the courtesies I must extend to people on both sides. I am sorry I cannot accommodate the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. We are no longer on that bill. As I understand it, we are on the motion to proceed to the Y2K bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I see some colleagues who want to speak at this time. I ask unanimous consent that Senator LINCOLN be recognized for 10 minutes and then Senator VOINOVICH, who will be on the floor shortly, be recognized for another 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE JUVENILE JUSTICE BILL

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on a bill that we have been addressing and that I think we have made some good progress on, the juvenile justice bill. But I rise today to encourage, to plead with both sides of the aisle, with all of my colleagues in the Senate, that we remember what it is we are here to address, and that is the well-being of our children; that we put down and put aside all of the other things to really focus on what it is we are here to do, and that is to address the well-being of our children in this country.

I think it is so important that we do not lose sight of the tragedies we have seen that have presented to us the agony which has brought us to this floor and to this debate to try to do something to correct those tragedies and, more importantly, to prevent any others from happening in the future.

It is so easy to lose sight of the forest for the trees. If we continue that in this debate on juvenile justice, we will have done a true disservice to the children of this Nation.

I will speak today on an amendment which will be offered, which I am joining two of my colleagues in offering, Senator HARKIN and Senator WELLSTONE. We think it will help to reduce crime and violence in our Nation's schools by preventing it before it ever happens, and that is exactly what can be the most important tool in this Nation in providing safety for our children.

It addresses the issues of the children's emotional well-being and providing schools with the necessary resources to help our children deal with the complicated problems that today society brings them.

Students bring more to school today than just backpacks and lunch boxes;

they bring severe emotional problems. Our children in today's world come to school with problems far more severe than we can imagine, and certainly far more severe than we may have experienced ourselves. And 71 percent of the children ages 7 to 10 are worried whether they will be stabbed or shot while in their school. This is inexcusable in a country like ours, that that many children are frightened to go to school and they are frightened of what they will be up against.

The Department of Education reported that in 1997 there were approximately 11,000 incidents nationally of physical attacks or fights in which weapons were used. We can no longer continue to look for a solution which is only a Band-Aid. We must look at the source of the problem. Preventative medicine rather than a haphazard Band-Aid approach is something that is absolutely essential to the emotional well-being of our children today and the future of our country. Theodore Roosevelt said: To educate a man in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to society.

It is so absolutely essential, in today's society where we are blessed with so much advanced technology, that we remind our children that their emotional well-being, that the friendships and the fellowships that they must build with their fellow students is essential to the safety of mankind and the future of this country. Isn't it great that my children and other people's children, one day when they are older, will be able to communicate on the Internet to children in France and other countries across the world?

But let us not forget that we must encourage them also to walk out the back door of the house and to talk over the back fence again with their neighbors and their neighbor's children so they know who their friends and their neighbors are and so they are less likely to violate them.

It is absolutely essential that we do not lose sight of what it is we are here to do on behalf of our children. Improvements, changes in accountability, are absolutely essential in our children's education. Metal detectors and surveillance cameras in schools won't get rid of the root of the problem. They will help us in dealing with what we have to deal with right now, but the most important thing we can do is provide our children with the kind of counseling and background to deal with the severity of problems they are coming to school with at a younger and younger age. We must minimize access to guns that can address the means to act out, but it doesn't address the illnesses that we begin with in our children's minds.

I have traveled across our State of Arkansas, and in absolutely every school I have visited, every teacher and administrator has said the same thing