

places where DNA evidence is evaluated, where drug evidence is evaluated, where fingerprints, ballistics, and all the other scientific data from carpet fibers, and so forth, are evaluated, and then reported out to the prosecutors around the country so cases can be prosecuted on sound science.

Today we have a crisis in our criminal justice system. We clearly have a bottleneck, of major proportions, in the laboratory arena. There is simply an exploding amount of work. More and more tests are available. People are demanding more and more tests on each case that comes down the pike. We are way behind.

In my view, as a person who spent 15 years of my life prosecuting criminal cases, swift, fair justice is critical for any effective criminal justice system. We need not to see our cases delayed. We need to create a circumstance in which they can be tried as promptly as possible, considering all justice relevant to the cases.

I ran for attorney general of Alabama in 1994. I talked in every speech I made, virtually, on the need to improve case processing. The very idea of a robber or a rapist being arrested and released on bail and tried 2 years later is beyond the pale. It cannot be acceptable. It cannot be the rule in America.

Yet I am told by Dr. Downs of the forensic laboratory in the State of Alabama that they now have delays of as much as 20 months on scientific evidence. We know Virginia last year, before making remarkable improvements, had almost a year—and other States. Another police officer today told us his State was at least a year in getting routine reports done. This is a kind of bottleneck, a stopgap procedure that undermines the ability of the police and prosecutors to do their jobs.

I was pleased and honored to be able to pick up the Paul Coverdell forensic bill and to reintroduce it as the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Improvement Act of 2000. We have had marvelous bipartisan support on this legislation. Senator MAX CLELAND from Georgia, Paul's colleague, was an original cosponsor of it. He was at our press conference this morning. Senator ZELL MILLER, former Governor of Georgia, who has replaced Paul in the Senate, was also at the press conference today, along with ARLEN SPECTER, a former prosecutor, PAUL WELLSTONE, DICK DURBIN, and others who participated in this announcement.

We need to move this bill. It will be one of the most important acts we can do as a Senate to improve justice in America. It is the kind of thing this Nation ought to do. It ought to be helping States, providing them the latest equipment for their laboratories, the latest techniques on how to evaluate hair fiber or carpet fiber or ballistics or DNA. It ought to be helping them do that and ought not to be taking over

their law enforcement processes by taking over their police departments, telling them what kind of cases to prosecute, what kind of sentences to impose and that sort of thing.

A good Federal Government is trying to assist the local States. One of the best ways we could ever do that is to support improvements in the forensic laboratories. I believe strongly that this is a good bill in that regard.

The numbers of cases are stunning. I will share a few of the numbers and statistics that I have. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the Department of Justice, as of December of 1997—it has gotten worse since—69 percent of State crime labs reported DNA backlogs of 6,800 cases and 287,000 offender samples were pending. That is human DNA we are talking about. That is not available in every case, but that is not all they have backlogs on. Every time cocaine is seized and a prosecutor wants to try a cocaine case, the defense lawyer is not going to agree to go to trial. He will not agree to plead guilty until he has a report back from the laboratory saying the powder is, in fact, cocaine. It is almost considered malpractice by many defense lawyers to plead guilty until the chemist's report is back.

This is slowing up cases all over America. The labs have lots of problems in how they are falling behind. I think we need to look at it.

One article reports:

As Spokane, Washington authorities closed in on a suspected serial killer they were eager to nail enough evidence to make their case stick. So they skipped over the backlogged Washington State Patrol crime lab and shipped some of the evidence to a private laboratory, paying a premium for quicker results. \* \* \* [A] chronic backlog at the State Patrol's seven crime labs, which analyze criminal evidence from police throughout Washington state, has grown so acute that Spokane investigators have feared their manhunt would be stalled.

Suspects have been held in jail for months before trial, waiting for forensic evidence to be completed. Thus potentially innocent persons stay in jail, potentially guilty persons stay out of jail, and victims get no closure while waiting on laboratory reports to be completed.

A newspaper in Alabama, the Decatur Daily, said:

[The] backlog of cases is so bad that final autopsy results and other forensic testing sometimes take up to a year to complete.

Now they are saying it takes even longer than that in Alabama.

It's a frustrating wait for police, prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges and even suspects. It means delayed justice for families of crime victims.

Another article:

To solve the slaying of Jon Benet Ramsey, Boulder police must rely to a great extent on the results of forensic tests being conducted in crime laboratories. [T]he looming problem for police and prosecutors, according to fo-

rensic experts, is whether the evidence is in good condition. Or whether lax procedures \* \* \* resulted in key evidence being hopelessly contaminated.

We need to improve our ability to deal with these issues. This legislation would provide \$768 million over 6 years directly to our 50 State crime labs to allow them to improve what they are doing.

At the press conference today, we were joined by a nonpolitician and a nonlaw enforcement officer, but perhaps without doubt the person in this country and in the world who has done more than any other to explain what goes on in forensic labs. We had Patricia Cornwell, a best-selling author of so many forensic laboratory cases—a best selling author, perhaps the best selling author in America. She worked for a number of years in a laboratory, actually measuring and describing, as they wrote down the description of the knife cuts and bullet wounds in bodies. She worked in data processing.

She has traveled around this country, and she has visited laboratories all over the country. She said at our press conference they are in a deplorable state. She said the backlog around the country is unprecedented. She lives in Richmond, VA. She personally has put \$1.5 million of her own money, matched by the State of Virginia, Governor Gilmore, to create a laboratory in Virginia that meets the standard she believes is required. It is a remarkable thing that she would do that, be that deeply involved.

She is involved and chairman of the board of the foundation that helped create that. She told us how police, defense attorneys, prosecutors, are asking for DNA evidence on cigarettes, on hat bands. They want hair DNA done, hundreds and hundreds of new uses, a Kleenex, perhaps, take the DNA off of that, in addition to the normal objects from which you might expect DNA to be taken. Her view was—and she is quite passionate about this; she has put her own money in it; she understands it deeply—that nothing more could be done to help improve justice in America than to help our laboratories around the country.

We have people on death row who are being charged with capital crimes. We have people who have been charged with rape who are out awaiting trial because they haven't gotten the DNA tests back on semen specimens or blood specimens, and they may well be committing other rapes and other robberies while they are out, if they are guilty. Also, there is evidence to prove they are not guilty if that is the case.

I believe we had a good day today. I believe this Senate and this Congress will listen to the facts about the need for improvement of our forensic laboratories which will respond to the crush of cases that are piling up all over the

country and will recognize the leadership that our magnificent and wonderful colleague, Paul Coverdell, gave to this effort and will be proud to vote for the bill named for him, the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Sciences Improvement Act of 2000, and that we can, on a bipartisan basis, move this bill and strike a major blow for justice in America.

I talked with the Attorney General of the United States, Janet Reno, yesterday. She told me this was very consistent with her views. She supports our efforts to improve forensic science capabilities, and she said it is consistent with the Department of Justice's approach to helping State and local law enforcement. I believe the Department of Justice will be supporting this legislation, and we intend to work with everybody who is interested to improve it. At this point, the legislation speaks for itself. It is receiving broad bipartisan support, and I believe we can move it on to passage this year. Nothing we could do would help fight crime more and produce a better quality of justice in our courts over America than passage of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators HARKIN, MCCONNELL, BUNNING, and GRAMS be added as original cosponsors of S. 3045, which I introduced earlier today.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I also want to express my appreciation for legal counsel on the Judiciary Committee, Sean Costello, who is with me today, and my chief counsel, Ed Haden, for their support and the extraordinary work they have done in helping to prepare this bill for filing.

#### SELLING VIOLENT VIDEO GAMES TO CHILDREN

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I see my colleague from Kansas, Senator BROWNBACK, is here. I had the pleasure recently to be at a press conference with him, which he arranged. He had written a letter to a number of businesses, which I joined. Senator TIM HUTCHINSON and JOE LIEBERMAN also signed that letter. We asked them to consider whether or not they ought to continue to sell video games rated "M," for mature audiences, to young people without some control. In fact, Sears and Montgomery Ward said they would not sell them anymore. They didn't want them in their stores. Wasn't that a good response? Kmart and Wal-Mart said they are not going to sell to minors without an adult or parent present. We believe that was a good corporate response.

I appreciate the leadership of the Senator from Kansas and his hearing, subsequent to that press conference, with a lot of the manufacturers of this product. I understand, from what I

have seen, he was particularly skillful in raising the issues and holding these producers of this product to account and challenging businesses and corporate leadership to be more responsible because we now have a conclusive statement from the American Medical Association and half a dozen other groups that this kind of violent entertainment and video games have the capability of harming young people and leading them on to violence. That is bad for them and our country.

I thank the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

#### MARKETING VIOLENT ENTERTAINMENT PRODUCTS TO CHILDREN

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Alabama, Senator SESSIONS, for his role in this matter. As a former attorney general, he brought up some excellent points about what these do when you put a child and a video game in a first person shooter role and you reward them for mass killings. You give them points. Particularly at the end, some of these games give a reward which is a particularly grisly killing scene. He pointed out that when you train children in this type of situation, this is harmful to them psychologically, and it is something to which we should be limiting their access.

He also brought a lot of personal insight from his background as an attorney general, and that was really helpful. I hope we are going to be able to draw more attention to parents in the country about these products because it has a harmful effect.

Some of our military actually buy the same products and train our military personnel on the video games. They use it as a simulator. They do it as a way of trying to get people to react and also to get them up on what is called their "kill ratio." In World Wars I and II, we had problems with soldiers who would not shoot to kill because it was not a natural reaction. They would tend to shoot around. So they had to figure out how to get that ratio up in the military. The problem is when you do that with a child in an unsupervised game—the same game being used by military personnel as a simulator of combat conditions—that can be very harmful.

We found out yesterday at the hearing that it is not only rated for a mature audience, it is not supposed to be used by a child. The industry itself rates it "mature," but they market it to the child. They are target marketing it to children, according to a Federal Trade Commission study.

I will speak about the Federal Trade Commission report that was aired in the Commerce Committee yesterday on marketing of violent entertainment products to our children. I want to talk

about what that report brought forward, what we saw at the hearing yesterday, and some conclusion and things I think we can move forward on in dealing with this problem.

At the outset, I recognize the work of one of my staff members, Cherie Harder, who has done outstanding work in the time she has been with me in the Senate in raising the visibility of this issue.

It has been said that every good idea goes through three stages: First, it is ridiculed; second, it is bitterly opposed; last, it is accepted as obvious.

Over the past 2 years, I have chaired three hearings in the Commerce Committee on the effectiveness of labels and ratings, the impact of violent entertainment products on children. The first hearing on whether violent products are being marketed to our children happened about a month after the Columbine killings took place in Colorado. When we started out in these hearings, these ideas I put forward were ridiculed, bitterly opposed shortly afterwards; but now, in reviewing the FTC report, the fact that harmful, violent entertainment is being marketed to kids is now being accepted as clear and obvious.

We have come a long way. This is an important Federal Trade Commission report. When I introduced the legislation last year to authorize the FTC report, which was cosponsored by several of my colleagues, I did so because of overwhelming anecdotal evidence that violent adult-rated entertainment was being marketed to children by the entertainment industry. It has been said that much of modern research is corroboration of the obvious by obscure methods. This study corroborates what many of us have long suspected, and it does so unambiguously and conclusively. It shows, as Chairman Pitofsky of the FTC noted, that the marketing is "pervasive and aggressive."

It shows that entertainment companies are literally making a killing off of marketing violence to kids. The problem is not one industry. It can be found in virtually every form of entertainment—music, movies, video games. Together they take up the majority of a child's leisure hours. The message they get and the images they see often glamorize brutality and trivialize cruelty.

Take, for example, popular music. The FTC report notes that 100 percent of sticker music—that is music that has been rated by the industry rating board itself as not appropriate for the audience under the age of 18. The survey by the FTC was of the entertainment industry target-marketing to kids. This is both troubling and fairly predictable—troubling in that the lyrics you see that we previously discussed are target-marketed to young