

(B) administrative requirements placed on affected individuals who are borrowers of Federal student loans are minimized, to the extent possible without impairing the integrity of the student loan programs, to ease the burden on such borrowers and avoid inadvertent, technical violations or defaults;

(C) the calculation of "annual adjusted family income" and "available income", as used in the determination of need for student financial assistance under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) for any such affected individual (and the determination of such need for his or her spouse and dependents, if applicable), may be modified to mean the sums received in the first calendar year of the award year for which such determination is made, in order to reflect more accurately the financial condition of such affected individual and his or her family; and

(D) institutions of higher education, eligible lenders, guaranty agencies, and other entities participating in the student assistance programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) that are located in, or whose operations are directly affected by, areas that are declared disaster areas by any Federal, State, or local official in connection with the national emergency may be granted temporary relief from requirements that are rendered infeasible or unreasonable by the national emergency, including due diligence requirements and reporting deadlines.

(b) NOTICE OF WAIVERS OR MODIFICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 437 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232) and section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary shall, by notice in the Federal Register, publish the waivers or modifications of statutory and regulatory provisions the Secretary deems necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The notice under paragraph (1) shall include the terms and conditions to be applied in lieu of such statutory and regulatory provisions.

(3) CASE-BY-CASE BASIS.—The Secretary is not required to exercise the waiver or modification authority under this section on a case-by-case basis.

(c) IMPACT REPORT.—The Secretary shall, not later than 15 months after first exercising any authority to issue a waiver or modification under subsection (a), report to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate on the impact of any waivers or modifications issued pursuant to subsection (a) on affected individuals and the programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), and the basis for such determination, and include in such report the Secretary's recommendations for changes to the statutory or regulatory provisions that were the subject of such waiver or modification.

(d) NO DELAY IN WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS.—Sections 482(c) and 492 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1089(c), 1098a) shall not apply to the waivers and modifications authorized or required by this Act.

SEC. 3. TUITION REFUNDS OR CREDITS FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) all institutions offering postsecondary education should provide a full refund to students who are members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty during the national emergency, for that portion of a period of in-

struction such student was unable to complete, or for which such individual did not receive academic credit, because he or she was called up for such service; and

(2) if affected individuals withdraw from a course of study as a result of such service, such institutions should make every effort to minimize deferral of enrollment or reapplication requirements and should provide the greatest flexibility possible with administrative deadlines related to those applications.

(b) DEFINITION OF FULL REFUND.—For purposes of this section, a full refund includes a refund of required tuition and fees, or a credit in a comparable amount against future tuition and fees.

SEC. 4. USE OF PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT.

At the time of publishing any waivers or modifications pursuant to section 2(b), the Secretary shall publish examples of measures that institutions may take in the appropriate exercise of discretion under section 479A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087tt) to adjust financial need and aid eligibility determinations for affected individuals.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ACTIVE DUTY.—The term "active duty" has the meaning given such term in section 101(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, except that such term does not include active duty for training or attendance at a service school.

(2) AFFECTED INDIVIDUAL.—The term "affected individual" means an individual who—

(A) is serving on active duty during the national emergency;

(B) is serving on National Guard duty during the national emergency;

(C) resides or is employed in an area that is declared a disaster area by any Federal, State, or local official in connection with the national emergency; or

(D) suffered direct economic hardship as a direct result of the national emergency, as determined under a waiver or modification issued under this Act.

(3) FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN.—The term "Federal student loan" means a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq., 20 U.S.C. 1087a et seq., and 20 U.S.C. 1087aa et seq.).

(4) NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—The term "national emergency" means the national emergency by reason of certain terrorist attacks declared by the President on September 14, 2001, or subsequent national emergencies declared by the President by reason of terrorist attacks.

(5) SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY DURING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—The term "serving on active duty during the national emergency" shall include service by an individual who is—

(A) a Reserve of an Armed Force ordered to active duty under section 12301(a), 12301(g), 12302, 12304, or 12306 of title 10, United States Code, or any retired member of an Armed Force ordered to active duty under section 688 of such title, for service in connection with such emergency or subsequent actions or conditions, regardless of the location at which such active duty service is performed; and

(B) any other member of an Armed Force on active duty in connection with such emergency or subsequent actions or conditions who has been assigned to a duty station at a location other than the location at which such member is normally assigned.

(6) SERVING ON NATIONAL GUARD DUTY DURING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—The term "serving on National Guard duty during the national emergency" shall include performing training or other duty authorized by section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, as a member of the National Guard, at the request of the President, for or in support of an operation during the national emergency.

SEC. 6. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.

The provisions of this Act shall cease to be effective on September 30, 2003.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FAMILY COURT ACT OF 2001

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 258, H.R. 2657.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2657) to amend title XI of the District of Columbia Code to redesignate the Family Division of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia as the Family Court of the Superior Court, to recruit and retain trained and experienced judges to serve in the Family Court, to promote consistency and efficiency in the assignment of judges to the Family Court and in the consideration of actions and proceedings in the Family Court, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. REDESIGNATION OF FAMILY DIVISION AS FAMILY COURT OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11-902, District of Columbia Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 11-902. Organization of the court

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Superior Court shall consist of the following:

"(1) The Civil Division.

"(2) The Criminal Division.

"(3) The Family Court.

"(4) The Probate Division.

"(5) The Tax Division.

"(b) BRANCHES.—The divisions of the Superior Court may be divided into such branches as the Superior Court may by rule prescribe.

"(c) DESIGNATION OF PRESIDING JUDGE OF FAMILY COURT.—The chief judge of the Superior Court shall designate one of the judges assigned to the Family Court of the Superior Court to serve as the presiding judge of the Family Court of the Superior Court.

"(d) JURISDICTION DESCRIBED.—The Family Court shall have original jurisdiction over the actions, applications, determinations, adjudications, and proceedings described in section 11-1101. Actions, applications, determinations, adjudications, and proceedings being assigned to cross-jurisdictional units established by the Superior Court, including the Domestic Violence Unit, on the date of enactment of this section may continue to be so assigned after the date of enactment of this section."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 9.—Section 11-906(b), District of Columbia Code, is amended by inserting "the Family Court and" before "the various divisions".

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 11.—(1) The heading for chapter 11 of title 11, District of Columbia, is amended by striking “FAMILY DIVISION” and inserting “FAMILY COURT”.

(2) The item relating to chapter 11 in the table of chapters for title 11, District of Columbia, is amended by striking “FAMILY DIVISION” and inserting “FAMILY COURT”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 16.—(1) CALCULATION OF CHILD SUPPORT.—Section 16–916.1(o)(6), District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking “Family Division” and inserting “Family Court of the Superior Court”.

(2) EXPEDITED JUDICIAL HEARING OF CASES BROUGHT BEFORE HEARING COMMISSIONERS.—Section 16–924, District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking “Family Division” each place it appears in subsections (a) and (f) and inserting “Family Court”.

(3) GENERAL REFERENCES TO PROCEEDINGS.—Chapter 23 of title 16, District of Columbia Code, is amended by inserting after section 16–2301 the following new section:

“§16–2301.1. References deemed to refer to Family Court of the Superior Court

“Any reference in this chapter or any other Federal or District of Columbia law, Executive order, rule, regulation, delegation of authority, or any document of or pertaining to the Family Division of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia shall be deemed to refer to the Family Court of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.”

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter I of chapter 23 of title 16, District of Columbia, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 16–2301 the following new item:

“16–2301.1. References deemed to refer to Family Court of the Superior Court.”

SEC. 3. APPOINTMENT AND ASSIGNMENT OF JUDGES; NUMBER AND QUALIFICATIONS.

(a) NUMBER OF JUDGES FOR FAMILY COURT; QUALIFICATIONS AND TERMS OF SERVICE.—Chapter 9 of title 11, District of Columbia Code, is amended by inserting after section 11–908 the following new section:

“§11–908A. Special rules regarding assignment and service of judges of Family Court

“(a) NUMBER OF JUDGES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The number of judges serving on the Family Court of the Superior Court shall be not more than 15.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—If the chief judge determines that, in order to carry out the intent and purposes of this Act, an emergency exists such that the number of judges needed on the Family Court of the Superior Court at any time is more than 15, the chief judge may temporarily reassign qualified judges from other divisions of the Superior Court or qualified senior judges to serve on the Family Court. Such reassigned judges shall not be subject to the term of service requirements of this Act.

“(3) COMPOSITION.—The total number of judges on the Superior Court may exceed the limit on such judges specified in section 11–903 to the extent necessary to maintain the requirements of this subsection if—

“(A) the number of judges serving on the Family Court is less than 15; and

“(B) the Chief Judge of the Superior Court—

“(i) is unable to secure a volunteer judge who is sitting on the Superior Court outside of the Family Court for reassignment to the Family Court;

“(ii) obtains approval of the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration; and

“(iii) reports to Congress regarding the circumstances that gave rise to the necessity to exceed the cap.

“(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The chief judge may not assign an individual to serve on the Family Court of the Superior Court or handle a Family Court case unless—

“(1) the individual has training or expertise in family law;

“(2) the individual certifies to the chief judge that the individual intends to serve the full term of service, except that this paragraph shall not apply with respect to individuals serving as senior judges under section 11–1504, individuals serving as temporary judges under section 11–908, and any other judge serving in another division of the Superior Court;

“(3) the individual certifies to the chief judge that the individual will participate in the ongoing training programs carried out for judges of the Family Court under section 11–1104(c); and

“(4) the individual meets the requirements of section 11–1501(b).

“(c) TERM OF SERVICE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) SITTING JUDGES.—An individual assigned to serve as a judge of the Family Court of the Superior Court who is serving as a judge in the Superior Court on the date of enactment of the District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001 shall serve in the Family Court for a term of not fewer than 3 years as determined by the chief judge of the Superior Court (including any period of service on the Family Division of the Superior Court immediately preceding the date of enactment of such Act).

“(B) NEW JUDGES.—An individual assigned to serve as a judge of the Family Court of the Superior Court who is not serving as a judge in the Superior Court on the date of enactment of the District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001 shall serve for a term of 5 years.

“(2) ASSIGNMENT FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICE.—After the term of service of a judge of the Family Court (as described in paragraph (1)) expires, at the judge’s request and with the approval of the chief judge, the judge may be assigned for additional service on the Family Court for a period of such duration (consistent with section 431(c) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act) as the chief judge may provide.

“(3) PERMITTING SERVICE ON FAMILY COURT FOR ENTIRE TERM.—At the request of the judge and with the approval of the chief judge, a judge may serve as a judge of the Family Court for the judge’s entire term of service as a judge of the Superior Court under section 431(c) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act.

“(d) REASSIGNMENT TO OTHER DIVISIONS.—The chief judge may reassign a judge of the Family Court to any division of the Superior Court if the chief judge determines that in the interest of justice the judge is unable to continue serving in the Family Court.”

(b) PLAN FOR FAMILY COURT TRANSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the chief judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia shall prepare and submit to the President and Congress a transition plan for the Family Court of the Superior Court, and shall include in the plan the following:

(A) The chief judge’s determination of the role and function of the presiding judge of the Family Court.

(B) The chief judge’s determination of the number of judges needed to serve on the Family Court.

(C) The chief judge’s determination of the number of magistrate judges of the Family Court needed for appointment under section 11–1732, District of Columbia Code.

(D) The chief judge’s determination of the appropriate functions of such magistrate judges, together with the compensation of and other personnel matters pertaining to such magistrate judges.

(E) A plan for case flow, case management, and staffing needs (including the needs for both judicial and nonjudicial personnel) for the Family Court.

(F) A plan for space, equipment, and other physical plant needs and requirements during the transition, as determined in consultation with the Administrator of General Services.

(G) An analysis of the number of magistrate judges needed under the expedited appointment procedures established under section 6(d) in reducing the number of pending actions and proceedings within the jurisdiction of the Family Court (as described in section 11–902(d), District of Columbia, as amended by subsection (a)).

(H) Consistent with the requirements of paragraph (2), a proposal for the disposition or transfer to the Family Court of child abuse and neglect actions pending as of the date of enactment of this Act (which were initiated in the Family Division but remain pending before judges serving in other Divisions of the Superior Court as of such date) in a manner consistent with applicable Federal and District of Columbia law and best practices, including best practices developed by the American Bar Association and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

(I) An estimate of the number of cases for which the deadline for disposition or transfer to the Family Court, specified in paragraph (2)(B), cannot be met and the reasons why such deadline cannot be met.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSAL FOR TRANSFER OR DISPOSITION OF ACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS TO FAMILY COURT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the chief judge of the Superior Court and the presiding judge of the Family Court shall take such steps as may be required as provided in the proposal for disposition of actions and proceedings under paragraph (1)(H) to ensure that each child abuse and neglect action of the Superior Court (as described in section 11–902(d), District of Columbia Code, as amended by subsection (a)) is transferred to the Family Court or otherwise disposed of as provided in subparagraph (B). The requirement of this subparagraph shall not apply to a child abuse or neglect action pending before a senior judge as defined in section 11–1504, District of Columbia Code.

(B) DEADLINE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act and except as provided in subparagraph (C), no child abuse or neglect action shall remain pending with a judge not serving on the Family Court upon the expiration of 18 months after the filing of the transition plan required under paragraph (1).

(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall preclude the immediate transfer of cases to the Family Court, particularly cases which have been filed with the court for less than 6 months prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) RETAINED CASES.—Child abuse and neglect cases that were initiated in the Family Division but remain pending before judges in other Divisions of the Superior Court as of the date of enactment of this Act may remain before judges in such other Divisions when—

(i) the case remains at all times in full compliance with section 103(a)(3) of Public Law 105–89 (42 U.S.C. 675(5)(E)); and

(ii) the case has been assigned continuously to the judge for 18 months or more and the judge has a special knowledge of the child’s needs, such that reassignment would be harmful to the child.

(D) PROGRESS REPORTS.—The chief judge of the Superior Court shall report to the Committee on Appropriations of each House, the Committee

on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives at 6-month intervals for a period of 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act on the progress made towards disposing of actions or proceedings described in subparagraph (B).

(3) **EFFECTIVE DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN.**—The chief judge of the Superior Court may not take any action to implement the transition plan under this subsection until the expiration of the 30-day period which begins on the date the chief judge submits the plan to the President and Congress under paragraph (1).

(c) **TRANSITION TO REQUIRED NUMBER OF JUDGES.**—

(1) **ANALYSIS BY CHIEF JUDGE OF SUPERIOR COURT.**—The chief judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia shall include in the transition plan prepared under subsection (b)—

(A) the chief judge's determination of the number of individuals serving as judges of the Superior Court who—

(i) meet the qualifications for judges of the Family Court of the Superior Court under section 11-908A, District of Columbia Code (as added by subsection (a)); and

(ii) are willing and able to serve on the Family Court; and

(B) if the chief judge determines that the number of individuals described in subparagraph (A) is less than 15, a request that the Judicial Nomination Commission recruit and the President nominate (in accordance with section 433 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act) such additional number of individuals to serve on the Superior Court who meet the qualifications for judges of the Family Court under section 11-908A, District of Columbia Code, as may be required to enable the chief judge to make the required number of assignments.

(2) **ROLE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDICIAL NOMINATION COMMISSION.**—For purposes of section 434(d)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, the submission of a request from the chief judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia under paragraph (1)(B) shall be deemed to create a number of vacancies in the position of judge of the Superior Court equal to the number of additional appointments so requested by the chief judge, except that the deadline for the submission by the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission of nominees to fill such vacancies shall be 90 days after the creation of such vacancies. In carrying out this paragraph, the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission shall recruit individuals for possible nomination and appointment to the Superior Court who meet the qualifications for judges of the Family Court of the Superior Court.

(d) **REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall prepare and submit to Congress and the chief judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia a report on the implementation of this Act (including the transition plan under subsection (b)), and shall include in the report the following:

(A) An analysis of the procedures used to make the initial appointments of judges of the Family Court under this Act and the amendments made by this Act, including an analysis of the time required to make such appointments and the effect of the qualification requirements for judges of the Court (including requirements relating to the length of service on the Court) on the time required to make such appointments.

(B) An analysis of the impact of magistrate judges for the Family Court (including the expedited initial appointment of magistrate judges for the Court under section 6(d)) on the workload of judges and other personnel of the Court.

(C) An analysis of the number of judges needed for the Family Court, including an analysis of how the number may be affected by the qualification requirements for judges, the availability of magistrate judges, and other provisions of this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

(2) **SUBMISSION TO CHIEF JUDGE OF SUPERIOR COURT.**—Prior to submitting the report under paragraph (1) to Congress, the Comptroller General shall provide a preliminary version of the report to the chief judge of the Superior Court and shall take any comments and recommendations of the chief judge into consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

(e) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The first sentence of section 11-908(a), District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking "The chief judge" and inserting "Subject to section 11-908A, the chief judge".

(f) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 9 of title 11, District of Columbia Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 11-908 the following new item:

"11-908A. Special rules regarding assignment and service of judges of Family Court."

SEC. 4. IMPROVING ADMINISTRATION OF CASES AND PROCEEDINGS IN FAMILY COURT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 11 of title 11, District of Columbia, is amended by striking section 1101 and inserting the following:

"§11-1101. Jurisdiction of the Family Court

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Family Court of the District of Columbia shall be assigned and have original jurisdiction over—

"(1) actions for divorce from the bond of marriage and legal separation from bed and board, including proceedings incidental thereto for alimony, pendente lite and permanent, and for support and custody of minor children;

"(2) applications for revocation of divorce from bed and board;

"(3) actions to enforce support of any person as required by law;

"(4) actions seeking custody of minor children, including petitions for writs of habeas corpus;

"(5) actions to declare marriages void;

"(6) actions to declare marriages valid;

"(7) actions for annulments of marriage;

"(8) determinations and adjudications of property rights, both real and personal, in any action referred to in this section, irrespective of any jurisdictional limitation imposed on the Superior Court;

"(9) proceedings in adoption;

"(10) proceedings under the Act of July 10, 1957 (D.C. Code, secs. 30-301 to 30-324);

"(11) proceedings to determine paternity of any child born out of wedlock;

"(12) civil proceedings for protection involving intrafamily offenses, instituted pursuant to chapter 10 of title 16;

"(13) proceedings in which a child, as defined in section 16-2301, is alleged to be delinquent, neglected, or in need of supervision;

"(14) proceedings under chapter 5 of title 21 relating to the commitment of the mentally ill;

"(15) proceedings under chapter 11 of title 21 relating to the commitment of the substantially retarded; and

"(16) proceedings under Interstate Compact on Juveniles (described in title IV of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970).

"(b) **DEFINITION.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In this chapter, the term 'action or proceeding' with respect to the Family Court refers to cause of action described in paragraphs (1) through (16) of subsection (a).

"(2) **EXCEPTION.**—An action or proceeding may be assigned to or retained by cross-jurisdic-

tional units established by the Superior Court, including the Domestic Violence Unit.

"§11-1102. Use of alternative dispute resolution

"To the greatest extent practicable and safe, cases and proceedings in the Family Court of the Superior Court shall be resolved through alternative dispute resolution procedures, in accordance with such rules as the Superior Court may promulgate.

"§11-1103. Standards of practice for appointed counsel

"The Superior Court shall establish standards of practice for attorneys appointed as counsel in the Family Court of the Superior Court.

"§11-1104. Administration

"(a) **'ONE FAMILY, ONE JUDGE' REQUIREMENT FOR CASES AND PROCEEDINGS.**—To the greatest extent practicable, feasible, and lawful, if an individual who is a party to an action or proceeding assigned to the Family Court has an immediate family or household member who is a party to another action or proceeding assigned to the Family Court, the individual's action or proceeding shall be assigned to the same judge or magistrate judge to whom the immediate family member's action or proceeding is assigned.

"(b) **RETENTION OF JURISDICTION OVER CASES.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to the requirement of subsection (a), any action or proceeding assigned to the Family Court of the Superior Court shall remain under the jurisdiction of the Family Court until the action or proceeding is finally disposed, except as provided in paragraph (2)(C).

"(2) **ONE FAMILY, ONE JUDGE.**—

"(A) **FOR THE DURATION.**—An action or proceeding assigned pursuant to this subsection shall remain with the judge or magistrate judge to whom the action or proceeding is assigned for the duration of the action or proceeding to the greatest extent practicable, feasible, and lawful.

"(B) **ALL CASES INVOLVING AN INDIVIDUAL.**—If an individual who is a party to an action or proceeding assigned to the Family Court becomes a party to another action or proceeding assigned to the Family Court, the individual's subsequent action or proceeding shall be assigned to the same judge or magistrate judge to whom the individual's initial action or proceeding is assigned to the greatest extent practicable and feasible.

"(C) **FAMILY COURT CASE RETENTION.**—If the full term of a Family Court judge to whom the action or proceeding is assigned is completed prior to the final disposition of the action or proceeding, the presiding judge of the Family Court shall ensure that the matter or proceeding is reassigned to a judge serving on the Family Court.

"(D) **EXCEPTION.**—A judge whose full term on the Family Court is completed but who remains in Superior Court may retain the case or proceeding for not more than 18 months after ceasing to serve if—

"(i) the case remains at all times in full compliance with section 103(a)(3) of Public Law 105-89 (42 U.S.C. 675(E)), if applicable, and the case has been assigned continuously to the judge for 18 months or more and the judge has a special knowledge of the child's needs, such that reassignment would be harmful to the child; and

"(ii) the chief judge, in consultation with the presiding judge of the Family Court determines that such retention is in the best interests of the parties.

"(3) **STANDARDS OF JUDICIAL ETHICS.**—The actions of a judge or magistrate judge in retaining an action or proceeding under this paragraph shall be subject to applicable standards of judicial ethics.

"(c) **TRAINING PROGRAM.**—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The chief judge, in consultation with the presiding judge of the Family Court, shall carry out an ongoing program to provide training in family law and related matters for judges of the Family Court and other judges of the Superior Court who are assigned Family Court cases, including magistrate judges, attorneys who practice in the Family Court, and appropriate nonjudicial personnel, and shall include in the program information and instruction regarding the following:

“(A) Child development.

“(B) Family dynamics, including domestic violence.

“(C) Relevant Federal and District of Columbia laws.

“(D) Permanency planning principles and practices.

“(E) Recognizing the risk factors for child abuse.

“(F) Any other matters the presiding judge considers appropriate.

“(2) *USE OF CROSS-TRAINING.*—The program carried out under this section shall use the resources of lawyers and legal professionals, social workers, and experts in the field of child development and other related fields.

“(d) *ACCESSIBILITY OF MATERIALS, SERVICES, AND PROCEEDINGS; PROMOTION OF ‘FAMILY-FRIENDLY’ ENVIRONMENT.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—To the greatest extent practicable, the chief judge and the presiding judge of the Family Court shall ensure that the materials and services provided by the Family Court are understandable and accessible to the individuals and families served by the Family Court, and that the Family Court carries out its duties in a manner which reflects the special needs of families with children.

“(2) *LOCATION OF PROCEEDINGS.*—To the maximum extent feasible, safe, and practicable, cases and proceedings in the Family Court shall be conducted at locations readily accessible to the parties involved.

“(e) *INTEGRATED COMPUTERIZED CASE TRACKING AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.*—The Executive Officer of the District of Columbia courts under section 11-1703 shall work with the chief judge of the Superior Court—

“(1) to ensure that all records and materials of cases and proceedings in the Family Court are stored and maintained in electronic format accessible by computers for the use of judges, magistrate judges, and nonjudicial personnel of the Family Court, and for the use of other appropriate offices of the District government in accordance with the plan for integrating computer systems prepared by the Mayor of the District of Columbia under section 4(b) of the District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001;

“(2) to establish and operate an electronic tracking and management system for cases and proceedings in the Family Court for the use of judges and nonjudicial personnel of the Family Court, using the records and materials stored and maintained pursuant to paragraph (1); and

“(3) to expand such system to cover all divisions of the Superior Court as soon as practicable.

“§11-1105. Social services and other related services

“(a) *ONSITE COORDINATION OF SERVICES AND INFORMATION.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Mayor of the District of Columbia, in consultation with the chief judge of the Superior Court, shall ensure that representatives of the appropriate offices of the District government which provide social services and other related services to individuals and families served by the Family Court (including the District of Columbia Public Schools, the District of Columbia Housing Authority, the Child and Family Services Agency, the Office of the Corporation Counsel, the Metropolitan Po-

lice Department, the Department of Health, and other offices determined by the Mayor) are available on-site at the Family Court to coordinate the provision of such services and information regarding such services to such individuals and families.

“(2) *DUTIES OF HEADS OF OFFICES.*—The head of each office described in paragraph (1), including the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools and the Director of the District of Columbia Housing Authority, shall provide the Mayor with such information, assistance, and services as the Mayor may require to carry out such paragraph.

“(b) *APPOINTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES LIAISON WITH FAMILY COURT.*—The Mayor of the District of Columbia shall appoint an individual to serve as a liaison between the Family Court and the District government for purposes of subsection (a) and for coordinating the delivery of services provided by the District government with the activities of the Family Court and for providing information to the judges, magistrate judges, and nonjudicial personnel of the Family Court regarding the services available from the District government to the individuals and families served by the Family Court. The Mayor shall provide on an ongoing basis information to the chief judge of the Superior Court and the presiding judge of the Family Court regarding the services of the District government which are available for the individuals and families served by the Family Court.

“§11-1106. Reports to Congress

“Not later than 90 days after the end of each calendar year, the chief judge of the Superior Court shall submit a report to Congress on the activities of the Family Court during the year, and shall include in the report the following:

“(1) The chief judge’s assessment of the productivity and success of the use of alternative dispute resolution pursuant to section 11-1102.

“(2) Goals and timetables as required by the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 to improve the Family Court’s performance in the following year.

“(3) Information on the extent to which the Family Court met deadlines and standards applicable under Federal and District of Columbia law to the review and disposition of actions and proceedings under the Family Court’s jurisdiction during the year.

“(4) Information on the progress made in establishing locations and appropriate space for the Family Court that are consistent with the mission of the Family Court until such time as the locations and space are established.

“(5) Information on any factors which are not under the control of the Family Court which interfere with or prevent the Family Court from carrying out its responsibilities in the most effective manner possible.

“(6) Information on—

“(A) the number of judges serving on the Family Court as of the end of the year;

“(B) how long each such judge has served on the Family Court;

“(C) the number of cases retained outside the Family Court;

“(D) the number of reassignments to and from the Family Court; and

“(E) the ability to recruit qualified sitting judges to serve on the Family Court.

“(7) Based on outcome measures derived through the use of the information stored in electronic format under section 11-1104(d), an analysis of the Family Court’s efficiency and effectiveness in managing its case load during the year, including an analysis of the time required to dispose of actions and proceedings among the various categories of the Family Court’s jurisdiction, as prescribed by applicable law and best practices, including (but not limited to) best practices developed by the American Bar Asso-

ciation and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

“(8) If the Family Court failed to meet the deadlines, standards, and outcome measures described in the previous paragraphs, a proposed remedial action plan to address the failure.”

(b) *EXPEDITED APPEALS FOR CERTAIN FAMILY COURT ACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS.*—Section 11-721, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) Any appeal from an order of the Family Court of the District of Columbia terminating parental rights or granting or denying a petition to adopt shall receive expedited review by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.”

(c) *PLAN FOR INTEGRATING COMPUTER SYSTEMS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall submit to the President and Congress a plan for integrating the computer systems of the District government with the computer systems of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia so that the Family Court of the Superior Court and the appropriate offices of the District government which provide social services and other related services to individuals and families served by the Family Court of the Superior Court (including the District of Columbia Public Schools, the District of Columbia Housing Authority, the Child and Family Services Agency, the Office of the Corporation Counsel, the Metropolitan Police Department, the Department of Health, and other offices determined by the Mayor) will be able to access and share information on the individuals and families served by the Family Court.

(2) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Mayor of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary to carry out paragraph (1).

(d) *CLERICAL AMENDMENT.*—The table of sections for chapter 11 of title 11, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new items:

“11-1102. Use of alternative dispute resolution.

“11-1103. Standards of practice for appointed counsel.

“11-1104. Administration.

“11-1105. Social services and other related services.

“11-1106. Reports to Congress.”

SEC. 5. TREATMENT OF HEARING COMMISSIONERS AS MAGISTRATE JUDGES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—

(1) *REDESIGNATION OF TITLE.*—Section 11-1732, District of Columbia Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “hearing commissioners” each place it appears in subsection (a), subsection (b), subsection (d), subsection (i), subsection (l), and subsection (n) and inserting “magistrate judges”;

(B) by striking “hearing commissioner” each place it appears in subsection (b), subsection (e), subsection (f), subsection (g), subsection (h), and subsection (j) and inserting “magistrate judge”;

(C) by striking “hearing commissioner’s” each place it appears in subsection (e) and subsection (k) and inserting “magistrate judge’s”;

(D) by striking “Hearing commissioners” each place it appears in subsections (b), (d), and (i) and inserting “Magistrate judges”; and

(E) in the heading, by striking “Hearing commissioners” and inserting “Magistrate judges”.

(2) *CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.*—Section 16-924, District of Columbia Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “hearing commissioner” each place it appears and inserting “magistrate judge”; and

(B) in subsection (f), by striking “hearing commissioner’s” and inserting “magistrate judge’s”.

(3) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The item relating to section 11-1732 of the table of sections of chapter 17 of title 11, D.C. Code, is amended to read as follows:

“11-1732. Magistrate judges.”

(b) **TRANSITION PROVISION REGARDING HEARING COMMISSIONERS.**—Any individual serving as a hearing commissioner under section 11-1732 of the District of Columbia Code as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall serve the remainder of such individual's term as a magistrate judge, and may be reappointed as a magistrate judge in accordance with section 11-1732(d), District of Columbia Code, except that any individual serving as a hearing commissioner as of the date of the enactment of this Act who was appointed as a hearing commissioner prior to the effective date of section 11-1732 of the District of Columbia Code shall not be required to be a resident of the District of Columbia to be eligible to be reappointed.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. SPECIAL RULES FOR MAGISTRATE JUDGES OF FAMILY COURT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia Code, is amended by inserting after section 11-1732 the following new section:

“§11-1732A. Special rules for magistrate judges of the Family Court of the Superior Court and the Domestic Violence Unit

“(a) **USE OF SOCIAL WORKERS IN ADVISORY MERIT SELECTION PANEL.**—The advisory selection merit panel used in the selection of magistrate judges for the Family Court of the Superior Court under section 11-1732(b) shall include certified social workers specializing in child welfare matters who are residents of the District and who are not employees of the District of Columbia Courts.

“(b) **SPECIAL QUALIFICATIONS.**—Notwithstanding section 11-1732(c), no individual shall be appointed as a magistrate judge for the Family Court of the Superior Court or assigned to handle Family Court cases unless that individual—

“(1) is a citizen of the United States;

“(2) is an active member of the unified District of Columbia Bar;

“(3) for the 5 years immediately preceding the appointment has been engaged in the active practice of law in the District, has been on the faculty of a law school in the District, or has been employed as a lawyer by the United States or District government, or any combination thereof;

“(4) has not fewer than 3 years of training or experience in the practice of family law as a lawyer or judicial officer; and

“(5)(A) is a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia and has maintained an actual place of abode in the District for at least 90 days immediately prior to appointment, and retains such residency during service as a magistrate judge; or

“(B) is a bona fide resident of the areas consisting of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties in Maryland, Arlington and Fairfax Counties, and the City of Alexandria in Virginia, has maintained an actual place of abode in such area, areas, or the District of Columbia for at least 5 years prior to appointment, and certifies that the individual will become a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia not later than 90 days after appointment.

“(c) **SERVICE OF CURRENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS.**—Those individuals serving as hearing commissioners under section 11-1732 on the effective date of this section who meet the qualifications described in subsection (b)(4) may request to be appointed as magistrate judges for the Family Court of the Superior Court under such section.

“(d) **FUNCTIONS OF FAMILY COURT AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT MAGISTRATES.**—A magistrate judge, when specifically designated by the chief judge in consultation with the presiding judge to serve in the Family Court or in the Domestic Violence Unit and subject to the rules of the Superior Court and the right of review under section 11-1732(k), may perform the following functions:

“(1) Administer oaths and affirmations and take acknowledgements.

“(2) Subject to the rules of the Superior Court and applicable Federal and District of Columbia law, conduct hearings, make findings and enter interim and final orders or judgments in uncontested or contested proceedings within the jurisdiction of the Family Court and the Domestic Violence Unit of the Superior Court (as described in section 11-1101), excluding jury trials and trials of felony cases, as assigned by the presiding judge of the Family Court.

“(3) Subject to the rules of the Superior Court, enter an order punishing an individual for contempt, except that no individual may be detained pursuant to the authority of this paragraph for longer than 180 days.

“(e) **LOCATION OF PROCEEDINGS.**—To the maximum extent feasible, safe, and practicable, magistrate judges of the Family Court of the Superior Court shall conduct proceedings at locations readily accessible to the parties involved.

“(f) **TRAINING.**—The chief judge, in consultation with the presiding judge of the Family Court of the Superior Court, shall ensure that all magistrate judges of the Family Court receive training to enable them to fulfill their responsibilities, including specialized training in family law and related matters.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—(1) Section 11-1732(a), District of Columbia Code, is amended by inserting after “the duties enumerated in subsection (j) of this section” the following: “(or, in the case of magistrate judges for the Family Court or the Domestic Violence Unit of the Superior Court, the duties enumerated in section 11-1732A(d)).”

(2) Section 11-1732(c), District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking “No individual” and inserting “Except as provided in section 11-1732A(b), no individual”.

(3) Section 11-1732(k), District of Columbia Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “subsection (j),” and inserting the following: “subsection (j) (or proceedings and hearings under section 11-1732A(d), in the case of magistrate judges for the Family Court or the Domestic Violence Unit of the Superior Court).”; and

(B) by inserting after “appropriate division” the following: “(or, in the case of an order or judgment of a magistrate judge of the Family Court or the Domestic Violence Unit of the Superior Court, by a judge of the Family Court or the Domestic Violence Unit).”

(4) Section 11-1732(l), District of Columbia Code, is amended by inserting after “responsibilities” the following: “(subject to the requirements of section 11-1732A(f) in the case of magistrate judges of the Family Court of the Superior Court or the Domestic Violence Unit).”

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 11-1732 the following new item:

“11-1732A. Special rules for magistrate judges of the Family Court of the Superior Court and the Domestic Violence Unit.”

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **EXPEDITED INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the chief judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia shall appoint not more than 5 individuals to serve as magistrate judges for the Family Division of the Superior Court in accordance with the requirements of sections 11-1732 and 11-1732A, District of Columbia Code (as added by subsection (a)).

(B) **TRANSITION RESPONSIBILITIES OF INITIALLY APPOINTED FAMILY COURT MAGISTRATES.**—The chief judge of the Superior Court and the presiding judge of the Family Division of the Superior Court (acting jointly) shall first assign the magistrate judges of Family Court appointed under this paragraph to work with judges to whom the cases are currently assigned in making case disposition or transfer decisions as follows:

(i) The action or proceeding involves an allegation of abuse or neglect.

(ii) The judge to whom the action or proceeding is assigned as of the date of enactment of this Act is not assigned to the Family Division.

(iii) The action or proceeding was initiated in the Family Division prior to the 2-year period which ends on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BORDER AGREEMENT WITH MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA.

It is the sense of Congress that the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the District of Columbia should promptly enter into a border agreement to facilitate the timely and safe placement of children in the District of Columbia's welfare system in foster and kinship homes and other facilities in Maryland and Virginia.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE USE OF COURT APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the chief judge of the Superior Court and the presiding judge of the Family Division should take all steps necessary to encourage, support, and improve the use of Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) in family court actions or proceedings.

SEC. 9. INTERIM REPORTS.

Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the chief judge of the Superior Court and the presiding judge of the Family Court—

(1) in consultation with the General Services Administration, shall submit to Congress a feasibility study for the construction of appropriate permanent courts and facilities for the Family Court; and

(2) shall submit to Congress an analysis of the success of the use of magistrate judges under the expedited appointment procedures established under section 6(d) in reducing the number of pending actions and proceedings within the jurisdiction of the Family Court (as described in section 11-902(d), District of Columbia).

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Courts of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary to carry out the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect upon the initial appropriation of funds specifically designated by Federal law for purposes of carrying out this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2610

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, Senators LIEBERMAN and THOMPSON have an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration; that the amendment be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that

the committee substitute, as amended, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no further intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 2610) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted and Proposed.")

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 2657), as amended, was passed.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to thank my colleagues for supporting and passing the "District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001," which my friend and colleague, Senator LANDRIEU, and I introduced earlier this summer. Our bill is aimed at guiding the District, as the Superior Court strives to reform its role in the child welfare system through its creation of a Family Court. This is a good bill, an important bill. It will have a significant impact on children and families throughout the District of Columbia.

Just last week, by passing the fiscal year 2002 District of Columbia Appropriations bill, the Senate took a major step toward fundamentally changing the direction of what we are doing in the District regarding its child welfare system. Passage of that bill, while significant, was just the beginning of our work, not the end. As Chair and Ranking Member of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator LANDRIEU and I made sure that the appropriations bill made a sizeable and sound investment in the District's court system. However, the bill we are passing today, through the creation of a new family court structure, actually outlines the essential, institutional changes necessary to achieve long-term reform and improvement in the District's ability to protect its children.

We need fundamental reforms, because, quite frankly, the District's child welfare system is a mess. This is nothing new. We have seen articles repeatedly in the Washington Post, that paint a very disturbing picture of the kinds of atrocities that children in the District of Columbia court system have faced. For example, a recent Post series outlined multiple mistakes made by the District of Columbia Government by placing children in unsafe homes or institutions. Unfortunately, these same mistakes occur in the child welfare system throughout our country. Here in Washington, though, these mistakes resulted in over 180 deaths of children in foster care since 1993, 40 of whom died as a direct result of govern-

ment workers' failure to take key preventative actions or because they placed children in unsafe homes or institutions.

Again just last week, the Post ran a story about deficiencies in District's child services. According to this story, "nearly 80 percent of the District's child abuse complaints were not investigated within 30 days and close to two-thirds of foster homes housing city children were unlicensed this year," a study reported. The article continues: "Among the reports' findings, 30 percent of the children under District care were not visited by social workers during their first 8 weeks in foster care. Thirty-seven percent of child neglect complaints were not investigated within 30 days after they came into the city's hotline. Abuse and neglect cases are required to be investigated within a 30-day period."

Stories like this, have been running for years in the District of Columbia. What is happening here in America's capital, is a national tragedy. I realize that no child welfare system is perfect. Each one of us representing our respective States has seen problems in our home States, but what we see in the District of Columbia is an absolute outright scandal.

Since being appointed to the District of Columbia Appropriations Committee, I have made it my personal mission to find financial solutions for the problems facing District of Columbia's foster children. In March, we laid the groundwork for a District of Columbia Family Court Bill that would be bipartisan and effective. In drafting this bill, we have held numerous hearings, met with child welfare advocates from across the District, and had countless meetings with the District of Columbia Superior Court Judges.

The bill we are now passing today includes a number of important reforms that would ensure that the judicial system protects the children of the District. First, it increases the length of judicial terms for judges from 1 year for judges already presiding over the Superior Court to 3 years. New judges appointed to the Superior Court and then assigned to the Family Court will have 5-year terms. This change enables judges to develop an expertise in Family Law.

Second, our bill creates magistrates so that the current backlog of 4,500 permanency cases can be properly and adequately addressed. These magistrates will be distributed among the judges according to a transition plan, which must be submitted to Congress within 90 days of passage of this bill. We want to make sure the court has the flexibility to deal with these important child welfare issues.

Third, the bill provides the resources for an Integrated Judicial Information System, IJIS. This will enable the court to track and properly monitor

family cases and will allow all judges and magistrates to have access to the information necessary to make the best decisions about placement and child safety.

Fourth, a reform in the bill that I find extremely important is the One-Judge/One Family provision. This policy will ensure that the same judge, a judge who knows the history of a family and the child, will be making the important permanency decisions. This provision is essential for those hard cases involving abuse and neglect. It ensures consistency. It ensures safety. And, it just makes sense.

Ultimately, our bill will help provide consistency through the One-Judge/One-Family provision. It will help increase safety and security, and it will help instill stability for the children of the District. We need to give the children in the District's welfare system all of these things. It is the right thing to do.

We must never, ever lose sight of our responsibility to the children involved. Their needs and their best interests must always come first. And today, I believe we are putting children first and taking a huge step forward on their behalf.

AUTHORIZING REPRESENTATION BY SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a resolution submitted earlier today by the majority and Republican leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 192) to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in *Judith Lewis v. Rick Perry, et al.*

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a civil action commenced in the District Court for Dallas County, Texas. The lawsuit, filed by a pro se plaintiff, names Texas Governor Rick Perry and Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON as defendants. While the allegations in the complaint are not clear, the plaintiff appears to call for the impeachment of the defendants by the Texas state courts because of some unspecified, official action. This resolution authorizes the Senate Legal Counsel to represent Senator HUTCHISON in this suit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 192) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The text of the resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")