

have a balanced bankruptcy reform bill. The administration is on record as saying they support it. If the President really wants a bill, and if my colleagues in the Senate really want a bill, then they should let us move to a formal conference. Furthermore, they should tell us why the clinic violence provision is even necessary.

Current law already prevents perpetrators of clinic violence, as well as other types of violence, from discharging the judgments against them in bankruptcy. Given this, it is clear that the overbroad abortion clinic violence amendment serves no substantive purpose. No one has brought forth a single case in which current law has been used to discharge debts from clinic violence. I raised this issue in a letter to Senator SCHUMER last week, and am still awaiting a response.

Let's move forward with a bankruptcy conference—we have waited long enough.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 13, 2000.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHUCK: I am writing you regarding your clinic violence amendment to the bankruptcy reform legislation. This amendment appears to be one of the final remaining issues holding up the overdue reform our bankruptcy laws truly need to both stop the abuse of the system by those who are able to pay back a portion of their debts and to implement new consumer protections such as enhanced credit card disclosures, which you played a major role in drafting.

I respect your views and the general objective of your amendment to prevent criminals from paying their debts to society or to others by using our bankruptcy laws. Furthermore, I am committed to addressing any legitimate abuse of our bankruptcy laws. However, I am concerned that some who oppose the broadly supported proposed reforms have capitalized on the issue of abortion clinic violence and have spread some misconceptions regarding this issue. Such misconceptions, unfortunately, appear to be jeopardizing passage of the important bankruptcy reform legislation.

For example, in a document circulated by one of our colleagues, it was represented that "[t]he Schumer amendment prevents a documented abuse of the bankruptcy system. . . ." and the compromise language that is in the conference report "would continue to allow many perpetrators of clinic violence to seek shelter in the nation's bankruptcy courts."

There has not been a single case reported or presented where the current bankruptcy laws were held to allow a perpetrator of clinic violence to "seek shelter in the nation's bankruptcy courts," nor is this a "documented abuse" of the system. On the contrary, when those who have committed violence have tried to hide behind the bankruptcy laws, they have found their debts were non-dischargeable under current bankruptcy law. Given this, I do not think that the amendment you offer is necessary.

Indeed, the abortion rights group NARAL recognized in a 1999 publication that "[c]oncluding that clinic violence-associated

debts are non-dischargeable under section 523(a)(6) is consistent with the Supreme court's interpretation of [current bankruptcy law's] "willful and malicious injury." Therefore such true debts are non-dischargeable.

Even given such interpretation of current law, and though the House-passed bill had no abortion-related provision, the current reform legislation goes further and incorporates compromise language that would expand current law and further make debts arising from willful and malicious threats also non-dischargeable. This is done in a politically neutral manner and protects debts from all threats of injury irrespective of the political message of the protestors. In addition, knowing that one of your biggest concerns regarding this subject is the ability of perpetrators to avoid debts arising from settlement or contempt orders, the compromise language specifically covers debts from settlement orders and violations of other orders of the court.

I appreciate your consideration of these points and would welcome any response you might have.

Sincerely,

ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman.

CHANGES TO H. CON. RES. 290
PURSUANT TO SECTION 213

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, section 213 of H. Con. Res. 290 (the FY2001 Budget Resolution) permits the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to make adjustments to the revenue aggregate, the reconciliation instructions, and the Senate pay-as-you-go scorecard, provided certain condition are met.

Pursuant to section 213, I hereby submit the following revisions to H. Con. Res. 290:

Current Revenue Aggregate: (sec. 101(1)(A))—FY 2001 Recommended Level of Federal Revenues	\$1,503,200,000,000
Adjustment: Additional reduction in revenues	-5,000,000,000
Revised Revenue Aggregate: FY 2001 Recommended Level of Federal Revenues	1,498,000,000,000
Current Reconciliation Instruction: (sec. 104(2))—Reduce revenues by no more than	11,600,000,000 in 2001, 150,000,000,000 in 2001-05
Adjustment: Additional reduction in revenues	5,000,000,000 in 2001
Revised Reconciliation Instruction: Reduce revenues by no more than	16,600,000,000 in 2001 150,000,000,000 in 2001-05
Current Senate Pay-as-you-go Scorecard: FY 2001 beginning balance	26,509,000,000
Adjustment: Additional balance added to scorecard	5,000,000,000
Revised Senate Pay-as-you-go Scorecard: FY 2001 beginning balance	31,500,000,000

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

July 20: Earl Lee Bannister, 23, Washington, DC; Charles L. Barre, 33, New Orleans, LA; Chastity Calhoun, 2, New Orleans, LA; Kevin Calhoun, 27, New Orleans, LA; James Fien, 41, Rochester, NY; Derrick Ginn, 25, New Orleans, LA; Carl Hamilton, 24, Baltimore, MD; Michael Harrell, 48, Dallas, TX; Anthony Hudson, Detroit, MI; Darryl Newhouse, 40, Oakland, CA; Damian Nix, 23, Pittsburgh, PA; Jacquaeaz H. Solomon, 22, Chicago, IL.

TAKE CONCRETE ACTION ON
CHECHNYA AT THE G-8 SUMMIT

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to once again draw attention to the continuing war in Chechnya. This war has raged for too long. The war in Chechnya from 1994-1996 left over 80,000 civilians dead, and the Foreign Relations Committee has received credible evidence that the current war has again resulted in the death of thousands of innocent civilians and the displacement of well over 250,000 others. The committee also received credible evidence of widespread looting, summary executions, detentions, denial of safe passage to fleeing civilians, torture and rape, committed by Russian soldiers. Colleagues, regardless of the politics of this war, this kind of behavior is unacceptable. War has rules, and the evidence and testimony the Foreign Relations Committee received raises serious doubts as to whether or not the Russian Federation is playing by those rules. Much of the evidence we received showed clear violations of international humanitarian law, including the well-established Geneva Convention.

Tomorrow is the official opening of Group of Eight Summit in Japan. The President must use this opportunity to relay our serious concerns with the actions of the Russian Government in Chechnya. Let's remember, what was the Group of Seven and became the G-8 with the inclusion of the Russian Federation, is an association of democratic societies with advanced economies. Although Russia is not yet a liberal democracy or an advanced economy, it was invited to take part in this group to encourage its democratic evolution. Today as I watch Russia refuse to initiate a political dialogue with the Chechen people, and continue to deny international humanitarian aid organizations and international human rights monitors access to Chechnya, I must question that evolution.

I am disappointed that the Group of Eight will not include the situation in