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The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection to the immediate consider-

of the bill?

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to

express my appreciation to the Senate for its swift action in passing S. 1624, which permanently reauthorizes the

Hate Crime Statistics Act.

The people of my State of Utah, and

of all of our States, have a stake in this

legislation, because any of our citizens can fall prey to a hate crime.

Every crime, of course, is a terrible

event. But the hate crime is of a par-

icularly insidious nature. It splits the

individual victim apart from his or her

neighbors and community. It isolates

the victim because of who he or she is.

The hate crime emphasizes the dif-

ferences, not as the strengths they are in this diverse country, but as a means of dividing American from American.

It submerges the common humanity of all peoples. All real Americans con-

demn these vile crimes without hesi-

tation or reservation.

Under the Hate Crime Statistics Act, the Attorney General is required to

collect data ‘‘about crimes that mani-

fest evidence of prejudice based on

race, religion, disability, sexual ori-

entation, or ethnicity. . . .’’ The act

has resulted in the creation of a Fed-

eral data base on bias-motivated crimi-

nal acts. In addition, it has served as a
catalyst for an FBI effort to train State and local law enforcement offi-
cials about hate crimes. Collection of

this data can help alert local commu-
nities and their law enforcement agen-
ties to any pattern of hate crimes in

their neighborhoods. It can also help

spur educational efforts aimed at en-
hancing goodwill in our communities.

The Hate Crime Statistics Act has

proved its value, and has earned the

permanent reauthorization that the

Senate has now approved.

I wish to commend my friend and dis-
tinguished colleague, Senator Simon,

for his work on this issue. Without his
tireless efforts, there would have been

no Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990,

and no reauthorization of the act this

year. I also wish to commend his chief
counsel, Susan Kaplan, for her work on

this law over the years.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am pleased that today the Senate will pass

S. 1624, a bill to reauthorize and pro-

vide a permanent mandate for the Hate

Crimes Statistics Act. I would like to

thank Chairman Hatch for his leader-

ship on this important issue, as well as

my 51 colleagues who cosponsored this

measure. In addition to its strong bi-

partisan support in the Senate, this

bill also has the strong support of At-
torney General Janet Reno and the en-
dorsement of major law enforcement and advocacy groups.

The Hate Crimes Statistics Act, which passed the Senate in 1990 by a

vote of 92 to 4 and was signed into law

by then President Bush, requires the Justice Department to collect data on

crimes that show evidence of prejudice

based on race, religion, ethnicity, or

sexual orientation. Until this Act was

passed, no Federal records of such

crimes existed. Lack of information

made it difficult to determine whether a particular crime was an isolated

incident, or part of a con-

tinuous series against a particular

group.

The act has proven successful in its

initial purpose—the creation of data

collection—and has also served as a

catalyst for an FBI effort to train

State and local law enforcement offi-
cials about hate crimes. Hearings held

sho

fore several years.

ago.

as a means

sections below. The teenagers found guilty

whether they are connected. Several of

the incidents have been solved, how-

ever, and clearly reveal the deadliness of

offenders. The teenagers found guilty

of burning a church in Mississippi in

1993 shouted racial epithets during

commission of their crime. Racist grafi-

fiti was spray-painted on the walls of a

Knoxville, TN Baptist church set afire

on January 8, 1996. Sumter County Cir-
cuit Court Judge Eddie Hardaway, a

black judge who sent two white men to

jail for vandalizing black churches, was

recently the victim of a shotgun attack

in his home. During the 1960’s civil rights

movement, many black churches were

set ablaze, however in the late 1980’s

and early 1990’s only one or two such

crimes were reported each year. This

recent string of arson reminds us that

prejudice and hate crimes remain a

problem in our Nation.

Recent reports by private groups,

such as the Anti-Defamation League,

the National Coalition on Anti-Vio-

lence Projects, and the National Asian

Pacific American Legal Consortium,

confirm that unfortunately the prob-

lem of crimes based on prejudice con-

tinues. The ADL’s 1995 annual audit of
The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 165) to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I support Senate passage of H.R. 1965, a bill to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act [CZMA] through fiscal year 1999. H.R. 165 is similar to section 205 of S. 1142, a bill that Senators Pressler, Hollings, Burns, Breaux, and I have sponsored to reauthorize the activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Our bill has been reported by the Senate Commerce Committee, but has not yet been brought before the full Senate.

The CZMA was enacted in 1972 to provide grants to States as an incentive to develop Federal approved coastal zone management (CZM) plans. CZM plans are intended to help plan for development in and protect coastal areas. Twenty-four coastal States and five island territories now have Federally approved CZM plans. Alaska, which has over half the coastline of the United States, has had a CZM plan in place since 1979. Of the seven eligible coastal States and territories that do not yet have approved CZM plans, five—Georgia, Minnesota, Ohio, Texas and Indiana—are in the process of developing plans.

In fiscal year 1995, fiscal year 1996, the States and territories with approved CZM plans received appropriations totalling $45.5 million and $46.2 million, respectively. H.R. 165 authorizes appropriations through fiscal year 1999 with a modest growth to these amounts, at roughly the same levels as S. 1142. The bill also reauthorizes grants for States to develop CZM plans, increasing the amounts that may be received, but ending the development grants program under section 1. H.R. 165 includes an amendment to prevent the Secretary of Commerce from delaying the issuance of permits.

Section 307 of the CZMA requires Federal activities—including private activities that require a Federal permit—and Federal assistance to State and local governments—to be consistent with the State’s CZM plan. Applicants for Federal permits—including permits to explore, develop or produce oil in areas approved under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act [OCSLA]—are required to certify that the activity is consistent with the State’s CZM plan before the Federal permit can be issued. States must concur with the certification, but applicants may appeal the State’s decision to the Secretary of Commerce. Section 8 of H.R. 165 requires the Secretary to publish a notice when the record for any appeal has ended, and to make a decision on the appeal within 45 days. This would prevent the Secretary from simply refusing to make a decision on an appeal.

H.R. 165 does not reauthorize funds for the Secretary of Commerce and Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce the section of law passed in 1990 to require States with CZM plans to prepare “coastal nonpoint pollution control programs,” and does not authorize grants to States to prepare those programs.

I encourage other Members of the Senate to support Senate passage of H.R. 165.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise to voice my support for passage of H.R. 165, a bill to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act [CZMA] for the fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999. This language is similar to language contained in S. 1142, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration authorization bill, which the Commerce Committee reported favorably late last session.

In 1969, the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources—recommended that:

A Coastal Zone Management Act be enacted which will provide policy objectives for the coastal zone and authorize federal grants to aid to facilitate implementation of State Coastal Zone Authorities empowered to manage the coastal waters and adjacent land.

In response to this recommendation, Congress in 1972 enacted coastal zone management legislation to balance coastal development and preservation needs. To encourage State participation, the CZMA established a voluntary, two-stage, State assistance program. The first stage involves the award of section 305 grants to coastal States for development of coastal management programs meeting certain Federal requirements. State programs which were judged by the Secretary of Commerce to meet those requirements received Federal approval and became eligible for the second stage of grants. This second stage, under section 306, provides ongoing assistance for States to implement their federally approved coastal programs. All grants require equal matching funds from the State. Since passage of the CZMA, all 34 eligible State and territories have participated in the program to some degree. Of the original 34 participants, 29—24 States and five territories—currently have programs which have achieved Federal approval status. Only five States are not actively participating in the program: Georgia, Texas, Indiana, Minnesota, and Ohio. Considering the 29 programs for which Federal approval has been attained, the national CZM network covers 45 percent of the Nation’s marine and Great Lakes coastline.

The nature and structure of CZM programs vary widely from State to State. This diversity was intended by Congress. Some States, like North Carolina, use the CZM network as a framework for coastal management. Other States, like Oregon, used existing land use legislation as the