S. 1761. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to conserve and enhance the water supplies of the Lower Rio Grande Valley; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COVERDELL (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 1762. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide cost share assistance for the rehabilitation of structural measures constructed as part of water resources projects previously funded by the Secretary under such Act or related laws; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. ALLARD:

S. 1763. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to reauthorize the Office of Ombudsman of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 1764. A bill to make technical corrections to various antitrust laws and to references to such laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1765. A bill to prohibit post-viability abortions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. BURNS):

S. 1766. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deferral of tax on gain from the sale of telecommunications businesses in specific circumstances of a tax credit and other incentives to promote diversity of ownership in telecommunications businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 1767. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve Native Hawaiian education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

S. 1768. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one Committee reports, the other Committee have thirty days to report or be discharged.

By Mr. GRAMS:

S.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution recognizing the late Bernt Balchen for his many contributions to the United States and a lifetime of remarkable achievements on the centenary of his birth, October 23, 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself, and Mr. MACK):

S. 1759. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit for taxpayers owning certain commercial power takeoff vehicles; to the Committee on Finance.

THE FUEL TAX EQUALIZATION CREDIT FOR SUBSTANTIAL POWER TAKEOFF VEHICLES ACT

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Fuel Tax Equalization Credit for Substantial Power Takeoff Vehicles Act. This bill upholds a long-held principle in the application of the Federal fuels excise tax, and restores this principle for certain single engine ''dual-use'' vehicles.

This long-held principle is simple: fuel consumed for the purpose of moving vehicles over the road is taxed, while fuel consumed for ''off-road'' purposes is not taxed. The tax is designed to compensate for the wear and tear impacts on roads. Fuel used for a non-propulsion ''off-road'' purpose has no impact on the roads. It should not be taxed as if it does. Mr. President, this bill is based on this principle, and it remedies a problem created by IRS regulations that control the application of the federal fuels excise tax to ''dual-use'' vehicles.

Dual-use vehicles are vehicles that use fuel both to propel the vehicle on the road, and also to operate separate, on-board equipment. The two prominent examples of dual-use vehicles are concrete mixers, which use fuel to rotate the mixing drum, and sanitation trucks, which use fuel to operate the compactor. Both of these trucks move over the road, but at the same time, a substantial portion of their fuel use is attributable to the non-propulsion function.

Mr. President, the current problem developed because progress in technology has outstripped the regulatory process. In the past, dual-use vehicles commonly had two engines. IRS regulations, written in the 1950s, specifically exempt the portion of fuel used by the separate engine that operates special equipment such as a mixing drum or a trash compactor. These IRS regulations reflect the principle that fuel consumed for non-propulsion purposes is not taxed.

Today, however, typical dual-use vehicles use only one engine. The single engine both propels the vehicle over the road and powers the non-propulsion function through ''power takeoff.'' A major reason for the growth of these single-engine, power takeoff vehicles is that they use less fuel. And a major benefit for everyone is that they are better for the environment.

Power takeoff was not in widespread use when the IRS regulations were drafted, and the regulations deny an exemption for fuel used in single-engine, dual-use vehicles. The IRS defends its distinction between one-engine and two-engine vehicles based on possible administrative problems if vehicle owners were permitted to allocate fuel between the propulsion and non-propulsion functions.

Mr. President, our bill is designed to address the administrative concerns expressed by the IRS, but at the same time, restore tax fairness for dual-use vehicles with one engine. The bill does this by establishing an annual tax credit available for taxpayers that own a licensed and insured concrete mixer or sanitation truck with a compactor. The amount of the credit is $250 and is a conservative estimate of the excise taxes actually paid, based on information compiled on typical sanitation trucks and concrete mixers.

In sum, as a fixed income tax credit, no audit or administrative issue will arise about the amount of fuel used for the off-road purpose. At the same time, the credit provides a rough justice method to make sure these taxpayers are not required to pay tax on fuels that they shouldn't be paying. Also, as an income tax credit, the proposal would have no effect on the highway trust fund.

Mr. President, I would like to stress that I believe the IRS' interpretation of the law is not consistent with long-help principles under the tax law, despite their administrative concerns. Quite simply, the law should not condone a situation where taxpayers are required to pay the excise tax on fuel attributable to non-propulsion functions. This bill corrects an unfair tax that should have never been imposed in the first place. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1759

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Fuel Tax Equalization Credit for Substantial Power Takeoff Vehicles Act''.

SEC. 2. REFUNDABLE CREDIT FOR TAXPAYERS OWNING COMMERCIAL POWER TAKEOFF VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 34 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to certain uses of gasoline and special fuels) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) CREDIT FOR COMMERCIAL POWER TAKEOFF VEHICLES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year the amount of $250 for each qualified commercial power takeoff vehicle owned by the taxpayer as of the close of the calendar year in which or with which the taxable year of the taxpayer ends.

''(2) QUALIFIED COMMERCIAL POWER TAKEOFF VEHICLE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualified commercial power takeoff vehicle' means any highway vehicle described in paragraph (3) which is propelled by any fuel subject to tax under section 4041 or 4081 if such vehicle is used in a trade or business or for the production of income (and is licensed and insured for such use).

''(3) HIGHWAY VEHICLE DESCRIBED.—A highway vehicle is described in this paragraph if such vehicle is—

''(A) designed to engage in the daily collection of refuse or recyclables from homes or businesses and is equipped with a mechanism under which the vehicle's propulsion engine provides the power to operate a load compactor, or

''(B) designed to deliver ready mixed concrete on a daily basis and is equipped with a mechanism under which the vehicle's propulsion engine provides the power to operate a mixer drum to agitate and mix the product en route to the delivery site.

''(4) EXCEPTION FOR VEHICLES USED BY GOVERNMENTS, ETC.—No credit shall be allowed under this subsection for any vehicle owned by any person at the close of a calendar year if such vehicle is used at any time during such year by—

''(A) the United States or an agency or instrumentality thereof, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or an agency or instrumentality of one or more States or political subdivisions, or

''(B) an organization exempt from tax under section 501(a).

''(5) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—The amount of any deduction under this subtitle for any tax imposed by subchapter B of chapter 31 or part III of subchapter A of chapter 32 for any taxable year shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount of the credit determined under this subsection for such taxable year.''

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1999.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague, Senator JOHN BREAUX, in introducing the Fuel Tax Equalization Credit for Substantial Power Takeoff Act.

This bill would create a simple mechanism to reimburse owners of concrete mixers and sanitation trucks for the Federal excise taxes that they pay on fuels used to power the off-road function of their vehicles.

Today, IRS regulations impose the Federal fuels excise tax on ''single engine, dual-use vehicles.'' Two prominent examples of such single-engine, dual-use vehicles are concrete mixers and sanitation trucks. The IRS taxes the entire amount of fuel used in these vehicles, despite the fact that a substantial portion of the fuel consumed is used to power an off-road function—the trash compactor of a sanitation truck, or the rotating drum of the cement truck.

Mr. President, the Federal fuels excise tax is meant to pay for our Nation's roads. If fuel is used for an off-road purpose, it is a well-established principle that we do not tax the fuel. In this case, fuels used to power the trash compactor or rotate the drum on a concrete mixer do not result in wear and tear on the roads and, therefore, should not be taxes.

Contrary to this well-established principle, the IRS imposes the excise tax on single engine, dual-use vehicles. The simple reason given by the IRS for this distinction is administrative convenience. But the convenience of the IRS is no reason to overtax diesel fuel consumers.

Mr. President, our bill corrects the discrepancy created under IRS regulations, and does so without creating any administrative red tape. The $250 income tax credit crafted in the bill would be easy to administer. While it will not fully and precisely compensate these truck owners for the taxes paid on fuel used off-road, this credit has been calculated based on industry data and using conservative estimates, and reduces a tax that these truck owners should not be paying in the first place. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join Senator BREAUX and me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1760. A bill to provide reliable officers, technology, education, community prosecutors, and training in our neighborhoods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION ACT OF 1999 OR PROVIDING RELIABLE OFFICER, TECHNOLOGY, EDUCATION, COMMUNITY PROSECUTORS AND TRAINING IN OUR NEIGHBORHOODS

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, when we passed the 1994 crime bill and created the COPS Program, there were some skeptics. There were people who thought community policing was nothing more than social work and that the program would not work.

Do you remember what I said to the skeptics? I told them that either this program was going to work and we would be geniuses or that it would flop and we would be run out of town. There is an old saying that success has a thousand fathers but failure is an orphan. Now, there are a thousand people all claiming to be the parent of this program simply because it has worked so darn well.

In 1994, we set a goal of funding 100,000 police officers by the year 2000. We met that goal last May—months ahead of schedule. As of today, there have been 103,000 officers funded and 55,000 officers deployed to the streets. The COPS Programs is ahead of schedule and under budget.

Because of COPS, the concept of community policing has become law enforcement's principal weapon fighting crime. Community policing has redefined the relationship between law enforcement and the public. But, more importantly, it has reduced crime. And that is what we attempted to do.

All across the country, from Wilmington to Washington—from Connecticut to California, we are seeing a dramatic decline in crime. Just this week, the FBI released its annual crime statistics which showed that once again, for the seventh year in a row, crime is down. In fact, since 1994, violent crime is down 17.6 percent. And just last year, violent crime was down 6.4 percent nationwide from the year before. But, we can't let that slow us down.

And that's why I'm here today. I am proud of our accomplishments, but we cannot become complacent. We have a unique opportunity here. Some people say if crime down, why put more cops on the streets? Well it's simple math: more cops equals less crime. If we know one thing it is this: if a crime is going to be committed and there is a cop on one street corner and not one the other, guess where the crime is going to be committed? Not where the cop is, I would guess.

Maybe someday we will reach the point where crime is so low that we don't have to take pro-active steps any longer. But, we are not there yet. Our children and our parents are still at great risk out there and it should not be that way. Nor does it have to be that way. And why more cops on the street, it won't be that way.

That is why today, I introduced a bill to continue this program for the next 5 years. It's called ''PROTECTION''—''Providing reliable officers, technology, education, community prosecutors and training in our neighborhoods.'' This bill will put up to 50,000 more officers on the street.

It will also allow police officers to be reimbursed for college or graduate school, because we all know that overcoming crime problems requires something more than just more cops. It requires cops who understand the importance of prevention and community relations. The legislation also provides funding for new technology so that law enforcement can purchase high-tech equipment to put them on equal footing with sophisticated criminals. And it provides for funding for community prosecutors—to expand the community policing concept to engage the whole law enforcement community in fighting crime. It has all the things that law enforcement told me that they needed to do their jobs.

I am proud to say that this legislation has the support of all the major law enforcement organizations and that 49 of my colleagues have told me that they support this legislation. Forty-five of them will join me today in cosponsoring this legislation—including 5 Republicans. I want to recognize my friends on the other side of the aisle and thank them for listening to their constituents, their mayors and their police chiefs who said: We can not do this without your help.

I hope that even more will join us today. I ask the rest of my colleagues—there are 50 more of you—will you be with us on this? Will you listen to everyone who is asking for help? Will you listen to your police chiefs and your mayors? Will you stand up and be counted among those who say enough is enough—and I'm going to do something about crime? I'm going to put more police officers on the street. I'm going to support the most effective law enforcement program of our time.

I hope that we can put politics aside on this one and all join forces to support the folks who do so much for us each and every day. The people who put their safety on the line so that we may be more secure. It is then, that I will know that we have all put our Nation's interest first.

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

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

S. 1760

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Providing Reliable Officers, Technology, Education, Community prosecutors, and Training In Our Neighborhoods Act of 1999'' or ''PROTECTION Act''.

SEC. 2. PROVIDING RELIABLE OFFICERS, TECHNOLOGY, EDUCATION, COMMUNITY PROSECUTORS, AND TRAINING IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD INITIATIVE.

(a) COPS PROGRAM.—Section 1701(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(a)) is amended by—

(1) inserting ''and prosecutor'' after ''increase police''; and

(2) inserting ''to enhance law enforcement access to new technologies, and'' after ''presence,''.

(b) HIRING AND REDEPLOYMENT GRANT PROJECTS.—Section 1701(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by inserting after ''Nation'' the following: '', or pay overtime to existing career law enforcement officers to the extent that such overtime is devoted to community policing efforts''; and

(ii) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by—

(i) striking ''or pay overtime''; and

(ii) striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) promote higher education among in-service State and local law enforcement officers by reimbursing them for the costs associated with seeking a college or graduate school education.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking all that follows SUPPORT SYSTEMS.—'' and inserting ''Grants pursuant to—

''(A) paragraph (1)(B) for overtime may not exceed 25 percent of the funds available for grants pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year;

''(B) paragraph (1)(C) may not exceed 20 percent of the funds available for grants pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year; and

''(C) paragraph (1)(D) may not exceed 5 percent of the funds available for grants pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year.''.

(c) ADDITIONAL GRANT PROJECTS.—Section 1701(d) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''integrity and ethics'' after ''specialized''; and

(B) by inserting ''and'' after ''enforcement officers'';

(2) in paragraph (7) by inserting ''school officials, religiously-affiliated organizations,'' after ''enforcement officers'';

(3) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

''(8) establish school-based partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and local school systems, by using school resource officers who operate in and around elementary and secondary schools to serve as a law enforcement liaison with other Federal, State, and local law enforcement and regulatory agencies, combat school-related crime and disorder problems, gang membership and criminal activity, firearms and explosives-related incidents, illegal use and possession of alcohol, and the illegal possession, use, and distribution of drugs;'';

(4) in paragraph (10) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(5) in paragraph (11) by striking the period that appears at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) develop and implement innovative programs (such as the TRIAD program) that bring together a community's sheriff, chief of police, and elderly residents to address the public safety concerns of older citizens.''.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 1701(f) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting ''use up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated under subsection (a) to'' after ''The Attorney General may'';

(B) by inserting at the end the following: ''In addition, the Attorney General may use up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated under subsections (d), (e), and (f) for technical assistance and training to States, units of local government, Indian tribal governments, and to other public and private entities for those respective purposes.'';

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting ''under subsection (a)'' after ''the Attorney General''; and

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''the Attorney General may'' and inserting ''the Attorney General shall'';

(B) by inserting ''regional community policing institutes'' after ''operation of''; and

(C) by inserting ''representatives of police labor and management organizations, community residents,'' after ''supervisors,''.

(e) TECHNOLOGY AND PROSECUTION PROGRAMS.—Section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd) is amended by—

(1) striking subsection (k);

(2) redesignating subsections (f) through (j) as subsections (g) through (k); and

(3) striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) LAW ENFORCEMENT TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.—Grants made under subsection (a) may be used to assist police departments, in employing professional, scientific, and technological advancements that will help them—

''(1) improve police communications through the use of wireless communications, computers, software, videocams, databases and other hardware and software that allow law enforcement agencies to communicate more effectively across jurisdictional boundaries and effectuate interoperability;

''(2) develop and improve access to crime solving technologies, including DNA analysis, photo enhancement, voice recognition, and other forensic capabilities; and

''(3) promote comprehensive crime analysis by utilizing new techniques and technologies, such as crime mapping, that allow law enforcement agencies to use real-time crime and arrest data and other related information—including non-criminal justice data—to improve their ability to analyze, predict, and respond pro-actively to local crime and disorder problems, as well as to engage in regional crime analysis.

''(f) COMMUNITY-BASED PROSECUTION PROGRAM.—Grants made under subsection (a) may be used to assist State, local or tribal prosecutors' offices in the implementation of community-based prosecution programs that build on local community policing efforts. Funds made available under this subsection may be used to—

''(1) hire additional prosecutors who will be assigned to community prosecution programs, including programs that assign prosecutors to handle cases from specific geographic areas, to address specific violent crime and other local crime problems (including intensive illegal gang, gun and drug enforcement projects and quality of life initiatives), and to address localized violent and other crime problems based on needs identified by local law enforcement agencies, community organizations, and others;

''(2) redeploy existing prosecutors to community prosecution programs as described in paragraph (1) of this section by hiring victim and witness coordinators, paralegals, community outreach, and other such personnel; and

''(3) establish programs to assist local prosecutors' offices in the implementation of programs that help them identify and respond to priority crime problems in a community with specifically tailored solutions.

At least 75 percent of the funds made available under this subsection shall be reserved for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2) and of those amounts no more than 10 percent may be used for grants under paragraph (2) and at least 25 percent of the funds shall be reserved for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2) to units of local government with a population of less than 50,000.''.

(f) RETENTION GRANTS.—Section 1703 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd–2) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''(d) RETENTION GRANTS.—The Attorney General may use no more than 50 percent of the funds under subsection (a) to award grants targeted specifically for retention of police officers to grantees in good standing, with preference to those that demonstrate financial hardship or severe budget constraint that impacts the entire local budget and may result in the termination of employment for police officers funded under subsection (b)(1).''.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) CAREER LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—Section 1709(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd–8) is amended by inserting after ''criminal laws'' the following: ''including sheriffs deputies charged with supervising offenders who are released into the community but also engaged in local community policing efforts.''.

(2) SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER.—Section 1709(4) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd–8) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) to serve as a law enforcement liaison with other Federal, State, and local law enforcement and regulatory agencies, to address and document crime and disorder problems including gangs and drug activities, firearms and explosives-related incidents, and the illegal use and possession of alcohol affecting or occurring in or around an elementary or secondary school;

(B) by striking subparagraph (E) and inserting the following:

''(E) to train students in conflict resolution, restorative justice, and crime awareness, and to provide assistance to and coordinate with other officers, mental health professionals, and youth counselors who are responsible for

the implementation of prevention/intervention programs within the schools;''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) to work with school administrators, members of the local parent teacher associations, community organizers, law enforcement, fire departments, and emergency medical personnel in the creation, review, and implementation of a school violence prevention plan;

''(I) to assist in documenting the full description of all firearms found or taken into custody on school property and to initiate a firearms trace and ballistics examination for each firearm with the local office of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms;

''(J) to document the full description of all explosives or explosive devices found or taken into custody on school property and report to the local office of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms; and

''(K) to assist school administrators with the preparation of the Department of Education, Annual Report on State Implementation of the Gun-Free Schools Act which tracks the number of students expelled per year for bringing a weapon, firearm, or explosive to school.''.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(11) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part Q, to remain available until expended—

''(i) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

''(ii) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

''(iii) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

''(iv) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

''(v) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

''(vi) $1,150,000,000 for fiscal year 2005.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''3 percent'' and inserting ''5 percent'';

(B) by striking ''1701(f)'' and inserting ''1701(g)'';

(C) by striking the second sentence and inserting ''Of the remaining funds, if there is a demand for 50 percent of appropriated hiring funds, as determined by eligible hiring applications from law enforcement agencies having jurisdiction over areas with populations exceeding 150,000, no less than 50 percent shall be allocated for grants pursuant to applications submitted by units of local government or law enforcement agencies having jurisdiction over areas with populations exceeding 150,000 or by public and private entities that serve areas with populations exceeding 150,000, and no less than 50 percent shall be allocated for grants pursuant to applications submitted by units of local government or law enforcement agencies having jurisdiction over areas with populations less than 150,000 or by public and private entities that serve areas with populations less than 150,000.'';

(D) by striking ''85 percent'' and inserting ''$600,000,000''; and

(E) by striking ''1701(b),'' and all that follows through ''of part Q'' and inserting the following: ''1701 (b) and (c), $350,000,000 to grants for the purposes specified in section 1701(e), and $200,000,000 to grants for the purposes specified in section 1701(f).''.

● Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the 21st Century Community Policing Initiative Act. I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this legislation, introduced by Senators BIDEN and SCHUMER, that I believe is crucial to our efforts to fight crime.

This important bill would re-authorize the successful Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program through the year 2005. Because of the COPS program, there are over 100,000 more police officers on the beat than there were before this program was implemented in 1994. This represents a nearly 20 percent increase in police presence nationwide.

By extending the COPS program, the 21st Century Community Policing Initiative Act will help put up to 50,000 more police on the streets over the next five years. It will also provide $350 million a year in grants to law enforcement agencies to assist them in acquiring new technology to enhance crime fighting efforts. This means better communications systems so cops in different jurisdictions can talk to each other; state of the art investigative tools like DNA analysis; and the means to target crime hot spots.

This legislation would also provide $200 million per year in grants for community-wide prosecutors. This aspect of the bill would expand the community policing concept to engage the whole community in preventing and fighting crime. The cops have been so successful in their jobs that the next step is to provide more prosecutors to help get criminals off the streets.

Mr. President, one of the best ways to fight crime is to have more well-trained police officers on our streets and in our schools, and to provide them with the latest equipment and technology. The COPS program has helped achieve these goals, and has in turn helped to make our communities safer places for our children, families, and businesses.

The COPS program has been a tremendous asset to my state of North Carolina. As of October 20th, the COPS program had provided North Carolina with grants of over $135 million. From Alexander Mills to Zebulon, North Carolina communities have received COPS funding to help law enforcement agencies hire an additional 2,602 police officers to patrol neighborhoods and protect our schools.

In August, I met with police officers and sheriffs from across North Carolina to learn more about how the COPS program is helping to keep local communities safe. I heard from law enforcement officers from the larger cities such as Raleigh and Charlotte. I also spoke with officers from smaller, rural areas like North Wilkesboro and Randolph County. The one clear message that I got from all of these officers is that the COPS program is working and should be continued.

Mr. President, crime rates in big cities are generally higher than they are in smaller towns. An increased police presence can help deter crime in these urban areas. However, officers I met with from less populated regions of North Carolina emphasized to me that even one more cop can make a world of difference to a community that lacks its own resources to hire more police officers. In these situations, the COPS program can step in and provide these communities with the additional help they need.

One of the most interesting and persuasive arguments to renew the COPS program was also one that I heard during these conversations with North Carolina police officers. They told me that when people think of the COPS program, they immediately think of more officers policing the streets. However, one of the most important roles that the COPS program has played is to provide funds for law enforcement agencies to work in partnership with education officials to solve problems of crime in and around schools.

Officers are not just placed in the schools to instill discipline. They act as counselors, coaches and mentors for children. And they are reaching out to students by offering safe after-school activities. North Carolina officers told me that these efforts are some of the best kinds of crime prevention measures that we can take.

By connecting with at-risk youth, these school-based officers have become trusted adult authority figures that kids will run to in times of trouble, instead of running away from them.

Many police chiefs and sheriffs credit community policing and COPS support with dramatic drops in crime rates around the nation. Since the inception of the COPS program, violent crime in North Carolina is down 7% and aggravated assault has fallen by 8%. According to a report issued by the State Bureau of Investigation, the state's murder rate fell 3% from 1997 to 1998. And, the country's crime rate is at its lowest in 25 years.

These statistics are encouraging, but now is not the time to eliminate a program that has substantially contributed to declining crime rates. We still have a long way to go to insuring that people are walking crime-free streets and children are attending crime-free schools.

Continuation of the COPS program is one significant way that we can continue to make progress towards these goals.

Mr. President, during debate on the juvenile crime bill, Senator BIDEN offered an amendment that would have re-authorized the COPS program through 2005. I voted for this amendment which was endorsed by many law enforcement organizations including the National Fraternal Order of Police and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Unfortunately, the amendment failed by the slimmest of margins (48–50). However, I am confident that upon reconsideration of the question whether it is necessary to renew the COPS program, my colleagues will realize how effective and valuable the program has been, not only to their individual states, but to the nation as a whole.

I want to thank Senators BIDEN and SCHUMER for their efforts to re-authorize the COPS program and I urge all of

my colleagues to support the 21st Century Community Policing Initiative Act.●

By Mr. COVERDELL (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 1762. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide cost share assistance for the rehabilitation of structural measures constructed as part of water resources projects previously funded by the Secretary under such act or related laws; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SMALL WATERSHED REHABILITATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, we have a national problem that greatly affects Georgia if not addressed. Since 1944, under a federal program administered by the United States Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service, over 10,400 small watershed dams were constructed in 46 states. These dams were planned and designed with a 50 year lifespan. The purpose of this program was to provide flood control, water quality improvement, rural water supply assurance, fish and wildlife habitat protection, recreation, and irrigation.

Communities depend upon these watershed projects. However, many of these dams have reached their life expectancy and are badly in need of repair. Currently, the United States Department of Agriculture has neither the authority nor funds for rehabilitation of watershed structures. The legislation I introduce today along with Senator LINCOLN, the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Act of 1999, provides a needed and critical solution to this growing crisis for rural America.

The state of Georgia alone has 357 small watershed dams, 69 of which will reach the end of their designed lifespan within the next 10 years. It is my understanding that 121 dams in Georgia need to be modified to meet state dam safety laws and protect residential and commercial development downstream from the dams while 8 dams need repairs and modifications to extend their useful life and help prevent future environmental and economic losses. Since fiscal year 1996, the state of Georgia has appropriated over $4.6 million to bring these structures in compliance with the Georgia Safe Dams Act. However, state and local communities do not have enough financial resources available to rehabilitate these watersheds dams in a timely fashion.

The legislation Senator LINCOLN and I are introducing lays out a procedure and a funding mechanism for a rehabilitation process that would ultimately save these dams across the nation, including those located in Georgia. The bill authorizes $60 million a year from 2000 to 2009 and requires the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a system of ranking and approving rehabilitation requests on need and merit. Specifically, the legislation calls for $5 million to be used annually by the Secretary to assess the true needs of the entire program in the first two years of the program's existence. Under this program, 65 percent would be funded by the federal government while the remaining 35 percent would be funded locally. Recent flooding in the southeast from Hurricane Floyd and Irene make enactment of this legislation an even more pressing matter.

This bi-partisan legislation has been endorsed by Governor Roy Barnes of Georgia and a wide range of other Georgia state and local officials and national associations.

I would like to thank Senator LINCOLN for her leadership, and for working with me on this important legislation. This bill is a Senate companion to legislation introduced by Representative FRANK LUCAS of Oklahoma. We look forward to working with him on securing its enactment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and letters of support be priinted in the RECORD.

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

S. 1762

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Watershed Rehabilitation Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. REHABILITATION OF WATER RESOURCE STRUCTURAL MEASURES CONSTRUCTED UNDER CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS.

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 14. REHABILITATION OF STRUCTURAL MEASURES NEAR, AT, OR PAST THEIR EVALUATED LIFE EXPECTANCY.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

''(1) REHABILITATION.—The term 'rehabilitation', with respect to a structural measure constructed as part of a covered water resource project, means the completion of all work necessary to extend the service life of the structural measure and meet applicable safety and performance standards. This may include (A) protecting the integrity of the structural measure, or prolonging the useful life of the structural measure, beyond the original evaluated life expectancy, (B) correcting damage to the structural measure from a catastrophic event, (C) correcting the deterioration of structural components that are deteriorating at an abnormal rate, (D) upgrading the structural measure to meet changed land use conditions in the watershed served by the structural measure or changed safety criteria applicable to the structural measure, or (E) decommissioning the structural measure, including removal or breaching.

''(2) COVERED WATER RESOURCE PROJECT.—The term 'covered water resource project' means a work of improvement carried out under any of the following:

''(A) This Act.

''(B) Section 13 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 78–534; 58 Stat. 905).

''(C) The pilot watershed program authorized under the heading 'FLOOD PREVENTION' of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1954 (Public Law 156; 67 Stat. 214).

''(D) Subtitle H of title XV of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3451 et seq.; commonly known as the Resource Conservation and Development Program).

''(3) ELIGIBLE LOCAL ORGANIZATION.—The term 'eligible local organization' means a local organization or appropriate State agency responsible for the operation and maintenance of structural measures constructed as part of a covered water resource project.

''(4) STRUCTURAL MEASURE.—The term 'structural measure' means a physical improvement that impounds water, commonly known as a dam, which was constructed as part of a covered water resource project.

''(b) COST SHARE ASSISTANCE FOR REHABILITATION.—

''(1) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may provide financial assistance to an eligible local organization to cover a portion of the total costs incurred for the rehabilitation of structural measures originally constructed as part of a covered water resource project. The total costs of rehabilitation include the costs associated with all components of the rehabilitation project, including acquisition of land, easements, and rights-of-ways, rehabilitation project administration, the provision of technical assistance, contracting, and construction costs, except that the local organization shall be responsible for securing all land, easements, or rights-of-ways necessary for the project.

''(2) AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE; LIMITATIONS.—The amount of Federal funds that may be made available under this subsection to an eligible local organization for construction of a particular rehabilitation project shall be equal to 65 percent of the total rehabilitation costs, but not to exceed 100 percent of actual construction costs incurred in the rehabilitation. However, the local organization shall be responsible for the costs of water, mineral, and other resource rights and all Federal, State, and local permits.

''(3) RELATION TO LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS.—As a condition on entering into an agreement to provide financial assistance under this subsection, the Secretary, working in concert with the eligible local organization, may require that proper zoning or other developmental regulations are in place in the watershed in which the structural measures to be rehabilitated under the agreement are located so that—

''(A) the completed rehabilitation project is not quickly rendered inadequate by additional development; and

''(B) society can realize the full benefits of the rehabilitation investment.

''(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR WATERSHED PROJECT REHABILITATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Natural Resources Conservation Service, may provide technical assistance in planning, designing, and implementing rehabilitation projects should an eligible local organization request such assistance. Such assistance may consist of specialists in such fields as engineering, geology, soils, agronomy, biology, hydraulics, hydrology, economics, water quality, and contract administration.

''(d) PROHIBITED USE.—

''(1) PERFORMANCE OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—Rehabilitation assistance provided under this section may not be used to perform operation and maintenance activities specified in the agreement for the covered water resource project entered into between the Secretary and the eligible local organization responsible for the works of improvement. Such operation and maintenance activities shall remain the responsibility of the local organization, as provided in the project work plan.

''(2) RENEGOTIATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), as part of the provision of financial assistance under subsection (b), the

Secretary may renegotiate the original agreement for the covered water resource project entered into between the Secretary and the eligible local organization regarding responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the project when the rehabilitation is finished.

''(e) APPLICATION FOR REHABILITATION ASSISTANCE.—An eligible local organization may apply to the Secretary for technical and financial assistance under this section if the application has also been submitted to and approved by the State agency having supervisory responsibility over the covered water resource project at issue or, if there is no State agency having such responsibility, by the Governor of the State. The Secretary shall request the State dam safety officer (or equivalent State official) to be involved in the application process if State permits or approvals are required. The rehabilitation of structural measures shall meet standards established by the Secretary and address other dam safety issues. At the request of the eligible local organization, personnel of the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture may assist in preparing applications for assistance.

''(f) JUSTIFICATION FOR REHABILITATION ASSISTANCE.—In order to qualify for technical or financial assistance under this authority, the Secretary shall require the rehabilitation project to be performed in the most cost-effective manner that accomplishes the rehabilitation objective. Since the requirements for accomplishing the rehabilitation are generally for public health and safety reasons, in many instances being mandated by other State or Federal laws, no benefit-cost analysis will be conducted and no benefit-cost ratio greater than one will be required. The benefits of and the requirements for the rehabilitation project shall be documented to ensure the wise and responsible use of Federal funds.

''(g) RANKING OF REQUESTS FOR REHABILITATION ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall establish such system of approving rehabilitation requests, recognizing that such requests will be received throughout the fiscal year and subject to the availability of funds to carry out this section, as is necessary for proper administration by the Department of Agriculture and equitable for all eligible local organizations. The approval process shall be in writing, and made known to all eligible local organizations and appropriate State agencies.

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $60,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2009 to provide financial and technical assistance under this section.

''(i) ASSESSMENT OF REHABILITATION NEEDS.—Of the amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (h) for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, $5,000,000 shall be used by the Secretary, in concert with the responsible State agencies, to conduct an assessment of the rehabilitation needs of covered water resource projects in all States in which such projects are located.

''(j) RECORDKEEPING AND REPORTS.—

''(1) SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall maintain a data base to track the benefits derived from rehabilitation projects supported under this section and the expenditures made under this section. On the basis of such data and the reports submitted under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress an annual report providing the status of activities conducted under this section.

''(2) GRANT RECIPIENTS.—Not later than 90 days after the completion of a specific rehabilitation project for which assistance is provided under this section, the eligible local organization that received the assistance shall make a report to the Secretary giving the status of any rehabilitation effort undertaken using financial assistance provided under this section.''.

STATE OF GEORGIA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Atlanta, June 16, 1999.

Hon. PAUL COVERDELL,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR PAUL: The purpose of this correspondence is to encourage your strong and active support for H.R. 728, the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Amendment of 1999. H.R. 728 was introduced by Representative Frank D. Lucas of Oklahoma and amends the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (P.L. 83–566, 16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) by adding a new section to provide federal cost-share for rehabilitation of structural measures that are near, at, or past their evaluated life expectancy. Cost-share assistance will be provided to local watershed, conservation and other districts that have the legal responsibility for the safety and conditions of watershed dams throughout the United States. The need for funding by H.R. 728 results from the fact that the United States Department of Agriculture now has neither the authority nor funds for rehabilitation of watershed structures.

To date, there have been over 10,400 watershed dams constructed with the help of federal cost-share funds, primarily through Public Law 83–566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Georgia has 351 watershed structures as a result of this program. Many of these dams are nearing, or are already at the end of, their design lifetime—50 years—and are in need of significant rehabilitation to maintain structural integrity and dam safety. Twenty-two of Georgia's Soil and Water Conservation Districts have primary responsibility for operating and maintaining these 351 dams, and many of our districts share responsibility with local governments on the remaining structures. Since FY96, the state of Georgia has appropriated over $4.6 million to bring these structures in compliance with the Georgia Safe Dams Act.

These watershed structures provide over $16 million of benefits each year to Georgia communities by protecting urban and rural infrastructures, as well as personal property, from flooding and flood damage. These dams also protect irreplaceable natural resources through an effective watershed approach.

Representative Lucas is currently seeking co-sponsors for this bill in the House. Congressmen Nathan Deal and Saxby Chambliss have already become co-sponsors of H.R. 728. I would like to ask for your support in co-sponsoring this legislation; it is important to Georgia's soil and water conservation districts and the state of Georgia.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ROY E. BARNES.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER,
Pickens County, GA, October 20, 1999.

Senator PAUL COVERDELL,
Russell Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COVERDELL: I certainly appreciate and support your effort to introduce the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Act 1999.

As you know, these watershed structures are very well placed in 19 sites throughout our County preventing major runoff, erosion and flooding.

Even though our efforts to maintain them are ongoing we are somewhat limited by budget and time restraints due to routine County maintenance.

Sincerely,

FRANK MARTIN,
Commissioner.

PAULDING COUNTY BOARD
OF COMMISSIONERS,
Dallas, GA, October 20, 1999.

Hon. PAUL COVERDELL,
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COVERDELL: I would like to offer you my support for the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Senate Bill that you will be introducing. I appreciate your efforts on behalf of Paulding County. If there is ever anything I can do for you, please don't hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,

BILL CARRUTH,
Chairman.

PAULDING COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Dallas, GA, October 20, 1999.

Hon. PAUL COVERDELL,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COVERDELL: In reference to the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Senate Bill that you will be introducing, I want to offer you my support in your efforts to get this passed. I appreciate your time and effort in what you are doing for Paulding County and if there is ever anything I can do for you, please don't hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,

HAL ECHOLS,
Post III Commissioner.

PAULDING COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Dallas, GA, October 20, 1999.

Hon. PAUL COVERDELL,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COVERDELL: In reference to the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Senate Bill that you will be introducing, I want to offer you my support in your efforts to get this passed. I appreciate your time and effort in what you are doing for Paulding County and if there is ever anything I can do for you, please don't hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,

ROGER LEGGETT,
Post II Commissioner.

PAULDING COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Dallas, GA, October 20, 1999.

Hon. PAUL COVERDELL,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COVERDELL: I am in total support of the Watershed Dam bill you will be introducing. We have many watershed dams in Paulding County that are in need of repair.

If you need any additional, please call me.

Sincerely,

MIKE J. POPE,
Commissioner, Post I.

COBB COUNTY BOARD
OF COMMISSIONERS,
Marietta, GA, October 19, 1999.

Hon. PAUL COVERDELL,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COVERDELL: I want to formally endorse your sponsorship of legislation to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, in order to provide financial assistance to local entities working

to rehabilitate structural measures constructed as part of a covered water resource project.

Having federal financial assistance available to address a portion of the costs for the rehabilitation of structures that impound water can ensure that appropriate revenues and support will be available as Cobb County works to extend the service life of these structures.

Finally, I appreciate the effort on behalf of Congress to address the safety concerns associated with the maintenance of these aging structures. The protection of life and property is a priority and assistance in this effort is most appreciated.

Please know that I aggressively support this legislation and your sponsorship.

Sincerely,

BILL BYRNE,
Chairman.

GWINNETT COUNTY,
Office of the County Administrator,
October 19, 1999.

Senator PAUL D. COVERDELL,
Colony Square, Atlanta, GA.

SENATOR COVERDELL: I appreciate the opportunity to give input on the Watershed Rehabilitation Legislation. I have reviewed the draft bill, and it appears to be in our best interest for this legislation to pass. It provides 65% rehabilitation funding for existing soil conservation service dams. This funding can also be used to extend the life of the dams, correct accelerated deterioration, correct damage from a catastrophic event, or upgrade the dam to meet changed land use conditions in the watershed.

It appears that no funding is currently available for this work, and since Gwinnett County has responsibility for 14 of the referenced dams, we support this draft legislation. If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to call me at (770) 822–7021. Thank you.

Sincerely,

CHARLOTTE NASH,
County Administrator.

HABERSHAM COUNTY,
OFFICE OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Clarkesville, GA, October 20, 1999.

To: Mr. RICHARD GUPTON.

Subject: Small Watershed Rehabilitation Act of 1999.

DEAR SIR: We fully support Senator Paul Coverdell's effort to obtain federal funds to up grade and maintain the watershed dams in our county. These dams have provided and are still providing much needed flood protection and other benefits including municipal water. The cost of bringing these dams up to safe dams standards far exceeds our budget. Any help from the federal level is certainly a wise use of tax dollars.

Sincerely,

JERRY L. TANKSLEY,
Chairman.

CITY OF HOGANSVILLE,
E. MAIN STREET,
Hogansville, GA, October 21, 1999.

HONORABLE PAUL COVERDELL: The reservoir here in Hogansville was built in the mid 1970's primarily for the purpose of flood control. It has served the community exceptionally well in its intended purpose.

It can't be overstated as to how important the maintenance of the dam is to the integrity of the dam and the safety to the community immediately downstream.

As with anything we do, it does cost to properly maintain the dam and these costs escalate each year. It is extremely important that we receive Federal financial assistance with the maintenance of the dam at our reservoir.

Sincerely,

DAVID ALDRICH,
City Manager.

UPPER CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
October 20, 1999.

Re Watershed Dam Rehabilitation.

Mr. RICHARD GUPTON.

DEAR MR. GUPTON: I would like to express our strongest support for Senator Coverdell's Bill to provide assistance to repair the watershed dams across the county and especially important to me the dams in Forsyth County.

I have been a supervisor in Forsyth County for over five years and have seen first hand the tremendous benefits that these structures have provided the citizens of Forsyth County.

As these dams approach 40 and 50 years old the District has seen the urgent need for federal assistance in performing necessary repairs and upgrades to meet new regulations and standards. This assistance is urgently needed to upgrade these structures so they can continue to provide benefits in the year to come.

Sincerely,

LEONARD RIDINGS,
District Supervisor.

BARTOW COUNTY
COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
October 21, 1999.

Senator PAUL COVERDELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Re Watershed Dams Legislation.

DEAR SENATOR COVERDELL: As County Commissioner, I support the legislation currently being considered on watershed dams.

Bartow County has seven watershed dams. This legislation, if passed, would benefit many counties, like Bartow that have several of these dams to maintain.

Thank you for your endorsement of this legislation.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE BROWN,
SOLE COMMISSIONER,
Bartow County, GA.

NATIONAL WATERSHED COALITION,
October 4, 1999.

Hon. PAUL D. COVERDELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COVERDELL, Recently I have heard you might be considering introducing a Small Watershed Rehabilitation Bill in the Senate, much like H.R. 728 that is working its way through the House of Representatives. This letter is to support you in that endeavor, and offer the resources of the National Watershed Coalition (NWC) in that support.

Our NWC represents local watershed project sponsors at the national level. For many years they have been telling us that our nation's small watershed structures, which provide invaluable benefits to society, in some instances are in vital need of rehabilitation and upgrading to meet current standards. In many cases, these local sponsors, no matter how much they would like to be able to accomplish these mandated upgrades, simply do not have the financial capability to do so, and are not likely to get that capability soon. Your own state of Georgia has been a national leader in recognizing this problem and assisting these local project sponsors with technical and financial help. Even with Georgia's own statewide rehabilitation program, more is needed. We believe that since the federal government worked with these local sponsors in planning and building these structures, and since much of the required upgrading is as a result of changed federal policies, it just makes sense that the federal government assist with the rehabilitation on a cost-sharing basis much as they did the original construction.

Within the next 10 years, 69 of Georgia's 357 watershed structures will reach the end of their designed lifespan. Georgia has about 130 structures that need some modification, and the cost estimate is $85 million. The cost of rehabilitating these structures can be expensive. Two dams were recently modified in Georgia's Etowah River and Raccoon Creek Watersheds at a cost of nearly $750,000 each. With rehabilitation, these very worthwile structures will continue to provide benefits to society for years to come. It has been estimated these watershed projects provide $2.20 in benefits for every $1.00 of cost. That is the kind of federal investment we ought to be protecting.

The NWC is pleased you are considering introducing such a bill, and will help.

Sincerely,

W.R. ''BILL'' HAMM,
Chairman.

NATIONAL WATERSHED COALITION,
Burke, VA.

NATIONAL WATERSHED COALITION—WHAT IS IT?—WHO IS IT?

The National Watershed Coalition is a nonprofit organization consisting of national, regional, state, and local associations and organizations that have joined forces to advocate the use of the watershed or hydrologic unit concept when assessing natural resources issues. Additionally, we are pooling our resources to support and strengthen USDA's Small Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Programs (PL 534 & 566) as we believe they represent the best available planning and implementation vehicles for water and land resource management. The Coalition also supports other water resources programs employing total resource based principles in planning, and the rehabilitation of older projects.

The affairs of the Coalition are managed by a steering committee made up of representatives of all participating national, regional, and state organizations and associations. Current steering committee membership includes: Alabama Association of Conservation Districts; Arkansas Watershed Coalition; Associated General Contractors of America; Association of State Dam Safety Officials; Association of State Floodplain Managers; Association of Texas Soil & Water Conservation Districts; Interstate Council on Water Policy; Iowa Watersheds; Kansas Association of Conservation Districts; Land Improvement Contractors of America; Lower Colorado River Authority, Texas; Mississippi Association of Conservation Districts; Missouri Watershed Association; National Association of Conservation Districts; National Association of Flood and Stormwater Management Agencies; National Association of State Conservation Agencies; New Mexico Watershed Coalition; North Carolina Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts; Oklahoma Association of Conservation Districts; Oklahoma Conservation Commission; Pennsylvania Division of Conservation Districts; Soil & Water Conservation Society; South Carolina Association of Conservation Districts; South Carolina Land Resources Conservation Commission; State Association of Kansas Watersheds; Tennessee Association of Conservation Districts; Texas Association of Watershed Sponsors; Texas State Soil & Water Conservation Board; Tombigbee River Valley Water Management District, Mississippi; Town Creek Water

Management District of Lee, Pontotoc, Prentiss & Union Counties, Mississippi; Virginia Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts; West Virginia Soil & Water Conservation District Supervisors Association; West Virginia State Soil Conservation Agency; and Wisconsin PL–566 Coalition.

MEMBERSHIPS

The National Watershed Coalition includes among its membership a number of supporters (local watershed sponsors and individuals), who have made voluntary tax-exempt contributions to support the Coalition's efforts. Funds obtained through memberships are used to provide information to all members, and help defray expenses of publishing the newsletter, mailings and a biennial conference. Our membership categories are individual, organization and Steering Committee.

HOW THE STEERING COMMITTEE WORKS

The steering committee meets three to four times each year to review problems and concerns about water resources issues and the PL 534 & 566 watershed programs and related authorities, and discuss recommendations on how the program can be improved. Each representative takes recommendations back to their own organization and follows up with their own membership, committees, and contacts. There is also regular communication throughout the year concerning progress made on current watershed management issues.

There is no required membership fee to become a member of the Steering Committee of the National Watershed Coalition, although some organizations do make a voluntary contribution in support. In addition, representatives of participating organizations and associations pay their own wages and expenses for attendance at committee meetings, and handle their own clerical and postage expenses inhouse. Steering committee members are encouraged to also be Individual Members.

From time to time, there has been, and may be again, solicitation for funds for specific purposes toward a common goal; however, it is understood that solicited funds are to be given entirely on a voluntary basis. The Coalition is a 501(c)(3) organization. Funds contributed to the Coalition are tax deductible.

If your organization wishes to play a more active role in this effort, we welcome your participation. All you need to do is write to the address indicated below requesting to be a part of this important effort, explaining your organization's interest and support for the watershed approach and the Small Watershed Programs, and providing the name, title, and address of the person designated to represent your group. When your organization receives its acceptance letter, you will be included on the mailing list and invited to participate in all steering committee meetings. We welcome all interested organizations.

We look forward to hearing from you. The more participation we have, the stronger our voice will be.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 1764. A bill to make technical corrections to various antitrust laws and to references to such laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ANTITRUST TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1999

● Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to co-sponsor the Antitrust Technical Corrections and Improvements Act of 1999 with my colleague MIKE DEWINE. This act makes five miscellaneous technical corrections to the antitrust laws. Companion legislation to this bill has been introduced in the House by Representatives HYDE and CONYERS.

One of the technical corrections repeals an outdated provision which applies only to the Panama Canal, one clarifies a long existing ambiguity and expressly ensures that the Sherman Act applies to the District of Columbia and the territories, and another repeals a redundant jurisdictional provision. In addition, two other provisions correct typographical errors in two antitrust statutes—the inadvertent mislabeling of an amendment to the Clayton Act passed last year and another a punctuation error in the Year 2000 Information and Readiness Disclosure Act.

The only difference between our bill and the House companion is that the House would repeal an outdated statute—the Taking Depositions in Public Act—which requires that pre-trial depositions in antitrust cases brought by the government be taken in public. This provision was enacted in 1913 at a time when antitrust cases were tried under completely different procedures from today and testimony was usually not taken in open court. In other words, back then antitrust trials were essentially conducted ''on paper.'' This statute was virtually ignored—and unused—until the past year. This provision was revived last year when, as part of its antitrust lawsuit against Microsoft, the government deposed Bill Gates.

Now, of course, people need to be deposed if they possess evidence that may be integral to the resolution of the case. But today the 1913 statute seems both unnecessary, counter-productive and, even, voyeuristic—that is, if you can have voyeurism in an antitrust context. Its need has vanished because testimony is now taken in open court in antitrust cases, as it is in any other. Indeed, requiring the depositions of prominent figures such as Bill Gates and Steve Case in controversial and widely publicized cases inevitably creates a media ''feeding frenzy'' contrary to the sound administration of justice and a sober examination of complicated legal issues.

So I would support the House provision but, at this point, my belief is that it is more important to move the underlying measure in a timely manner than to wait to develop a consensus on the deposition provision in the Senate. We'll work on that consensus here, or we'll work the differences out in conference.

Mr. President, I ask that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD. I look forward to working with my colleagues to turn this bill into law.

The summary of the bill follows:

SUMMARY OF THE ANTITRUST TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1999

1. Repeal of the Antitrust Provision of the Panama Canal Act (15 U.S.C. §31)—Section 11 of the Panama Canal Act provides that no vessel owned by someone who is violating the antitrust laws may pass through the Panama Canal. With the return of the Canal to Panamanian sovereignty at the end of 1999, it is appropriate to repeal this outdated provision.

2. Clarification that Section 2 of the Sherman Act Applies to the District and the Territories (15 U.S.C. §3)—Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act are two of the central provisions of the antitrust laws. Section 1 prohibits combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade, and Section 2 prohibits monopolization. Section 3 of the Sherman Act was intended to apply these provisions to the District of Columbia and the various territories of the United States. Unfortunately, however, section 3 is ambiguously drafted and leaves it unclear whether Section 2 applies to the District of Columbia and the territories. This bill clarifies that both Section 1 and Section 2 apply to the District and the Territories.

3. Repeal of Redundant Antitrust Jurisdictional Provision in Section 77 at the Wilson Tariff Act—In 1955, Congress modernized the jurisdictional and venue provisions relating to antitrust suits by amendment Section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. §15). At that time, it repealed the redundant jurisdiction provision in Section 7 of the Sherman Act, but not the corresponding provision in Section 77 of the Wilson Tariff Act. It appears that this was an oversight because Section 77 was never codified and has rarely been used. Repealing Section 77 will not change any substantive rights because Section 4 of the Clayton Act provides any potential plaintiff with the same rights. Rather it simply rides the law of a confusing, redundant, and little used provision.

4. Technical Amendment to the Curt Flood Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–297)—This provision corrects an inadvertent technical error in the statutory codification of the Curt Flood Act of 1998, the statute which provided that major league baseball players are covered under the antitrust law. The Curt Flood Act was codified to a section number of the Clayton Act which was already in use. The amendment corrects this error by redesignating the statute as section 28 of the Clayton Act. This substantive change to the statute is intended.

5. Technical Amendment to the Year 2000 Information and Readiness Disclosure Act—This provision corrects a typographical error in the statute as enacted by the inserting a missing period in section 5(a)(2). No substantive change to the statute is intended.●

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1765. A bill to prohibit post-viability abortions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE LATE-TERM ABORTION BAN BILL

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, Senator BOXER and I today are introducing a bill to ban abortions after a fetus is viable.

The bill has 3 provisions:

(1) It bans post-viability abortions.

(2) It provides an exception to the ban if, in the medical judgment of the attending physician, the abortion is necessary to preserve the life of the woman or to avert serious adverse health consequences to the woman.

(3) It includes two civil penalties:

For the first offense, a fine not to exceed $10,000. For the second offense, revocation of a physician's medical license.

This amendment is similar to S. 481 which we introduced in the previous Congress and the amendment we offered as a substitute to the ''partial-birth abortion bill'' when the Senate considered it. The major difference is that the bill we introduce today adds the penalty of revocation of the medical license for a second offense. S. 481 did not include this penalty. Both S. 481 and this bill have as the penalty for the first offense a $10,000 fine.

This bill reflects my deep belief that abortions after a fetus is viable should not take place except in the rarest of circumstances to protect the life and health of the mother. That is the intent of this bill.

The medical community has said that there are very occasionally very extraordinary and tragic circumstances when a physician may determine that a postviability abortion is the safest procedure for protecting a woman's health. These are circumstances which most of us can never imagine.

Leading medical organizations say that post-viability abortions are rare and should be rare. They say that medical decisions should be made by doctors who must determine the best procedure. For example, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, has said:

ACOG has never supported post-viability abortions except for the constitutionally protected exception of saving the life or health of a woman.

There may be circumstances where the physician and patient would reach the conclusion that this procedure [Intact Dilatation and Extraction after 16 weeks of pregnancy] is the most medically appropriate . . . there is a need for flexibility in handling unexpected situations. . . .

The California Medical Association wrote me, ''The determination of the medical need for, and effectiveness of, particular medical procedures must be left to the medical profession, to be reflected in the standard of care . . . The legislative process is ill-suited to evaluate complex medical procedures whose importance may vary with a particular patient's case and with the state of scientific knowledge.''

Congress cannot anticipate every conceivable medical situation. Only the doctor, in consultation with the patient, based upon the woman's unique medical history and health can make this decision of how best to protect the woman's health.

This substitute is designed to protect the fetus, to protect the woman's life and health and to give the physician the latitude to make the necessary medical decisions in those rarest of circumstances.

The U.S. Supreme Court, in the 1973 Roe v. Wade decision, held that the woman's health must be the physician's primary concern and the physician must be given the discretion he or she needs to choose the most appropriate abortion method to protect the woman's life and health.

The Supreme Court has defined ''health of the mother.'' In Doe v. Bolton, the Court held that the decision of whether a woman requires an abortion for the health of the mother is a medical judgment to ''be exercised in light of all factors—physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the woman's age—relevant to the well-being of the patient.'' In so doing, the Court further recognized a doctor's important role in determining whether an abortion is necessary.

I believe that the language of this bill—unlike S. 1692, Senator SANTORUM's bill and the substitute offered yesterday by Senator DURBIN—has a meaningful health exception for the woman and is constitutional.

The decision to have an abortion—by the mother, the father, the physician—is never an easy one. It is the most wrenching decision any woman could ever have to make. It is a profoundly, impossibly difficult decision in the late stages of pregnancy.

No physician would perform a postviability abortion without extended and serious consideration. Because the physician's action has consequences for human life and the action should not be undertaken except in the gravest of circumstances, the substitute includes two penalties. It creates for the first offense a $10,000 fine; for the second offense, revocation of the physician's license.

I oppose post-viability abortions. They are wrong, except to save the mother's life and health. Late-term abortions are rare and they should be rare.

I will vote against S. 1692, Senator SANTORUM's bill, because it is not constitutional. It does not include adequate protections for a woman's health.

I believe this bill is a far preferable approach. Its penalties represent grave consequences for violations. It protects the fetus except in extraordinary circumstances that could have serious adverse consequences for the mother's health. It protects a woman's life and health.

I hope my colleagues will join me in passing this bill.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 1767. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve Native Hawaiian education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill, on behalf of myself and Senator AKAKA, that would provide for the reauthorization of the Native Hawaiian Education Act.

First enacted into law in 1988 as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Native Hawaiian Education Act provides support for the education of native Hawaiian students in furtherance of the United States' trust responsibility to the native people of Hawaii.

Mr. President, I am sad to report that while these programs are beginning to demonstrate an improved pattern of academic performance and achievement, we still have a way to go, as the following statistics would indicate.

Education risk factors continue to start even before birth for many native Hawaiian children, including late or no prenatal care, high rates of births to unmarried native Hawaiian mothers, and high rates of births to teenage parents.

Native Hawaiian students continue to begin their school experience lagging behind other students in terms of readiness factors such as vocabulary test scores;

Native Hawaiian students continue to score below national norms on standardized education achievement tests at all grade levels;

Both public and private schools continue to show a pattern of lower percent ages of native Hawaiian students in the uppermost achievement levels and in gifted and talented programs;

Native Hawaiian students continue to be over-represented among students qualifying for special education programs provided to students with learning disabilities, mild mental retardation, emotional impairment, and other such disabilities;

Native Hawaiian continue to be under-represented in institutions of higher education and among adults who have completed four or more years of college;

Native Hawaiian continue to be disproportionately represented in many negative social and physical statistics indicative of special educational needs, as demonstrated by the fact that—

Native Hawaiian students are more likely to be retained in grade level and to be excessively absent in secondary school;

Native Hawaiian students have the highest rates of drug and alcohol use in the State of Hawaii; and

Native Hawaiian children continue to be disproportionately victimized by child abuse and neglect; and

In the 1988, National Assessment of Educational Progress, Hawaiian fourth graders ranked 39 among groups of students from 39 States in reading.

Mr. President, because Hawaiian students rank among the lowest groups of students nationally in reading, and because native Hawaiian students rank the lowest among Hawaiian students in reading, it is imperative that greater focus be placed on beginning reading and early education and literacy in Hawaii.

Mr. President, there was a time in the history of Hawaii when there were very high rates of literacy and integration of traditional culture and Western Education among native Hawaiians. These high rates were attributable to the Hawaiian language-based public school system established in 1840 by King Kamehameha III.

Mr. President, if we are to reverse the course of these downward trends in

educational achievement and academic performance of native Hawaiian students, it is critical that the initiatives authorized by the Native Hawaiian Education Act be reauthorized.

Mr. President, I respectfully request unanimous consent that the text of this measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1767

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Native Hawaiian Education Reauthorization Act''.

SEC. 2. NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATION.

Part B of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''PART B—NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATION

''SEC. 9201. SHORT TITLE.

''This part may be cited as the 'Native Hawaiian Education Act'.

''SEC. 9202. FINDINGS.

''Congress finds the following:

''(1) Native Hawaiians are a distinct and unique indigenous people with a historical continuity to the original inhabitants of the Hawaiian archipelago, whose society was organized as a nation and internationally recognized as a nation by the United States, Britain, France, and Japan, as evidenced by treaties governing friendship, commerce, and navigation.

''(2) At the time of the arrival of the first non-indigenous people in Hawai'i in 1778, the Native Hawaiian people lived in a highly organized, self-sufficient subsistence social system based on a communal land tenure system with a sophisticated language, culture, and religion.

''(3) A unified monarchal government of the Hawaiian Islands was established in 1810 under Kamehameha I, the first King of Hawai'i.

''(4) From 1826 until 1893, the United States recognized the sovereignty and independence of the Kingdom of Hawai'i, which was established in 1810 under Kamehameha I, extended full and complete diplomatic recognition to the Kingdom of Hawai'i, and entered into treaties and conventions with the Kingdom of Hawai'i to govern friendship, commerce and navigation in 1826, 1842, 1849, 1875, and 1887.

''(5) In 1893, the sovereign, independent, internationally recognized, and indigenous government of Hawai'i, the Kingdom of Hawai'i, was overthrown by a small group of non-Hawaiians, including United States citizens, who were assisted in their efforts by the United States Minister, a United States naval representative, and armed naval forces of the United States. Because of the participation of United States agents and citizens in the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai'i, in 1993 the United States apologized to Native Hawaiians for the overthrow and the deprivation of the rights of Native Hawaiians to self-determination through Public Law 103–150 (107 Stat. 1510).

''(6) In 1898, the joint resolution entitled 'Joint Resolution to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States', approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), ceded absolute title of all lands held by the Republic of Hawai'i, including the government and crown lands of the former Kingdom of Hawai'i, to the United States, but mandated that revenue generated from the lands be used 'solely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands for educational and other public purposes'.

''(7) By 1919, the Native Hawaiian population had declined from an estimated 1,000,000 in 1778 to an alarming 22,600, and in recognition of this severe decline, Congress enacted the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920 (42 Stat. 108), which designated approximately 200,000 acres of ceded public lands for homesteading by Native Hawaiians.

''(8) Through the enactment of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, Congress affirmed the special relationship between the United States and the Native Hawaiians, which was described by then Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane, who said: 'One thing that impressed me . . . was the fact that the natives of the island who are our wards, I should say, and for whom in a sense we are trustees, are falling off rapidly in numbers and many of them are in poverty.'.

''(9) In 1938, Congress again acknowledged the unique status of the Hawaiian people by including in the Act of June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 781, chapter 530; 16 U.S.C. 391b, 391b–1, 392b, 392c, 396, 396a), a provision to lease lands within the National Parks extension to Native Hawaiians and to permit fishing in the area 'only by native Hawaiian residents of said area or of adjacent villages and by visitors under their guidance.'.

''(10) Under the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union', approved March 18, 1959 (73 Stat. 4), the United States transferred responsibility for the administration of the Hawaiian Home Lands to the State of Hawai'i but reaffirmed the trust relationship between the United States and the Hawaiian people by retaining the exclusive power to enforce the trust, including the power to approve land exchanges and amendments to such Act affecting the rights of beneficiaries under such Act.

''(11) In 1959, under the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union', the United States also ceded to the State of Hawai'i title to the public lands formerly held by the United States, but mandated that such lands be held by the State 'in public trust' and reaffirmed the special relationship that existed between the United States and the Hawaiian people by retaining the legal responsibility to enforce the public trust responsibility of the State of Hawai'i for the betterment of the conditions of Native Hawaiians, as defined in section 201(a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920.

''(12) The United States has recognized and reaffirmed that—

''(A) Native Hawaiians have a cultural, historic, and land-based link to the indigenous people who exercised sovereignty over the Hawaiian Islands, and that group has never relinquished its claims to sovereignty or its sovereign lands;

''(B) Congress does not extend services to Native Hawaiians because of their race, but because of their unique status as the indigenous people of a once sovereign nation as to whom the United States has established a trust relationship;

''(C) Congress has also delegated broad authority to administer a portion of the Federal trust responsibility to the State of Hawaii;

''(D) the political status of Native Hawaiians is comparable to that of American Indians and Alaska Natives; and

''(E) the aboriginal, indigenous people of the United States have—

''(i) a continuing right to autonomy in their internal affairs; and

''(ii) an ongoing right of self-determination and self-governance that has never been extinguished.

''(13) The political relationship between the United States and the Native Hawaiian people has been recognized and reaffirmed by the United States, as evidenced by the inclusion of Native Hawaiians in—

''(A) the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991 et seq.);

''(B) the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 U.S.C. 1996);

''(C) the National Museum of the American Indian Act (20 U.S.C. 80q et seq.);

''(D) the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.);

''(E) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.);

''(F) the Native American Languages Act (25 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.);

''(G) the American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Culture and Art Development Act (20 U.S.C. 4401 et seq.);

''(H) the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) and the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.); and

''(I) the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.).

''(14) In 1981, Congress instructed the Office of Education to submit to Congress a comprehensive report on Native Hawaiian education. The report, entitled the 'Native Hawaiian Educational Assessment Project', was released in 1983 and documented that Native Hawaiians scored below parity with regard to national norms on standardized achievement tests, were disproportionately represented in many negative social and physical statistics indicative of special educational needs, and had educational needs that were related to their unique cultural situation, such as different learning styles and low self-image.

''(15) In recognition of the educational needs of Native Hawaiians, in 1988, Congress enacted title IV of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 (102 Stat. 130) to authorize and develop supplemental educational programs to address the unique conditions of Native Hawaiians.

''(16) In 1993, the Kamehameha Schools Bishop Estate released a 10-year update of findings of the Native Hawaiian Educational Assessment Project, which found that despite the successes of the programs established under title IV of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, many of the same educational needs still existed for Native Hawaiians. Subsequent reports by the Kamehameha Schools Bishop Estate and other organizations have generally confirmed those findings. For example—

''(A) educational risk factors continue to start even before birth for many Native Hawaiian children, including—

''(i) late or no prenatal care;

''(ii) high rates of births by Native Hawaiian women who are unmarried; and

''(iii) high rates of births to teenage parents;

''(B) Native Hawaiian students continue to begin their school experience lagging behind other students in terms of readiness factors such as vocabulary test scores;

''(C) Native Hawaiian students continue to score below national norms on standardized education achievement tests at all grade levels;

''(D) both public and private schools continue to show a pattern of lower percentages of Native Hawaiian students in the uppermost achievement levels and in gifted and talented programs;

''(E) Native Hawaiian students continue to be overrepresented among students qualifying for special education programs provided to students with learning disabilities, mild mental retardation, emotional impairment, and other such disabilities;

''(F) Native Hawaiians continue to be underrepresented in institutions of higher education and among adults who have completed 4 or more years of college;

''(G) Native Hawaiians continue to be disproportionately represented in many negative social and physical statistics indicative of special educational needs, as demonstrated by the fact that—

''(i) Native Hawaiian students are more likely to be retained in grade level and to be excessively absent in secondary school;

''(ii) Native Hawaiian students have the highest rates of drug and alcohol use in the State of Hawai'i; and

''(iii) Native Hawaiian children continue to be disproportionately victimized by child abuse and neglect; and

''(H) Native Hawaiians now comprise over 23 percent of the students served by the State of Hawai'i Department of Education, and there are and will continue to be geographically rural, isolated areas with a high Native Hawaiian population density.

''(17) In the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress, Hawaiian fourth-graders ranked 39th among groups of students from 39 States in reading. Given that Hawaiian students rank among the lowest groups of students nationally in reading, and that Native Hawaiian students rank the lowest among Hawaiian students in reading, it is imperative that greater focus be placed on beginning reading and early education and literacy in Hawai'i.

''(18) The findings described in paragraphs (16) and (17) are inconsistent with the high rates of literacy and integration of traditional culture and Western education historically achieved by Native Hawaiians through a Hawaiian language-based public school system established in 1840 by Kamehameha III.

''(19) Following the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai'i in 1893, Hawaiian medium schools were banned. After annexation, throughout the territorial and statehood period of Hawai'i, and until 1986, use of the Hawaiian language as an instructional medium in education in public schools was declared unlawful. The declaration caused incalculable harm to a culture that placed a very high value on the power of language, as exemplified in the traditional saying: 'I ka 'ōlelo nō ke ola; I ka 'ōlelo nō ka make. In the language rests life; In the language rests death.'.

''(20) Despite the consequences of over 100 years of nonindigenous influence, the Native Hawaiian people are determined to preserve, develop, and transmit to future generations their ancestral territory and their cultural identity in accordance with their own spiritual and traditional beliefs, customs, practices, language, and social institutions.

''(21) The State of Hawai'i, in the constitution and statutes of the State of Hawai'i—

''(A) reaffirms and protects the unique right of the Native Hawaiian people to practice and perpetuate their culture and religious customs, beliefs, practices, and language; and

''(B) recognizes the traditional language of the Native Hawaiian people as an official language of the State of Hawai'i, which may be used as the language of instruction for all subjects and grades in the public school system.

''SEC. 9203. PURPOSES.

''The purposes of this part are to—

''(1) authorize and develop innovative educational programs to assist Native Hawaiians in reaching the National Education Goals;

''(2) provide direction and guidance to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies to focus resources, including resources made available under this part, on Native Hawaiian education, and to provide periodic assessment and data collection;

''(3) supplement and expand programs and authorities in the area of education to further the purposes of this title; and

''(4) encourage the maximum participation of Native Hawaiians in planning and management of Native Hawaiian education programs.

''SEC. 9204. NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATION COUNCIL AND ISLAND COUNCILS.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATION COUNCIL.—In order to better effectuate the purposes of this part through the coordination of educational and related services and programs available to Native Hawaiians, including those programs receiving funding under this part, the Secretary is authorized to establish a Native Hawaiian Education Council (referred to in this part as the 'Education Council').

''(b) COMPOSITION OF EDUCATION COUNCIL.—The Education Council shall consist of not more than 21 members, unless otherwise determined by a majority of the council.

''(c) CONDITIONS AND TERMS.—

''(1) CONDITIONS.—At least 10 members of the Education Council shall be Native Hawaiian education service providers and 10 members of the Education Council shall be Native Hawaiians or Native Hawaiian education consumers. In addition, a representative of the State of Hawai'i Office of Hawaiian Affairs shall serve as a member of the Education Council.

''(2) APPOINTMENTS.—The members of the Education Council shall be appointed by the Secretary based on recommendations received from the Native Hawaiian community.

''(3) TERMS.—Members of the Education Council shall serve for staggered terms of 3 years, except as provided in paragraph (4).

''(4) COUNCIL DETERMINATIONS.—Additional conditions and terms relating to membership on the Education Council, including term lengths and term renewals, shall be determined by a majority of the Education Council.

''(d) NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATION COUNCIL GRANT.—The Secretary shall make a direct grant to the Education Council in order to enable the Education Council to—

''(1) coordinate the educational and related services and programs available to Native Hawaiians, including the programs assisted under this part;

''(2) assess the extent to which such services and programs meet the needs of Native Hawaiians, and collect data on the status of Native Hawaiian education;

''(3) provide direction and guidance, through the issuance of reports and recommendations, to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies in order to focus and improve the use of resources, including resources made available under this part, relating to Native Hawaiian education, and serve, where appropriate, in an advisory capacity; and

''(4) make direct grants, if such grants enable the Education Council to carry out the duties of the Education Council, as described in paragraphs (1) through (3).

''(e) ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF THE EDUCATION COUNCIL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Education Council shall provide copies of any reports and recommendations issued by the Education Council, including any information that the Education Council provides to the Secretary pursuant to subsection (i), to the Secretary, the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

''(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Education Council shall prepare and submit to the Secretary an annual report on the Education Council's activities.

''(3) ISLAND COUNCIL SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE.—The Education Council shall provide such administrative support and financial assistance to the island councils established pursuant to subsection (f) as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, in a manner that supports the distinct needs of each island council.

''(f) ESTABLISHMENT OF ISLAND COUNCILS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to better effectuate the purposes of this part and to ensure the adequate representation of island and community interests within the Education Council, the Secretary is authorized to facilitate the establishment of Native Hawaiian education island councils (referred to individually in this part as an 'island council') for the following islands:

''(A) Hawai'i.

''(B) Maui.

''(C) Moloka'i.

''(D) Lana'i.

''(E) O'ahu.

''(F) Kaua'i.

''(G) Ni'ihau.

''(2) COMPOSITION OF ISLAND COUNCILS.—Each island council shall consist of parents, students, and other community members who have an interest in the education of Native Hawaiians, and shall be representative of individuals concerned with the educational needs of all age groups, from children in preschool through adults. At least ¾ of the members of each island council shall be Native Hawaiians.

''(g) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS RELATING TO EDUCATION COUNCIL AND ISLAND COUNCILS.—The Education Council and each island council shall meet at the call of the chairperson of the appropriate council, or upon the request of the majority of the members of the appropriate council, but in any event not less often than 4 times during each calendar year. The provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the Education Council and each island council.

''(h) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Education Council and each island council shall not receive any compensation for service on the Education Council and each island council, respectively.

''(i) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of the Native Hawaiian Education Reauthorization Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate a report that summarizes the annual reports of the Education Council, describes the allocation and use of funds under this part, and contains recommendations for changes in Federal, State, and local policy to advance the purposes of this part.

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $300,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years. Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

''SEC. 9205. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

''(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—

''(1) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—The Secretary is authorized to make direct grants to, or enter into contracts with—

''(A) Native Hawaiian educational organizations;

''(B) Native Hawaiian community-based organizations;

''(C) public and private nonprofit organizations, agencies, and institutions with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction in the Native Hawaiian language; and

''(D) consortia of the organizations, agencies, and institutions described in subparagraphs (A) through (C),

to carry out programs that meet the purposes of this part.

''(2) PRIORITIES.—In awarding grants or contracts to carry out activities described in paragraph (3), the Secretary shall give priority to entities proposing projects that are designed to address—

''(A) beginning reading and literacy among students in kindergarten through third grade;

''(B) the needs of at-risk youth;

''(C) needs in fields or disciplines in which Native Hawaiians are underemployed; and

''(D) the use of the Hawaiian language in instruction.

''(3) PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Activities provided through programs carried out under this part may include—

''(A) the development and maintenance of a statewide Native Hawaiian early education and care system to provide a continuum of services for Native Hawaiian children from the prenatal period of the children through age 5;

''(B) the operation of family-based education centers that provide such services as—

''(i) programs for Native Hawaiian parents and their infants from the prenatal period of the infants through age 3;

''(ii) preschool programs for Native Hawaiians; and

''(iii) research on, and development and assessment of, family-based, early childhood, and preschool programs for Native Hawaiians;

''(C) activities that enhance beginning reading and literacy among Native Hawaiian students in kindergarten through third grade;

''(D) activities to meet the special needs of Native Hawaiian students with disabilities, including—

''(i) the identification of such students and their needs;

''(ii) the provision of support services to the families of those students; and

''(iii) other activities consistent with the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;

''(E) activities that address the special needs of Native Hawaiian students who are gifted and talented, including—

''(i) educational, psychological, and developmental activities designed to assist in the educational progress of those students; and

''(ii) activities that involve the parents of those students in a manner designed to assist in the students' educational progress;

''(F) the development of academic and vocational curricula to address the needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults, including curriculum materials in the Hawaiian language and mathematics and science curricula that incorporate Native Hawaiian tradition and culture;

''(G) professional development activities for educators, including—

''(i) the development of programs to prepare prospective teachers to address the unique needs of Native Hawaiian students within the context of Native Hawaiian culture, language, and traditions;

''(ii) in-service programs to improve the ability of teachers who teach in schools with concentrations of Native Hawaiian students to meet those students' unique needs; and

''(iii) the recruitment and preparation of Native Hawaiians, and other individuals who live in communities with a high concentration of Native Hawaiians, to become teachers;

''(H) the operation of community-based learning centers that address the needs of Native Hawaiian families and communities through the coordination of public and private programs and services, including—

''(i) preschool programs;

''(ii) after-school programs; and

''(iii) vocational and adult education programs;

''(I) activities to enable Native Hawaiians to enter and complete programs of postsecondary education, including—

''(i) provision of full or partial scholarships for undergraduate or graduate study that are awarded to students based on their academic promise and financial need, with a priority, at the graduate level, given to students entering professions in which Native Hawaiians are underrepresented;

''(ii) family literacy services;

''(iii) counseling and support services for students receiving scholarship assistance;

''(iv) counseling and guidance for Native Hawaiian secondary students who have the potential to receive scholarships; and

''(v) faculty development activities designed to promote the matriculation of Native Hawaiian students;

''(J) research and data collection activities to determine the educational status and needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults;

''(K) other research and evaluation activities related to programs carried out under this part; and

''(L) other activities, consistent with the purposes of this part, to meet the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults.

''(4) SPECIAL RULE AND CONDITIONS.—

''(A) INSTITUTIONS OUTSIDE HAWAII.—The Secretary shall not establish a policy under this section that prevents a Native Hawaiian student enrolled at a 2- or 4-year degree granting institution of higher education outside of the State of Hawai'i from receiving a fellowship pursuant to paragraph (3)(I).

''(B) FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall establish conditions for receipt of a fellowship awarded under paragraph (3)(I). The conditions shall require that an individual seeking such a fellowship enter into a contract to provide professional services, either during the fellowship period or upon completion of a program of postsecondary education, to the Native Hawaiian community.

''(b) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 5 percent of funds provided to a grant recipient under this section for any fiscal year may be used for administrative purposes.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

''SEC. 9206. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

''(a) APPLICATION REQUIRED.—No grant may be made under this part, and no contract may be entered into under this part, unless the entity seeking the grant or contract submits an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part.

''(b) SPECIAL RULE.—Each applicant for a grant or contract under this part shall submit the application for comment to the local educational agency serving students who will participate in the program to be carried out under the grant or contract, and include those comments, if any, with the application to the Secretary.

''SEC. 9207. DEFINITIONS.

''In this part:

''(1) NATIVE HAWAIIAN.—The term 'Native Hawaiian' means any individual who is—

''(A) a citizen of the United States; and

''(B) a descendant of the aboriginal people who, prior to 1778, occupied and exercised sovereignty in the area that now comprises the State of Hawai'i, as evidenced by—

''(i) genealogical records;

''(ii) Kupuna (elders) or Kama'aina (long-term community residents) verification; or

''(iii) certified birth records.

''(2) NATIVE HAWAIIAN COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION.—The term 'Native Hawaiian community-based organization' means any organization that is composed primarily of Native Hawaiians from a specific community and that assists in the social, cultural, and educational development of Native Hawaiians in that community.

''(3) NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION.—The term 'Native Hawaiian educational organization' means a private nonprofit organization that—

''(A) serves the interests of Native Hawaiians;

''(B) has Native Hawaiians in substantive and policymaking positions within the organization;

''(C) incorporates Native Hawaiian perspective, values, language, culture, and traditions into the core function of the organization;

''(D) has demonstrated expertise in the education of Native Hawaiian youth; and

''(E) has demonstrated expertise in research and program development.

''(4) NATIVE HAWAIIAN LANGUAGE.—The term 'Native Hawaiian language' means the single Native American language indigenous to the original inhabitants of the State of Hawai'i.

''(5) NATIVE HAWAIIAN ORGANIZATION.—The term 'Native Hawaiian organization' means a private nonprofit organization that—

''(A) serves the interests of Native Hawaiians;

''(B) has Native Hawaiians in substantive and policymaking positions within the organizations; and

''(C) is recognized by the Governor of Hawai'i for the purpose of planning, conducting, or administering programs (or portions of programs) for the benefit of Native Hawaiians.

''(6) OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.—The term 'Office of Hawaiian Affairs' means the office of Hawaiian Affairs established by the Constitution of the State of Hawai'i.''.

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—Section 317(b)(3) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 9212'' and inserting ''section 9207''.

(b) PUBLIC LAW 88–210.—Section 116 of Public Law 88–210 (as added by section 1 of Public Law 105–332 (112 Stat. 3076)) is amended by striking ''section 9212 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act (20 U.S.C. 7912)'' and inserting ''section 9207 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act''.

(c) MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES ACT.—Section 261 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9161) is amended by striking ''section 9212 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act (20 U.S.C. 7912)'' and inserting ''section 9207 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act''.

(d) NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES ACT.—Section 103(3) of the Native American Languages Act (25 U.S.C. 2902(3)) is amended by striking ''section 9212(1) of the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7912(1))'' and inserting ''section 9207 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965''.

(e) WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT OF 1998.—Section 166(b)(3) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2911(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''paragraphs (1) and (3), respectively, of section 9212 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act (20 U.S.C. 7912)'' and inserting ''section 9207 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act''.

(f) ASSETS FOR INDEPENDENCE ACT.—Section 404(11) of the Assets for Independence Act (42 U.S.C. 604 note) is amended by striking ''section 9212 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act (20 U.S.C. 7912)'' and inserting ''section 9207 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act''.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 172

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 172, a bill to reduce acid deposition under the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

S. 185

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to establish a Chief Agricultural Negotiator in the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

S. 729

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to ensure that Congress and the public have the right to participate in the declaration of national monuments on federal land.

S. 931

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, a bill to provide for the protection of the flag of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1085

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1085, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the treatment of bonds issued to acquire renewable resources on land subject to conservation easement.

S. 1106

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for qualified individuals for bone mass measurement (bone density testing) to prevent fractures associated with osteoporosis.

S. 1133

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1133, a bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to cover birds of the order Ratitae that are raised for use as human food.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to allow the recovery of attorney's fees and costs by certain employers and labor organizations who are prevailing parties in proceedings brought against them by the National Labor Relations Board or by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

S. 1187

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1187, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, and for other purposes.

S. 1263

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1263, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 to limit the reductions in medicare payments under the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services.

S. 1464

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1464, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish certain requirements regarding the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

S. 1485

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1485, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to confer United States citizenship automatically and retroactively on certain foreign-born children adopted by citizens of the United States.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services regarding the placement of automatic external defibrillators in Federal buildings in order to improve survival rates of individuals who experience cardiac arrest in such buildings, and to establish protections from civil liability arising from the emergency use of the devices.

S. 1495

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to establish, wherever feasible, guidelines, recommendations, and regulations that promote the regulatory acceptance of new and revised toxicological tests that protect human and animal health and the environment while reducing, refining, or replacing animal tests and ensuring human safety and product effectiveness.

S. 1526

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to taxpayers investing in entities seeking to provide capital to create new markets in low-income communities.

S. 1558

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1558, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for holders of Community Open Space bonds the proceeds of which are used for qualified environmental infrastructure projects, and for other purposes.

S. 1580

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1580, a bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to assist agricultural producers in managing risk, and for other purposes.

S. 1592

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1592, a bill to amend the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act to provide to certain nationals of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Haiti an opportunity to apply for adjustment of status under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1619

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1619, a bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide for periodic revision of retaliation lists or other remedial action implemented under section 306 of such Act.

S. 1638

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1638, a