law, the report of additions to the procurement list received on October 18, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–11223. A communication from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the August 2000 Report; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–11224. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sweet Onions Grown in the Walla Walla Valley of Southeast Washington and Northeast Oregon; Revision of Administrative Rules and Regulations'' (Docket Number: FV00–956–1–IFR) received on October 18, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STEVENS, from the Committee on Appropriations: Special Report entitled ''Further Revised Allocation To Subcommittees Of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2001'' (Rept. No. 106–507).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of committee were submitted:

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Armed Services.

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Alexander H. Burgin, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Joseph K. Kellogg Jr., 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Jeffrey J. Schloesser, 0000

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably nomination lists which were printed in the RECORD of the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Army nominations beginning Kirk M. Krist and ending Robert H. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 12, 2000.

Army nominations beginning James W. Lenoir and ending Charles L. Yriarte, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 12, 2000.

Army nominations beginning Timothy L. Bartholomew and ending Robert E. Welch Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 12, 2000.

Army nomination of Angelo Riddick, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 12, 2000.

Army nomination of James White, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 12, 2000.

Army nominations beginning Joseph C. Carter and ending Raymond M. Murphy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 17, 2000.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DASCHLE (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 3219. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the appearance of Social Security account numbers on or through unopened mailings of checks or other drafts issued on public money in the Treasury; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DEWINE:

S. 3220. A bill to amend sections 3 and 5 of the National Child Protection Act of 1993, relating to national criminal history background checks of providers of care to children, elderly persons, and persons with disabilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

S. 3221. A bill to provide grants to law enforcement agencies that ensure that law enforcement officers employed by such agencies are afforded due process when involved in a case that may lead to dismissal, demotion, suspension, or transfer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

S. 3222. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance through States to eligible weed management entities to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative weeds on public and private land; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 3223. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to establish the conservation security program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (by request):

S. 3224. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies of specific areas for potential inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. 3225. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the tip tax credit to employers of cosmetologists and to promote tax compliance in the cosmetology sector; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 3226. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend for an additional 3 years the special immigrant religious worker program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 380. A resolution approving the placement of 2 paintings in the Senate reception room; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. HELMS):

S. Con. Res. 153. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the parliamentary elections held in Belarus on October 15, 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DEWINE:

S. 3220. A bill to amend sections 3 and 5 of the National Child Protection Act of 1993, relating to national criminal history background checks of providers of care to children, elderly persons, and persons with disabilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, today I am introducing the National Child Protection Act Improvement Act of 2000. This bill would amend the National Child Protection act, as amended by the Volunteers for Children Act. It is designed to facilitate the gathering of criminal history record information from both state and federal repositories for background checks of employees and volunteers for organizations providing services to children, the elderly, and the disabled.

Despite the best efforts of the law enforcement community and the volunteer and child services community, many of the individuals who volunteer and are employed in these critical positions still are not subject to criminal history background checks. The bill that I am introducing today modified the National Child Protection Act to facilitate these background checks. Under my bill, with the consent of the individual, the organization with which the individual is applying would receive a copy of the full criminal history record, including relevant arrest information. Further, the bill includes an authorization to provide assistance to these volunteer and service organizations in offsetting the cost of these background checks. To help protect the privacy of individuals who volunteer and are employed in these positions, the bill also would provide a number of important privacy protections.

we need to be sure that we do everything possible to facilitate these important background checks, while assuring that these background checks are not so costly that volunteer organizations and their volunteers are deterred from initiating these vital safety checks.

In shaping this bill, I have worked closely with law enforcement, state officials, and other interested parties. Because of that, the legislation that I am introducing today would help accomplish the laudable goals of the national Child Protection Act and the

Volunteers for Children Act—which are to facilitate national background checks initiated in states which have not adopted authorizing language, and, at the same time, assure that those checks are processed effectively and quickly. We need to give states the flexibility they need to accomplish those goals.

Mr. EDWARDS:

S. 3221. A bill to provide grants to law enforcement agencies that ensure that law enforcement officers employed by such agencies are afforded due process when involved in a case that may lead to dismissal, demotion, suspension, or transfer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS DUE PROCESS ACT OF 2000

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Law Enforcement Officers Due Process Act of 2000. Every day our Nation's police officers put their lives on the line in the fight against crime. Every time they patrol a beat they put their own safety at risk to protect our children and make our country a better place to live and work. We all owe a great deal to these brave men and women.

Working police officers spend their lives among the public safeguarding the innocent and apprehending those who have committed crimes. Much of this contact can be stressful for everyone involved. Perhaps an individual has been stopped by an officer for the suspected violation of a law. Or maybe the officer is assisting someone who is the victim of a crime. Due to the circumstances, these are often unpleasant situations. And unfortunately, in some instances, contact with the police officer may become adversarial and generate complaints about the officer's actions.

These complaints range from accusations that an officer took too long to arrive at a crime scene, used too much force, or was not forceful enough, to claims that the officer was rude or didn't show proper respect. Some complaints against officers are legitimate. However, some complaints are generated to intimidate an officer who is simply doing his or her job, into dropping charges. Any one of these complaints can get an officer fired, suspended, or otherwise punished without the benefit of due process.

A patchwork of state and local laws currently governs the rights of officers when they are involved in a case that may lead to dismissal, demotion, suspension or transfer. Thirty-five states have state and/or local laws in place that govern the administrative due process rights of law enforcement officers. However, 15 states do not have any of these much-deserved due process protections for their law enforcement officers.

The Law Enforcement Officers Due Process Act is a common-sense measure designed to replace arbitrary and ad hoc investigatory procedures with consistent standards. The legislation will provide additional funding to law enforcement agencies that either have in place, or currently do not have but certify they will implement, administrative due process for their law enforcement officers. An agency will be eligible for grant money if its administrative procedures include the right of a law enforcement officer under investigation to: (1) a hearing before a fair and impartial board or hearing officer; (2) be represented by an attorney or other officer at the expense of the officer under investigation; (3) confront any witness testifying against him or her; and (4) record all meetings he or she attends. In many instances, an employer with direct control over an officer is also the investigator. That is why providing basic, explicitly stated rights to officers under investigation is crucial to maintaining impartial investigations. These rights will not interfere with the management of state and local internal investigations. They will merely ensure that officers receive the benefit of fair and objective investigations, whether a complaint against them is legitimate or not.

Some individuals may be concerned that providing these rights would delay removal of an officer who is ultimately found to have deserved disciplinary action taken against them. However, I'd like to emphasize that my legislation would not prevent the immediate suspension of an officer whose continued presence on the job is considered to be a substantial and immediate threat to the welfare of the law enforcement agency or the public; who refuses to obey a direct order issued in conformance with the agency's rules and regulations; or who is accused of committing an illegal act.

The Law Enforcement Officers Due Process Act does not force a law enforcement agency to implement due process rights for its officers. Rather, it encourages agencies to do the right thing by offering them additional funds if they establish written procedures for determining if a complaint is valid or merely designed to cause trouble for the officer.

I urge my colleagues who represent states that do not have law enforcement officers' due process rights laws to cosponsor my bill and give their police officers the protections they deserve. I also urge my colleagues who represent states that have various local laws in place to cosponsor my bill. By doing so they will help eliminate the disparity that exists among local jurisdictions, and guarantee that every single officer in their state will have a minimum baseline of rights to help guarantee fair and impartial investigations.

Crime rates are down across the Nation. We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to our Nation's police officers for helping make this happen. Our communities, our schools, and our places of business would not enjoy the level of security they have today without the efforts of law enforcement. Enacting the Law Enforcement Officers Due Process Act is the least we can do to show officers that we will fight for all of them just like they fight for all of us every day.

I ask unanimous consent that the Law Enforcement Officers Due Process Act be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3221

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 ''Law Enforcement Officers Due Process Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. PROTECTION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General is authorized to provide grants to law enforcement agencies that are eligible under subsection (b).

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a law enforcement agency shall—

(1) have in effect an administrative process that complies with the requirements of subsection (c) or an existing procedure described in subsection (e); or

(2) certify that it will establish, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, an administrative process that complies with the requirements of subsection (c).

(c) OFFICER RIGHTS.—The administrative process referred to in subsection (b) shall require that a law enforcement agency that investigates a law enforcement officer for matters which could reasonably lead to disciplinary action against such officer, including dismissal, demotion, suspension, or transfer provide recourse for the officer that, at a minimum, includes the following:

(1) ACCESS TO ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS.—The agency has written procedures to ensure that any law enforcement officer is afforded access to any existing administrative process established by the employing agency prior to the imposition of any such disciplinary action against the officer.

(2) SPECIFIC PROCEDURES.—The procedures used under paragraph (1) include, the right of a law enforcement officer under investigation—

(A) to a hearing before a fair and impartial board or hearing officer;

(B) to be represented by an attorney or other officer at the expense of such officer;

(C) to confront any witness testifying against such officer; and

(D) to record all meetings in which such officer attends.

(d) IMMEDIATE SUSPENSION.—Nothing in this section shall prevent the immediate suspension with pay of a law enforcement officer—

(1) whose continued presence on the job is considered to be a substantial and immediate threat to the welfare of the law enforcement agency or the public;

(2) who refuses to obey a direct order issued in conformance with the agency's written and disseminated rules and regulations; or

(3) who is accused of committing an illegal act.

(e) EXISTING PROCEDURES.—The provisions of this section shall not apply to a law enforcement agency if the Attorney General determines that such agency has in effect an established civil service system, agency review board, grievance procedure or personnel

board, which meets or exceeds the minimum standards of subsection (c).

(f) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—From the amount made available to carry out this section, the Attorney General shall allocate—

(1) 50 percent for law enforcement agencies that are eligible under paragraph (1) of subsection (b); and

(2) 50 percent for law enforcement agencies that are eligible under paragraph (2) of subsection (b).

(g) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term ''law enforcement agency'' means any State or unit of local government within the State that employs law enforcement officers; and

(2) the term ''law enforcement officer'' means an officer with the powers of arrest as defined by the laws of each State and required to be certified under the laws of such State.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

S. 3222. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance through States to eligible weed management entities to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative weeds on public and private land; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HARMFUL NON-NATIVE WEED CONTROL ACT OF 2000

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today with Senator DASCHLE to introduce the Harmful Non-native Weed Control Act of 2000—to provide assistance to eligible weed management entities to control or eradicate harmful, non-native weeds on public and private land. I am pleased that Senators BAUCUS, BURNS, CRAPO, JOHNSON, and GORDON SMITH, are joining us as original cosponsors.

Currently, noxious weeds are a dangerous threat to the viability of both public and private lands across the country. Over a century ago, a wave of noxious weeds entered North America from Europe and Asia. Unlike native species, which have natural predators and control mechanisms, these weeds lack native insects, fungi, or diseases to control their growth and takeover of native plants.

Noxious weeds are estimated to spread at the rate of 4,600 acres per day on federal lands alone in the Western United States. Idaho's own rush skeltonweed has increased from a few plants in 1954 to roughly 4 million acres today. Hundreds of millions of dollars are spent each year by Western states to prevent and stop the growth of noxious weeds.

These nonnative weeds threaten fully two-thirds of all endangered species and are now considered by some experts to be the second most important threat to biodiversity. In some areas, spotted knapweed grows so thick that big game like deer will move out of the area to find edible plants. Noxious weeds also increase soil erosion, and prevent recreationists from accessing land that is infested with poisonous plants. Bikers are often met with a formidable foe when 2-inch-long thorns pop their tires on bike paths overrun with puncture vine that can pierce all but the most rugged materials.

In response to this environmental crisis, I have worked with the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Public Lands Council, and the Nature Conservancy to develop the Harmful Non-Native Weed Control Act of 2000. This legislature will provide a mechanism to get funding to the local level where weeds can be fought in a collaborative way. Working together is what this entire initiative is about.

Specifically, this bill establishes, in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, a program to provide assistance through States to eligible weed management entities. The Secretary of the Interior appoints an Advisory Committee of ten individuals to make recommendations to the Secretary regarding the annual allocation of funds. The Secretary, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, will allocate funds to States to provide funding to eligible weed management entities to carry out projects approved by States to control or eradicate harmful, non-native weeds on public and private lands. Funds will be allocated based on several factors, including but not limited to: the seriousness of the problem in the State; the extent to which the Federal funds will be used to leverage non-Federal funds to address the problem; and the extent to which the State has already made progress in addressing the problems.

The bill directs that the States use 25 percent of their allocation to make base payments and 75 percent for financial awards to eligible weed management entities for carrying out projects relating to the control or eradication of harmful, non-native weeds on public or private lands. To be eligible to obtain a base payment a weed management entity must be established by local stakeholders for weed management or public education purposes, provide the State a description of their purpose and proposed projects, and fulfill any other requirements set by the State. Weed management entities are also eligible for financial awards which are funds awarded by the State on a competitive basis to carry out projects which cannot be funded within the base payment. Projects will be evaluated, giving equal consideration to economic and natural values, and selected for funding based on factors such as the seriousness of the problem, the likelihood that the project will address the problem, and how comprehensive the project's approach is to the harmful, non-native weed problem within the State. A 50 percent non-Federal match is required to receive the funds.

The Department of Agriculture in Idaho (ISDA) has developed a Strategic Plan for Managing Noxious Weeds through a collaborative effort involving private landowners, State and Federal land managers, State and local governmental entities, and other interested parties. Cooperative Weed Management Areas (CWMAs) are the centerpiece of the strategic plan. CWMAs cross jurisdictional boundaries to bring together all landowners, land managers, and interested parties to identify and prioritize noxious weed strategies within the CWMA in a collaborative manner. The primary responsibilities of the ISDA are to provide coordination, administrative support, facilitation, and project cost-share funding for this collaborative effort. Idaho already has a record of working in a collaborative way on this issue—my legislation will heighten the progress we've had, and establish the same formula for success in other States.

We are introducing this legislation today to get the discussion started. We hope to refine the bill over the winter and introduce an improved bill next year. Constructive suggestions are welcome and we look forward to working with other Members of Congress to get this bill passed next year. Noxious weeds are not only a problem for farmers and ranchers, but a hazard to our environment, economy, and communities in Idaho and the West. The Harmful Nonnative Weeds Act of 2000 is an important step to ensure we are diligent in stopping the spread of these weeds. I am confident that if we work together at all levels of government and throughout our communities, we can protect our land, livelihood, and environment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy 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. 3222

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 ''Harmful Nonnative Weed Control Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) public and private land in the United States faces unprecedented and severe stress from harmful, nonnative weeds;

(2) the economic and resource value of the land is being destroyed as harmful nonnative weeds overtake native vegetation, making the land unusable for forage and for diverse plant and animal communities;

(3) damage caused by harmful nonnative weeds has been estimated to run in the hundreds of millions of dollars annually;

(4) successfully fighting this scourge will require coordinated action by all affected stakeholders, including Federal, State, and local governments, private landowners, and nongovernmental organizations;

(5) the fight must begin at the local level, since it is at the local level that persons feel the loss caused by harmful nonnative weeds and will therefore have the greatest motivation to take effective action; and

(6) to date, effective action has been hampered by inadequate funding at all levels of government and by inadequate coordination.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to provide assistance to eligible weed management entities in carrying out projects to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative weeds on public and private land;

(2) to coordinate the projects with existing weed management areas and districts;

(3) in locations in which no weed management entity, area, or district exists, to stimulate the formation of additional local or regional cooperative weed management entities, such as entities for weed management areas or districts, that organize locally affected stakeholders to control or eradicate weeds;

(4) to leverage additional funds from a variety of public and private sources to control or eradicate weeds through local stakeholders; and

(5) to promote healthy, diverse, and desirable plant communities by abating through a variety of measures the threat posed by harmful, nonnative weeds.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term ''Advisory Committee'' means the advisory committee established under section 5.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.

The Secretary shall establish in the Office of the Secretary a program to provide financial assistance through States to eligible weed management entities to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative weeds on public and private land.

SEC. 5. ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish in the Department of the Interior an advisory committee to make recommendations to the Secretary regarding the annual allocation of funds to States under section 6 and other issues related to funding under this Act.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of not more than 10 individuals appointed by the Secretary who—

(1) have knowledge and experience in harmful, nonnative weed management; and

(2) represent the range of economic, conservation, geographic, and social interests affected by harmful, nonnative weeds.

(c) TERM.—The term of a member of the Advisory Committee shall be 4 years.

(d) COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Advisory Committee shall receive no compensation for the service of the member on the Advisory Committee.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the Advisory Committee shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of the duties of the Advisory Committee.

(e) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.

SEC. 6. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In consultation with the Advisory Committee, the Secretary shall allocate funds made available for each fiscal year under section 8 to States to provide funding in accordance with section 7 to eligible weed management entities to carry out projects approved by States to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative weeds on public and private land.

(b) AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall determine the amount of funds allocated to a State for a fiscal year under this section on the basis of—

(1) the seriousness of the harmful, nonnative weed problem or potential problem in the State, or a portion of the State;

(2) the extent to which the Federal funds will be used to leverage non-Federal funds to address the harmful, nonnative weed problems in the State;

(3) the extent to which the State has made progress in addressing harmful, nonnative weed problems in the State;

(4) the extent to which weed management entities in a State are eligible for base payments under section 7; and

(5) other factors recommended by the Advisory Committee and approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 7. USE OF FUNDS ALLOCATED TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives an allocation of funds under section 6 for a fiscal year shall use—

(1) not more than 25 percent of the allocation to make a base payment to each weed management entity in accordance with subsection (b); and

(2) not less than 75 percent of the allocation to make financial awards to weed management entities in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) BASE PAYMENTS.—

(1) USE BY WEED MANAGEMENT ENTITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Base payments under subsection (a)(1) shall be used by weed management entities—

(i) to pay the Federal share of the cost of carrying out projects described in subsection (d) that are selected by the State in accordance with subsection (d); or

(ii) for any other purpose relating to the activities of the weed management entities, subject to guidelines established by the State.

(B) FEDERAL SHARE.—Under subparagraph (A), the Federal share of the cost of carrying out a project described in subsection (d) shall not exceed 50 percent.

(2) ELIGIBILITY OF WEED MANAGEMENT ENTITIES.—To be eligible to obtain a base payment under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, a weed management entity in a State shall—

(A) be established by local stakeholders—

(i) to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative weeds on public or private land; or

(ii) to increase public knowledge and education concerning the need to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative weeds on public or private land;

(B)(i) for the first fiscal year for which the entity receives a base payment, provide to the State a description of—

(I) the purposes for which the entity was established; and

(II) any projects carried out to accomplish those purposes; and

(ii) for any subsequent fiscal year for which the entity receives a base payment, provide to the State—

(I) a description of the activities carried out by the entity in the previous fiscal year—

(aa) to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative weeds on public or private land; or

(bb) to increase public knowledge and education concerning the need to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative weeds on public or private land; and

(II) the results of each such activity; and

(C) meet such additional eligibility requirements, and conform to such process for determining eligibility, as the State may establish.

(c) FINANCIAL AWARDS.—

(1) USE BY WEED MANAGEMENT ENTITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Financial awards under subsection (a)(2) shall be used by weed management entities to pay the Federal share of the cost of carrying out projects described in subsection (d) that are selected by the State in accordance with subsection (d).

(B) FEDERAL SHARE.—Under subparagraph (A), the Federal share of the cost of carrying out a project described in subsection (d) shall not exceed 50 percent.

(2) ELIGIBILITY OF WEED MANAGEMENT ENTITIES.—To be eligible to obtain a financial award under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, a weed management entity in a State shall—

(A) meet the requirements for eligibility for a base payment under subsection (b)(2); and

(B) submit to the State a description of the project for which the financial award is sought.

(d) PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible weed management entity may use a base payment or financial award received under this section to carry out a project relating to the control or eradication of harmful, nonnative weeds on public or private land, including—

(A) education, inventories and mapping, management, monitoring, and similar activities, including the payment of the cost of personnel and equipment; and

(B) innovative projects, with results that are disseminated to the public.

(2) SELECTION OF PROJECTS.—A State shall select projects for funding under this section on a competitive basis, taking into consideration (with equal consideration given to economic and natural values)—

(A) the seriousness of the harmful, nonnative weed problem or potential problem addressed by the project;

(B) the likelihood that the project will prevent or resolve the problem, or increase knowledge about resolving similar problems in the future;

(C) the extent to which the payment will leverage non-Federal funds to address the harmful, nonnative weed problem addressed by the project;

(D) the extent to which the entity has made progress in addressing harmful, nonnative weed problems;

(E) the extent to which the project will provide a comprehensive approach to the control or eradication of harmful, nonnative weeds;

(F) the extent to which the project will reduce the total population of a harmful, nonnative weed within the State; and

(G) other factors that the State determines to be relevant.

(3) SCOPE OF PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A weed management entity shall determine the geographic scope of the harmful, nonnative weed problem to be addressed through a project using a base payment or financial award received under this section.

(B) MULTIPLE STATES.—A weed management entity may use the base payment or financial award to carry out a project to address the harmful, nonnative weed problem of more than 1 State if the entity meets the requirements of applicable State laws.

(4) LAND.—A weed management entity may use a base payment or financial award received under this section to carry out a project to control or eradicate weeds on any public or private land with the approval of the owner or operator of the land, other than land that is devoted to the cultivation of row crops, fruits, or vegetables.

(5) PROHIBITION ON PROJECTS TO CONTROL AQUATIC NOXIOUS WEEDS OR ANIMAL PESTS.—A base payment or financial award under this section may not be used to carry out a project to control or eradicate aquatic noxious weeds or animal pests.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 5 percent of the funds made available under section 8 for a fiscal year may be used by the States or the Federal Government to pay the administrative costs of the program established by this Act, including the costs of complying with Federal environmental laws.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I am introducing with Senator LARRY CRAIG the Harmful Non-native Weed Control Act of 2000. This legislation will provide critically needed resources to local agencies to reduce the spread of harmful weeds that are destroying the productivity of farmland and reducing ecological diversity.

In the last few years, public and private lands in the west have seen a startling increase in the spread of harmful, non-native weeds. In South Dakota, these weeds choke out native species, destroy good grazing land, and cost farmers and ranchers thousands of dollars a year to control. On public lands in South Dakota and throughout the West, the spread of the weeds has outpaced the ability of land managers to control them, threatening species diversity and, at times, spreading on to private land.

This problem has become so severe that the White House has created an Invasive Species Council to address it. As Secretary Bruce Babbitt noted, ''The blending of the natural world into one great monoculture of the most aggressive species is, I think, a blow to the spirit and beauty of the natural world.''

Despite these efforts, the scale of this problem is vast. Some estimate that it could cost well into the hundreds of millions of dollars to control effectively the spread of these weeds. This legislation will help to meet that need by putting funding directly into the hands of the local weed boards and managers who already are working to control this problem and whose lands are directly affected.

Specifically, this legislation authorizes new weed control funding and establishes an Advisory Board in the Department of Interior to identify the areas of greatest need for the distribution of those funds. States, in turn, will transfer up to 25 percent of it directly to local weed control boards in order to support ongoing activities and spur the creation of new weed control boards, where necessary. The remaining 75 percent of funds will be made available to weed control boards on a competitive basis to fund weed control projects.

I would like to thank Senator CRAIG for his work on this issue, and to thank the National Cattlemen's Association and the Nature Conservancy, who have been instrumental to the development of this bill. Now that this legislation has been introduced, it is my hope that we can work with all interested stakeholders to enact it as soon as possible. I look forward to working with my colleagues during this process.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 3223. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to establish the conservation security program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE CONSERVATION SECURITY ACT OF 2000

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today, I am reintroducing the Conservation Security Act of 2000, a bill which represents a fresh new approach to the future of farm policy.

America's farmers and ranchers hold the key for production of a bountiful, safe, and nourishing food supply for Americans and for the population around the globe, as well as for the future for our environment. Farmers and ranchers have a long history to build on.

Specifically on the issue of conservation, it became a national priority in the days of the Dust Bowl, leading to the creation in the 1930s of the Soil Conservation Service at the Department of Agriculture, which is now the Natural Resources Conservation Service. With the very foundation of our food supply at risk, the Government stepped forward with billions of dollars in assistance to help farmers preserve their precious soils.

Since that time, Federal spending on conservation has steadily declined in inflation adjusted dollars. Yet today agriculture faces a wide range of environmental challenges, from overgrazing and manure management to cropland runoff and water quality impairment. Urban and rural citizens alike are increasingly concerned about the environmental impacts of agriculture.

Farmers and ranchers pride themselves on being good stewards of the land, and there are farm-based solutions to these problems being implemented all over the country. But every dollar spent on constructing a filter strip or developing a nutrient management plan is a dollar that farmers don't have for other purposes in hard times like these. And even in better times, there is a lot of competition for that dollar.

So who benefits from conservation on farm lands? As much or more than the farmer, it is all of us, who depend on the careful stewardship of our air, water, soil and our other natural resources. Farmers and ranchers tend not only to their crops and animals, but also to our nation's natural resources. They are the real stewards for future generations.

Since we all share in these benefits, it is only right that we share in conserving them. It is time to enter into a true conservation partnership with our farmers and ranchers to help ensure that conservation is an integral and permanent part of agricultural production nationwide.

In the 1985 farm bill, we required that farmers who wanted to participate in USDA farm programs develop soil conservation plans for their highly erodible land. This provision helped put new conservation plans in place for our most fragile farmlands. In the most recent farm bill, we streamlined conservation programs and established new cost-share and incentive payments for certain practices.

The Conservation Security Act of 2000, which establishes the Conservation Security Program, builds on our past successes and takes a bold step forward in farm and conservation policy.

My bill would establish a universal and voluntary incentive payment program to support and encourage conservation activities by farmers and ranchers. Under this program, farmers and ranchers could receive up to $50,000 per year in conservation payments through entering into 5 to 10-year contracts with USDA and choose from one of three tiers of conservation practices. Payments are based on the number and types of practices they maintain or adopt on their working lands. It is not a set-aside or easement program.

For implementing a basic set of practices, farmers would receive an annual payment of up to $20,000, as well as an advance payment of the greater of $1,000 or 20% of the annual payment. This basic category, Tier I, would include such practices as nutrient management, soil conservation, and wildlife habitat management.

To receive up to $35,000 and an advance payment of the greater of $2,000 or 20% of the annual payment, farmers would add to their Class I practices by choosing a minimum number of Class II practices—including such practices as controlled rotational grazing, partial field practices like buffers strips and windbreaks, wetland restoration and wildlife habitat enhancement.

Farmers who adopt comprehensive Tier III conservation practices on their whole farm—under a plan that addresses all aspects of air, land, water and wildlife—would receive up to $50,000 plus an advance payment of the greater of $3,000 or 20% of the annual payment.

Again, I emphasize, the Conservation Security Program would be totally voluntary. It would be up to the farmer or rancher to decide if they want to do it. If they do, then they would get additional payments. A lot of these practices farmers are already doing now, for which they receive little or no support. My legislation changes that by rewarding those farmers and ranchers who have already implemented these practices through payments to maintain them.

Again, these practices don't just benefit the farmer or rancher. The beneficiaries are all of us. We all will benefit from cleaner air, cleaner streams and rivers, saving soil, protecting our groundwater, and wildlife habitats.

Our private lands are a national resource, and conservation on farm and ranchlands provides environmental benefits that are just as important as the production of abundant and safe food. I am introducing the Conservation Security Act because I believe it will help secure both the economic future of our farmers by helping them obtain better income and as a cornerstone of our national farm policy and the environmental future of agriculture.

Mr. BINGAMAN (by request):

S. 3224. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies of specific areas for potential inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

NATIONAL PARK AREA STUDIES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake studies of several areas to determine whether these areas merit potential designation as units of the National Park System. I am introducing this legislation at the request of the Administration. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Donald J. Barry, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, transmitting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

S. 3224

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Park Service Studies Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF STUDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall conduct studies of the geographical areas and historic and cultural themes listed in subsection (c) to determine the appropriateness of including such areas or themes in the National Park System.

(b) CRITERIA.—In conducting the studies authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall use the criteria for the study of areas for potential inclusion in the National Park System in accordance with section 8 of Public Law 91–383, as amended by section 303 of the National Park System New Areas Study Act (Public Law 105–391; 112 Stat. 3501).

(c) STUDY AREAS.—The Secretary shall conduct studies of the following:

(1) Erskine House/Russian American Storehouse, Alaska;

(2) Blackwater Canyon, West Virginia;

(3) Farm Labor Movement Sites, California and other States;

(4) Carter G. Woodson Home, District of Columbia;

(5) Governors Island, New York; and

(6) World War II Homefront Sites, Multi-State.

SEC. 3. REPORTS.

The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of each study under section 2 within three fiscal years following the date on which funds are first made available for each study.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, March 22, 2000.

Hon. AL GORE Jr.,
President of the Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a bill, ''To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies of specific areas for potential inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes.''

We recommend that the bill be introduced, referred to the appropriate committee, and enacted.

The bill authorizes studies of six specific areas and cultural themes for potential inclusion in the National Park System. The legislation provides for the Secretary to follow criteria for such studies in existing law, and to submit reports on each study to the appropriate congressional committees within three years after funds for the study are made available. The areas and themes that are the subject of these special resource studies (also called new area studies) are described on the attached page.

A letter listing these six studies has been transmitted to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the House Resources Committee, pursuant to the requirement of the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 (P.L. 105–391) that the Secretary submit a list of areas recommended for study for potential inclusion in the National Park System to those committees at the beginning of each calendar year with the President's budget.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of the enclosed draft legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

DONALD J. BARRY,
Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. 3225. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the tip tax credit to employers of cosmetologists and to promote tax compliance in the cosmetology sector; to the Committee on Finance.

COSMETOLOGY TAX FAIRNESS AND COMPLIANCE ACT OF 2000

Mr. SANTORUM. 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. 3225

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 ''Cosmetology Tax Fairness and Compliance Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF CREDIT FOR PORTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES PAID WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYEE TIPS.

(a) EXPANSION OF CREDIT TO OTHER LINES OF BUSINESS.—Paragraph (2) of section 45B(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) APPLICATION ONLY TO CERTAIN LINES OF BUSINESS.—In applying paragraph (1), there shall be taken into account only tips received from customers or clients in connection with—

''(A) the providing, delivering, or serving of food or beverages for consumption if the tipping of employees delivering or serving food or beverages by customers is customary, or

''(B) the providing of any cosmetology service for customers or clients at a facility licensed to provide such service if the tipping of employees providing such service is customary.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF COSMETOLOGY SERVICES.—Section 45B of such Code is amended by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) COSMETOLOGY SERVICE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'cosmetology service' means—

''(1) hairdressing,

''(2) haircutting,

''(3) manicures and pedicures,

''(4) body waxing, facials, mud packs, wraps and other similar skin treatments, and

''(5) any other beauty related service provided at a facility at which a majority of the services provided (as determined on the basis of gross revenue) are described in paragraphs (1) through (4).''

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxes paid after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 3. INFORMATION REPORTING BY PROVIDERS OF COSMETOLOGY SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 6050S the following new section:

''SEC. 6050T. RETURNS RELATING TO COSMETOLOGY SERVICES AND INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO COSMETOLOGISTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Every person who leases space to any individual for use by the individual in providing cosmetology services (as defined in section 45B(c)) on more than 5 calendar days during a calendar year shall make a return, according to the forms or regulations prescribed by the Secretary, setting forth the name, address, and TIN of each such lessee.

''(b) STATEMENT TO BE FURNISHED TO INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO WHOM INFORMATION IS FURNISHED.—Every person required to make a return under subsection (a) shall furnish to each individual whose name is required to be set forth on such return a written statement showing—

''(1) the name, address, and phone number of the information contact of the person required to make such return, and

''(2) a statement informing the recipient that (as required by this section), the provider of the notice has advised the Internal Revenue Service that the recipient provided cosmetology services during the calendar year to which the statement relates.

''(c) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO SERVICE PROVIDER.—A person who provides a statement pursuant to subsection (b) to an individual who provides cosmetology services shall include with the statement a publication of the Secretary, as designated by the Secretary, describing the tax obligations of independent contractors unless the publication was previously provided to the individual by the statement provider.

''(d) METHOD AND TIME FOR PROVIDING STATEMENT AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The written statement required by subsection (b) and the additional information, if any, required to be furnished under subsection (c) shall be furnished (either in person or in a statement mailed by first-class mail which includes adequate notice that the statement is enclosed) to the person on or before January 31 of the year following the calendar year for which the return under subsection (a) is to be made. Such statement shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe by regulations.

''(e) LEASE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'lease' include booth rentals and any other arrangements pursuant to which

an individual provides cosmetology services, other than as an employee, on premises not owned by the service provider.

''(f) EXCEPTION FOR SERVICES PROVIDED BY PROPRIETORSHIPS WITH EMPLOYEES.—This section shall not apply to leases of premises with at least 3 work stations for providing cosmetology services.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 6724(d)(1)(B) of such Code (relating to the definition of information returns) is amended—

(A) by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (xiv),

(B) by adding a comma at the end of clause (xv),

(C) by striking ''; or'' at the end of clause (xvi) and inserting a comma,

(D) by striking the period at the end of clause (xvii) and inserting '', or'', and

(E) by inserting after clause (xvii) the following new clause:

''(xviii) section 6050T (relating to returns by cosmetology service providers).''.

(2) Section 6724(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (Z) and inserting a comma,

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (AA) and inserting '', or'', and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (AA) the following new subparagraph:

''(BB) section 6050T(c) (relating to statements from cosmetology service providers) even if the recipient is not a payee.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to calendar years after 2000.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 341

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 341, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount allowable for qualified adoption expenses, to permanently extend the credit for adoption expenses, and to adjust the limitations on such credit for inflation, and for other purposes.

S. 835

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) was added as a cosponsor of S . 835, a bill to encourage the restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient project financing and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1915

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1915, a bill to enhance the services provided by the Environmental Protection Agency to small communities that are attempting to comply with national, State, and local environmental regulations.

S. 2887

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2887, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes.

S. 2938

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2938, a bill to prohibit United States assistance to the Palestinian Authority if a Palestinian state is declared unilaterally, and for other purposes.

S. 2940

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2940, a bill to authorize additional assistance for international malaria control, and to provide for coordination and consultation in providing assistance under the Foreign Assistance act of 1961 with respect to malaria, HIV, and tuberculosis.

S. 3007

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3007, a bill to provide for measures in response to a unilateral declaration of the existence of a Palestinian state.

S. 3078

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3078, a bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Santa Fe Regional Water Management and River Restoration Project.

S. 3089

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3089, a bill to authorize the design and construction of a temporary education center at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

S. 3106

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3106, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to clarify the definition of homebound under the medicare home health benefit.

S. 3116

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3116, a bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to prevent circumvention of the sugar tariff-rate quotas.

S. 3127

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3127, a bill to protect infants who are born alive

S. 3157

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3157, a bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to establish restrictions regarding the qualifications of physicians to prescribe the abortion drug commonly known as RU–486.

S. 3181

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 3181, a bill to establish the White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance, and for other purposes.

S. 3211

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3211, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to provide grants to develop technologies to eliminate functional barriers to full independence for individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S.RES. 292

At the request of Mr. GORTON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.Res. 292, a resolution recognizing the 20th century as the ''Century of Women in the United States''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4301

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) were added as cosponsors of Amendment No. 4301 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1102, a bill to provide for pension reform, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4303

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4303 proposed to S. 2508, a bill to amend the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988 to provide for a final settlement of the claims of the Colorado Ute Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 153—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS HELD IN BELARUS ON OCTOBER 15, 2000, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. HELMS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 153

Whereas on October 15, 2000, Aleksandr Lukashenko and his authoritarian regime