Res. 270, a resolution designating the week of October 13, 2002, through October 19, 2002, as ''National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week.''

S. RES. 281

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 281, a resolution designating the week beginning August 25, 2002, as ''National Fraud Against Senior Citizens Awareness Week.''

AMENDMENT NO. 3566

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3566 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4775, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3667

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3667 proposed to H.R. 4775, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3671

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3671 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4775, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3672

At the request of Mr. CLELAND, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3672 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4775, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3700

At the request of Mr. SMITH of Oregon, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3700 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4775, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3704

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3704 proposed to H.R. 4775, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3727

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3727 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4775, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3729

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3729 proposed to H.R. 4775, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SMITH of Oregon, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3729 proposed to H.R. 4775, supra.

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3729 proposed to H.R. 4775, supra.

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3729 proposed to H.R. 4775, supra.

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3729 proposed to H.R. 4775, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 3732

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3732 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4775, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3755

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3755 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4775, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself and Mr. CLELAND):

S. 2593. A bill to protect diverse and structurally complex areas of the seabed in the United States exclusive economic zone by establishing a maximum diameter size limit on rockhopper, roller, and all other ground gear used on bottom trawls; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, our oceans are one of America's most precious and valuable resources. For hundreds of millions of people, our coastal waters are a place of relaxation, recreation, and rejuvenation. The oceans are also a tremendous supply of fish and other seafood, many caught by commercial fishers and others by recreational sportsmen and hobbyists.

There is a growing concern, however, about protecting ocean habitat from the damaging effects of some types of commercial fishing gear. The manner in which these concerns are presently being handled by the National Marine Fishery Service has led to a great deal of confusion and litigation. Therefore, in an effort to protect important ocean substrates that are recognized as critical areas of marine habitat, I, with my colleague, Senator MAX CLELAND of Georgia, am introducing a bill today that takes a much more direct approach.

I have received many letters from constituents in my home State of New Jersey who are concerned about the use of ''rock hopper'' nets in the New York Bight area and elsewhere. They have chronicled the negative effects of this gear and the damage they see occurring as a result of its use. In response to their concerns I feel compelled to introduce in the Senate companion legislation to Congressman JOEL HEFLEY's Sea Bed Protection Act of 2002, which he introduced recently in the House. This bill will amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act by reining in the use of this damaging fishing gear.

Rock hopper nets are used in hard-bottom areas where naturally occurring vertical structures prevents the use of more conventional trawl gear. The rock hopper incorporates a series of rollers that act like the drum on the front of a steamroller. While operating, the rollers prevent the net from becoming entangled by guiding it up and over obstructions. While it is effective at catching fish, it is equally effective at damaging the sea floor where it is used.

It has been clearly documented that rock hopper nets kill clinging organisms and living corals, the very things that attracted the fish they were designed to catch in the first place. The heavy rollers and sweeps that guide the nets crush marine life and can even flatten bottom topography.

When a specific piece of equipment is demonstrated to be harmful to marine life or the marine environment, it is common sense to stop using it and find a more ecosystem-friendly method of harvesting fish for the market. It is folly to allow the continued use of fishing gear that has an uncontrollable level of bycatch of that is damaging to the very habitat necessary for the fish it catches to grow and reproduce. Rock hopper nets are clearly a threat to fragile habitats that are particularly important to a healthy marine ecosystem. The Sea Bed Protection Act

will limit their use and protect critical habitat, while highlighting our concern for the broader issues of sustainable fisheries and habitat protection.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 2594. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver on the open market when the silver stockpile is depleted, to be used to mint coins; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Support of American Eagle Silver Bullion Program Act. The American Eagle Silver Bullion Program was originally created in 1985 to provide a vehicle for investors who wish to invest in silver, and to deplete the Defense Logistics Agency's Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile. As many investors in silver bullion know, since its inception, the American Eagle Silver Bullion Coin Program has grown to become the largest and most successful coin program in the United States, generating millions of dollars in revenue each year. In fact, between 1995 and 2001, the American Eagle Silver Coin program has generated revenues of over $264 million, much of which has been used to pay down the national debt.

Ironically, the success of this program threatens its future, because it has also fulfilled its secondary purpose, depleting the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile. The authorizing language for the American Eagle Silver Bullion Program mandates that silver to mint the coins may only be drawn from the stockpile. Legislation is needed to allow the program, which is so beneficial to both investors and the government, to continue.

The Support of American Eagle Silver Bullion Program Act will allow the U.S. Mint to continue the American Eagle Silver Bullion Program by authorizing them to purchase silver on the open market. Given the dual purposes of the program's birth, it is only fitting that its rebirth will also have two results. Not only will the program be able to continue to serve the needs of investors and the government, it will also provide a needed boost to the nation's silver mining industry. It is estimated that the Mint will purchase approximately 9 million ounces of silver per year for the American Eagle Silver Bullion Program. As the largest silver producing state in the nation, representing approximately 34 percent of the United States' silver production, Nevada will lead the other 12 silver producing states in supplying this successful program.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 2595. A bill to authorize the expenditure of funds on private lands and facilities at Mesa Verde National Park, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today, I am introducing a very simple and important bill that will aid in our Nation's understanding of an ancient time.

The 52,000 acre Mesa Verde National Park in southwestern Colorado holds one of the most unique archaeological sites in the world. The culture represented at Mesa Verde reflects more than 700 years of history. People lived and flourished in communities in the area from around 400 A.D. through 1300 A.D.

Eventually, the people there built elaborate stone villages in the sheltered alcoves of the canyon walls that are today regarded as ''cliff dwellings.'' The villagers lived in the cliff dwellings during the last 100 to 125 years of occupation at Mesa Verde. Within the span of two generations, in the late 1200s, the people left their homes and moved away. However, they left behind a literal treasure trove of artifacts in the ruins, artifacts that are still being collected and studied to this day.

Our Nation's first conservationist and fellow Republican, President Theodore Roosevelt established the Mesa Verde National Park in 1906. Since that time, countless artifacts have been carefully excavated and catalogued.

Unfortunately, those priceless treasures have not had a suitable home, and instead have been housed in what effectively is a tin shed built in the 1950s, which has since become infested with mice. The tin shed lacks proper temperature and humidity controls in an area where the humidity can swing from seventeen to eighty percent in a short time. A tin shed is no place to store 800 year old corn and yucca leaves or clay pot artifacts, especially considering such drastic and damaging climate changes.

My bill provides the Secretary of the Interior with the authority to collect and expend donated funds for the design and construction and associated costs to build a visitors center. The legislation provides no Federal money for this much needed project, but allows for Interior to partner with devoted non-profit historical and cultural organizations, especially the Mesa Verde Foundation.

The visitors center will be located on land owned by the Foundation adjacent to the entrance of the park. The proximity of the cultural and visitors center to the cliff dwellings will allow archeologists, students, and visitors an open and accessible window to the lives of indigenous and prehistoric people.

I am proud to follow in the footsteps of fellow conservationist, Teddy Roosevelt, and ask the Senate for quick passage of this important bill. Thank you, and 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. 2595

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

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to collect and expend donated funds and expend appropriated funds for the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of a cultural center and related facilities to be constructed to accommodate visitors, to protect artifacts and archival materials, and for the administration of Mesa Verde National Park on privately owned lands located outside and adjacent to the boundary of the park.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the financing of the Superfund; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce a bill that addresses a critical gap that now exists in the funding for the clean-up of the Nation's most toxic waste sites. The Toxic Clean-up Polluter Pays Renewal Act restores the fees on oil, chemical and other industries to ensure that the Superfund trust fund is solvent, and that polluters, not the American Taxpayers, bear the burden of cleaning up sites that pose a threat to the health and safety of our communities.

I am also pleased to be joined in this effort by the ranking member of the Superfund Subcommittee, Senator CHAFEE as well as the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator JEFFORDS. As Chair of the Superfund Subcommittee, I thank them for joining me in this effort.

Senators TORRICELLI, CORIZINE, and BIDEN are also cosponsers.

The threats posed by Superfund sites affect communities in every corner of the country. One in every four Americans lives within four miles of a Superfund site. That's 70 million Americans, including 10 million children, who are at risk of cancer and other health problems.

My State of California has the second highest number of Superfund sites in the country after New Jersey. And more than 40 percent of Californians live within four miles of a Superfund site.

Anyone who lives anywhere near a Superfund site knows about the terrible damage these industrial sites do to the community. Parents worry if their kids are safe when they find out there is a toxic mess down the street; real estate values go down the drain; and major challenges must be overcome to get the responsible parties to own up to their responsibility.

Fortunately, after Love Canal in 1980, Congress enacted the Superfund law to address the serious threat posed by these sites. And this law has worked. Great progress was made. Since the creation of this program over 800 sites have been cleaned up. During the last four years of the Clinton Administration, there was an average of 87 final cleanups a year.

Unfortunately, this program has seen a sharp decline since the start of the Bush Administration. The pace of cleanups has slowed to a crawl. Instead of 87 National Priority List sites a year, less than half of that are now being cleaned-up. The number is projected to drop further, to just 40 sites, this year.

At the same time, the heart of the Superfund law is under attack: the principle that polluters must pay for cleanups. And that is the issue that my bill addresses.

The Superfund trust fund, which includes funds from Superfund fees previously paid by oil, chemical, and other industries, is nearly gone. It will be depleted by 2004. Why? Because these fees expired in 1995.

The result is that a greater and greater share of the cost of Superfund cleanups is being borne by taxpayers instead of polluters. In fact, in 1995, taxpayers contributed just 18 percent to the Superfund trust fund. But by next year, American taxpayers will pay 54 percent of the Superfund budget.

This trend must be reversed. We must return to the principle of ''polluter pays.''

That is what the Toxic Clean-up Polluter Pays Renewal Act would do. It would reinstate the two Superfund fees, the excise tax on oil and chemical companies as well as the corporate environmental income tax, as they existed from 1986 to 1995.

These fees are not large in scope. For example, for every barrel of oil, the excise tax is only 9.7 cents. Chemical manufacturers pay $4.45 for every ton of arsenic or mercury they produce. This fee varies based on the frequency and toxicity of the chemical.

With regard to the corporate environmental income tax, corporations that have over $2 million in taxable income pay only 0.12 percent on taxable income above $2 million dollars. That means that a company that has $2,010,000 in taxable income would pay only $12.

These companies make millions on their sales. This fee is a small price to pay for a healthy, safe environment.

And, while the fees themselves are relatively small, the preliminary estimates indicate that they would generate $15 billion to $16 billion over the next 10 years for the Superfund Trust Fund. And that is $16 billion that the American taxpayer would not have to pay.

After the Superfund fees expired in 1995, President Clinton repeatedly tried to have them reinstated. Unfortunately, the Bush Administration is not supporting returning to the important principle of polluters pays.

Polluters pays is fair. Polluters pays works. And polluter pays must continue. To shift the burden to all taxpayers is wrong, and we will fight this Administration's attempt to turn its back on the health of the American people.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, today I join with Senator BOXER to introduce a bill to fund the Superfund program for the 10 years. With the Superfund Trust Fund on the verge of insolvency and with a large number of Superfund sites still requiring cleanup, it is incumbent upon us to provide a stable source of funding for this important program. I am pleased that the bill we introduce today will ensure Superfund cleanups will continue without jeopardizing funding for other key programs.

The need for the Superfund program dates back to the late 1970 and the discovery of thousands of barrels of toxic waste buried illegally in a New York community outside of Buffalo. Congress responded to Love Canal and other sites by enacting Superfund. This law was intended to address the Nation's worst sites and ensure that parties are held responsible for the contamination they created. Litigation ensued throughout the 1980's, which slowed down the pace of cleanups. By the 1990s, the pace of Superfund cleanups increased. Administrative and legislative reforms in the last 10 years have significantly improved the effectiveness and pace of the Superfund program.

Collection of excise and income taxes to supply the Superfund ceased at the end of 1995 and have never been reinstated. While spending for the Superfund program has remained steady, the dependence on general revenue dollars have grown. By fiscal year 2004, the Superfund program will be funded virtually entirely by general revenues. Unfortunately, we are currently living in an atmosphere of budget deficits. We find ourselves unable to pay for key programs due to insufficient resources and I believe it is a mistake to make the Superfund program compete for those limited general revenue dollars because we did not replenish the Superfund Trust Fund.

The legislation which we have introduced today will reinstate the Superfund taxes for 10 years. It is true that these taxes will generate less revenue than those that expired in 1995. This is a deliberate effort maintain balance between the amount of money paid into the trust fund and the amount of money appropriated by Congress. We do not want to create a situation in which we are putting more money into the trust fund than will be spent. At the same time, we must ensure that Superfund cleanups progress as quickly as possible. Despite some claims that Superfund cleanups will soon be complete, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency testified recently before the Environment and Public Works Committee that the remaining Superfund sites are complex and costly. All evidence points to the fact that the Superfund program is not in jeopardy of winding down any time soon and that adequate funding will be needed.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I believe this to be a reasonable proposal. It is not perfect, because a perfect solution would ensure that the people responsible for the contamination pay to clean it up. In the future we may wish to look for more equitable ways to fund the Superfund program. However, with the Superfund Trust Fund on the verge of insolvency, a return to the previous funding mechanism is a prudent step.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2597. A bill to authorize a 3-year demonstration program to recruit and train physicians to serve in a rural setting; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Rural Health Training Incentive Act. I am pleased that Senators PATTY MURRAY, CONRAD BURNS, MIKE CRAPO and FRANK MURKOWSKI are joining with me in this effort today.

We are all aware there is a nationwide shortage of health practitioners in rural America and that this shortage is affecting the availability of health care in those communities. This trend is aggravated by the upcoming retirement of 77 million baby-boomers and the overall aging of the rural populations. Unfortunately, there is no quick fix for the problem, and the solution will require a long-term investment in human resources. The bill that I am introducing today would begin work on this long-term investment through the regional Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana and Idaho, WWAMI, program.

The WWAMI program has an excellent track record in its 30 year history of designing programs that work. It has a regionally focused medical school with a mission to train physicians for the communities in Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana and Idaho. With 27 percent of the land mass of the Nation and only 3.3 percent of its population it is truly a ready made laboratory for exploring the best ways to recruit and train rural health care professionals.

This legislation seeks to expand upon the existing WWAMI programs for the recruitment and training of all health care professionals in the five state rural settings and to develop and evaluate similar programs that could be used in other regions of the country. This legislation would be a step in preparing our young people to go into the medical professions and, importantly, would encourage them to practice in rural communities.

I am pleased to be able to introduce this legislation as part of an overall strategy to stabilize health care in rural communities. This session, I have introduced legislation that would provide rural health care facilities with much needed capital to build new or repair existing infrastructure and to purchase medical equipment to help them keep pace with changing technologies. I am also pleased to have worked with my colleague Senator HARKIN on two

separate pieces of legislation that would provide Medicare equity to both providers and seniors in rural States. The bill that I am introducing today adds an integral element of this strategy by making sure that health professionals are available to serve in rural areas.

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. 2597

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 ''Rural Health Training Incentive Act''.

SEC. 2. WWAMI DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) GRANT AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') is authorized to award a grant to the Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and Idaho joint medical school (in this section referred to as ''WWAMI'') to strengthen and expand programs to encourage more health professionals to practice in rural areas.

(2) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award the grant in paragraph (1) for a period of 3 years.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—The grant awarded pursuant to subsection (a) may be used for activities including—

(1) developing new mechanisms for recruiting and mentoring rural youth with respect to all health professions;

(2) strengthening and stabilizing the system of training for the family physicians needed in rural areas; and

(3) expanding the network of rural training tracks throughout WWAMI.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the end of the grant period described in subsection (a)(2), WWAMI shall submit to the Secretary a report evaluating the results of programs funded with the grant authorized under subsection (a)(1) and any recommendations regarding the effectiveness of such programs.

SEC. 3. PROJECT EXPANSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—After submission of the report required in section 2(c), the Secretary is authorized to award grants to eligible entities to expand the programs under section 2, and to implement the recommendations made in such report, in other geographic areas.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—As used in this section, the term ''eligible entity'' means a partnership between a regional university or college and the medical school associated with such university or college where such medical school has a rural area training track of at least 2 months.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, except section 2(c) and section 3, $3,400,000 for fiscal year 2003, $4,100,000 for fiscal year 2004, and $4,800,000 for fiscal year 2005.

(b) EVALUATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the report described in section 2(c), $500,000 for fiscal year 2005.

(c) PROJECT EXPANSION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 3, such sums as may be necessary beginning in fiscal year 2006.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2598. A bill to enhance the criminal penalties for illegal trafficking of archaeological resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Enhanced Protection of Our Cultural Heritage, EPOCH, Act of 2002. This legislation will increase the maximum penalties for violations of three existing statutes that protect the cultural and archaeological history of the American people, particularly Native Americans. The United States Sentencing Commission recommended the statutory changes contained in this bill, which would complement the Commission's strengthening of Federal sentencing guidelines to ensure more stringent penalties for criminals who steal from our public lands. I welcome the Commission's suggestion and am pleased that Senators INOUYE, CLINTON, BINGAMAN, and BOXER have joined me as cosponsors.

This bill will increase the maximum penalties for the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, ARPA, 16 USC § 470ee, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, NAGPRA, 18 USC § 1170, and for 18 USC § 1163, which prohibits theft from Indian Tribal Organizations. All three statutes currently impose a 5-year maximum sentence, and each includes a lower maximum for a first offense of the statute and/or a violation of the statute involving property of less than a specified value. This bill would create a 10-year maximum sentence for each statute, while eliminating the lower maximums under ARPA and NAGPRA for first offenses.

Such maximum sentences would be consistent with similar Federal statutes. For example, the 1994 law proscribing museum theft carries a 10-year maximum sentence, as do the general statutes punishing theft and the destruction of government property. Moreover, increasing the maximum sentences will give judges and the Sentencing Commission greater discretion to impose punishments appropriate to the amount of destruction a defendant has done.

Making these changes will also enable the Sentencing Commission's recent sentencing guidelines to be fully implemented. The Commission has increased sentencing guidelines for cultural heritage crimes, but the statutory maximum penalties contained in current law will prevent judges from issuing sentences in the upper range of the new guidelines. Those new guidelines have the enthusiastic support of the Justice and Interior Departments, the Society for American Archeology, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, numerous Native American nations, and many others. Congress should take the steps necessary to see the guidelines take full effect.

Two of the three laws we amend with this legislation protect Native American lands and property. The third, ARPA, protects both public and Indian lands, and provides significant protection to my State of Vermont. For example, ARPA can be used to prosecute those who would steal artifacts from the wrecked military vessels at the bottom of Lake Champlain that date to the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. U.S. Attorneys can also use ARPA to prosecute criminals who take items that are at least 100 years old from a protected site on Vermont State property without a permit, and then transport those goods into another State. In addition, ARPA protects artifacts found on the approximately 5 percent of Vermont land that is Federal property, land that includes many ''ghost towns'' that have long been abandoned but are an important part of our history.

Those who would pillage the rich cultural heritage of this Nation and its people are committing serious crimes. These artifacts are the legacy of all Americans and should not be degraded as garage sale commodities or as fodder for private enrichment.

I would like to thank a number of people for their help and advice about this legislation. Charlie Tetzlaff, as well as the rest of the staff at the Sentencing Commission, helped us understand the importance of this issue, and made protecting our cultural heritage a priority when he served as United States Attorney for Vermont. Art Cohn, the director of the Lake Champlain Maritime Museum, and Giovanna Peebles, Vermont's State Archeologist, were very helpful in explaining how our laws protect the cultural heritage of Vermont and the rest of the Nation, and I am grateful for their support for this bill.

Passage of this legislation would demonstrate Congress' commitment to preserving our Nation's history and our cultural heritage. I urge my colleagues to support this common-sense initiative.

I would ask that the text of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2598

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 ''Enhanced Protection of Our Cultural Heritage Act of 2002''.

SEC. 2. ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE CRIMES.

(a) ENHANCED PENALTY FOR ILLEGAL TRAFFICKING IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES.—Section 6(d) of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470ee(d)) is amended by striking ''not more than $10,000'' and all that follows through the end of the subsection, and inserting ''not more than $100,000, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.''.

(b) ENHANCED PENALTY FOR EMBEZZLEMENT AND THEFT FROM INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 1163 of title 18, United States

Code, is amended by striking ''five years'' and inserting ''10 years''.

(c) ENHANCED PENALTY FOR ILLEGAL TRAFFICKING IN NATIVE AMERICAN HUMAN REMAINS AND CULTURAL ITEMS.—Section 1170 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''or imprisoned not more than 12 months, or both, and in the case of a second or subsequent violation, be fined in accordance with this title, or imprisoned not more than 5 years'' and inserting ''imprisoned not more than 10 years''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''imprisoned not more than one year, or both, and in the case of a second or subsequent violation, be fined in accordance with this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years'' and inserting ''imprisoned not more than 10 years''.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. KYL, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 2599. A bill to establish the Water Supply Technologies Program within the Office of Energy Efficiency and renewable Energy of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senator KYL, and Senator CRAPO, I am introducing a bill with reference to water, water supply, and research. We have no American policy, no place that you can go where the basic water issues of our land can be metered and modeled, and where we can find out what the real situation is with reference to water for our growing needs in our cities and the surrounding areas.

If you are interested in that, I think you will find the bill I am sending to the desk to be an intriguing one. It has been put together by very bright, technical people from laboratories and similar entities, where they clearly set forth the way we ought to go about establishing a water supply research center for a country as important as ours, and how we can provide research on an annual basis in these areas for very few dollars.

Water is the lifeblood of our Southwest. We don't have an abundant supply and what we do have is becoming increasingly threatened. Between providing water for people and various endangered species, there just isn't enough water to go around.

I'm sure many of my colleagues are seeing daily headlines like:

Winds Parch Remaining Moisture Out of New Mexico Land,

Navajos Urged To Sell Parched Livestock, New Mexico Going to Drought Emergency, Drought Watch—Skies Without Hope, and Trees Need Big Help To Survive Drought.

There is no larger problem facing our Southwest.

This bill is part of my broad strategy for dealing with water quality and quantity issues. In earlier bills, I have sought to provide grants to communities struggling to meet the new EPA arsenic mandates. I recently introduced the National Drought Preparedness Act of 2002 to help communities develop drought preparedness plans in an effort to mitigate the effects of future droughts.

This bill will help with short term challenges like meeting arsenic mandates and longer term issues like cost-effective desalination technologies and better modeling to enable optimum utilization of the water in our major river basins.

There are good reasons for designating the Department of Energy to create these technologies. Energy is the second largest user of water, second only to agriculture. Furthermore, energy costs are a major component in purifying and pumping drinking water and in treating wastewater.

As scarcity of water intensifies, more and more energy will be needed to obtain and treat it. Water will be pumped from greater depths and over greater distances. More treatment will be needed as we use less pure resources. As just one example, up to half the costs of desalination involve energy.

Removal of arsenic will be one focus for this new program. In New Mexico, as in much of the West, arsenic occurs naturally in significant concentrations. This, coupled with the fact that New Mexico is not a wealthy State, has made the recent unfunded mandate imposed by the EPA insurmountable.

This new standard is going to cost New Mexico around $400 million. More than 100 community water systems in the State will probably have to upgrade their water treatment facilities. Ratepayers are likely to see monthly rate increases averaging between $40 and $90, that's simply unacceptable. Other States have similar problems.

Even worse, these costs may force people to shift from expensive treated water to cheaper domestic wells. Since these wells often contain even greater amounts of arsenic and pollutants, there may be unintended public health consequences created by this new mandate.

I introduced S. 1299 to provide grants to States to help them comply with these new standards. That will help, but grant dollars alone aren't the answer to this issue. We also need to reduce the costs of arsenic removal.

This bill authorizes $8 million for research and development of cost effective strategies. The program will focus on reducing overall costs, including those for energy and will include demonstration projects in the arid southwest.

The bill also provides for a 4 year extension in the time by which municipalities must comply with the new EPA mandate, in addition to the extension that EPA has already committed to. This extension is open to any public water system that is in the process of utilizing technology authorized under this bill. Our national laboratories, especially Sandia, will be strong contributors to this program.

Another part of the bill deals with the challenges of providing adequate supplies of fresh water for the growing populations of our southwest. These States face severe water shortages, which impact both our urban communities and our rural agricultural ones. Our fresh water supply will not increase, unless we take steps today and invest in new approaches to water supply and management.

To achieve this, my bill provides authority for the program director, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Reclamation, to coordinate desalination research for improved technologies. This program is authorized at $6 million.

The program will focus on development and demonstration of technologies appropriate for desalinating brackish water and encourages the use of renewable energy. Part of these funds will enable completion of a national desalination research center in the Tularosa Basin of New Mexico.

The bill also provides $7 million to implement programs to examine the relationships between water supplies and energy needs. It will focus on the availability of water and on opportunities for increasing our supplies. Hopefully, with this research we can turn our water future into something other than a ''zero sum'' game.

The program will develop comprehensive models to assess and manage competing demands for water by energy, agriculture and other sectors. To accomplish this, models will include a range of physical phenomena and a complete set of the major water uses. The bill provides for the development of these models for up to 3 domestic river basins, one of which addresses an international border.

Many Americans are under the illusion that water will always flow out of their tap each time it is turned on. And they continue to believe that there will always be an adequate supply of good quality water to meet all needs, energy, agriculture and domestic. I fear this may not always be the case. Unless we develop a long-term strategy for dealing with impending water shortages it could be too late.

I hope this bill starts us down the path of conquering water challenges in the 21st Century.

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. 2599

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 ''Water Supply Technologies Act of 2002''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the understanding, use, and protection of water resources are matters of national and global security;

(2) increasing demand for water supply may dramatically alter population patterns and strain international relations;

(3) the remediation of many sites of the Department of Energy and the treatment of domestic water supplies require cost-effective, efficient removal of contaminants from water supplies;

(4) such remediation frequently involves knowledge and modeling of water transport at the surface and subsurface levels;

(5)(A) energy costs—

(i) are a major factor in the extraction, storage, treatment, and delivery of water; and

(ii) are particularly high in the case of desalination processes; and

(B) increased efficiencies in energy use, or use of renewable energy sources in treatment processes, can result in large cost savings;

(6)(A) most energy production technologies are highly water intensive;

(B) the energy industry is the second largest water user after agriculture;

(C) energy production requires a reliable, predictable water supply; and

(D) the limited availability of water is beginning to constrain construction of new powerplants;

(7) having strong expertise in geosciences, hydrology, chemistry, energy options, system modeling, and security technologies, the Department of Energy is well positioned to contribute to national efforts relating to water issues;

(8) modeling and simulation of water cycles on at least the scale of river basins can guide strategies affecting—

(A) site cleanup;

(B) agricultural use of land;

(C) industrial use of land;

(D) protection of the environment; and

(E) population expansion;

(9) municipal water systems are facing unfunded Federal mandates to remove heavy metals and other contaminants from water supplies;

(10) in the future, as water supplies are further stressed, municipal water systems may be forced to use water supplies that cannot, using existing technologies, be cost-effectively purified to meet clean water standards;

(11) many components of technologies used in the remediation of heavy metals and other contaminants at sites of the Department would aid municipal water systems in water purification;

(12) for municipal water systems, 2 of the most economically and technically challenging treatment processes are—

(A) reduction of arsenic levels; and

(B) desalination;

(13)(A) the security of water supplies is a growing concern; and

(B) there is an emerging need for real-time sensing, and reporting systems for early warnings to the public, of potentially hazardous contaminants in the drinking water supply;

(14) major water shortages along the United States-Mexico border—

(A) are projected to occur in the future; and

(B) could contribute to many issues affecting the border region; and

(15) research and development of the Department must be coordinated with research and development of other Federal agencies, each of which has responsibilities, interests, and capabilities to contribute to solving the important problems described in this section.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ARSENIC REMOVAL PROGRAM.—The term ''arsenic removal program'' means the program carried out under section 4(d).

(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Energy.

(3) DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term ''Deputy Assistant Secretary'' means the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water Supply Technologies in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy of the Department appointed under section 4(a)(2).

(4) DESALINATION PROGRAM.—The term ''desalination program'' means the program carried out under section 4(e).

(5) FOUNDATION.—The term ''Foundation'' means the American Water Works Association Research Foundation.

(6) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(7) PROGRAM.—The term ''Program'' means the Water Supply Technologies Program established by section 4(a)(1).

(8) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

(9) WATER AND ENERGY SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM.—The term ''water and energy sustainability program'' means the program carried out under section 4(f).

(10) WATER SUPPLY SECURITY PROGRAM.—The term ''water supply security program'' means the program carried out under section 4(g).

SEC. 4. WATER SUPPLY TECHNOLOGIES PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy of the Department a program to be known as the ''Water Supply Technologies Program''.

(2) DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall establish, and appoint an individual to fill, the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water Supply Technologies.

(b) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Deputy Assistant Secretary shall carry out the Program, consisting of—

(A) the arsenic removal program under subsection (d);

(B) the desalination program under subsection (e);

(C) the water and energy sustainability program under subsection (f); and

(D) the water supply security program under subsection (g).

(2) CONTRACTUAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out the duties of the Deputy Assistant Secretary, the Deputy Assistant Secretary may enter into contracts with—

(A) private industries;

(B) colleges and universities;

(C) national laboratories; and

(D) nonprofit organizations.

(c) OVERSIGHT.—The Secretary shall ensure that the results of research and development conducted by the Department that are relevant to the Program are communicated to the Deputy Assistant Secretary.

(d) ARSENIC REMOVAL PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Deputy Assistant Secretary shall offer to enter into a contract with the Foundation under which the Foundation shall carry out a research program to develop and demonstrate innovative arsenic removal technologies.

(2) TYPES OF RESEARCH.—In carrying out the arsenic removal program, the Foundation shall, to the maximum extent practicable, conduct research on means of—

(A) reducing energy costs incurred in using arsenic removal technologies;

(B) minimizing materials costs, operating costs, and maintenance costs incurred in using arsenic removal technologies; and

(C) minimizing any quantities of waste (especially hazardous waste) that result from use of arsenic removal technologies.

(3) WATER PURIFICATION TECHNOLOGIES.—In carrying out the arsenic removal program, the Foundation shall carry out peer-reviewed projects (including research projects and cost-shared demonstration projects in conjunction with municipal water systems) to develop and demonstrate water purification technologies.

(4) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

(A) ARID SOUTHWESTERN UNITED STATES.—In carrying out the arsenic removal program, the Foundation shall carry out at least 3 demonstration projects to demonstrate the applicability of innovative arsenic removal technologies to the arid southwestern United States.

(B) RURAL COMMUNITIES AND INDIAN TRIBES.—Not less than 40 percent of the funds of the Department used for demonstration projects under the arsenic removal program shall be expended in partnership with rural communities or Indian tribes.

(5) EVALUATION OF COST EFFECTIVENESS.—In carrying out the arsenic removal program, the Foundation shall use WERC, A Consortium for Environmental Education and Technology Development, to evaluate the cost effectiveness of arsenic removal technologies used in the program.

(6) EDUCATION AND TRAINING.—In carrying out the arsenic removal program, the Deputy Assistant Secretary shall provide a mechanism for education, training, and technology transfer to be developed and implemented by WERC, A Consortium for Environmental Education and Technology Development.

(7) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS.—The Deputy Assistant Secretary, in conjunction with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall ensure that activities under the arsenic removal program are coordinated with appropriate programs of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(8) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of commencement of the arsenic removal program, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the arsenic removal program.

(e) DESALINATION PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Deputy Assistant Secretary, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall carry out a desalination program in accordance with the desalination technology progress plan developed under the matter under the heading ''WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES'' under the heading ''BUREAU OF RECLAMATION'' in title II of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002 (115 Stat. 498), and described in Senate Report 107–39.

(2) DESALINATION RESEARCH.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Under the desalination program, Sandia National Laboratories and the Bureau of Reclamation shall coordinate desalination research for next-generation desalination technology.

(B) REQUIRED RESEARCH ELEMENTS.—In conducting research under the desalination program, Sandia National Laboratories and the Bureau of Reclamation shall—

(i) focus on research relating to, and development and demonstration of, technologies that are appropriate for use in desalinating brackish groundwater and other saline water supplies; and

(ii) consider the use of renewable energy.

(3) CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Under the desalination program, funds made available to carry out activities in the Tularosa Basin, New Mexico, may be used for construction projects, including completion of the National Desalination Research Center.

(4) STEERING COMMITTEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Deputy Assistant Secretary and the Commissioner of Reclamation shall jointly establish a steering committee for the desalination program.

(B) CHAIRPERSONS.—The steering committee shall be jointly chaired by 1 representative from the Program and 1 representative from the Bureau of Reclamation.

(f) WATER AND ENERGY SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Deputy Assistant Secretary shall carry out a program to ensure that sufficient quantities of water are available for the energy sector through development of modeling and analysis tools to assess and manage—

(A) competing demands for water by the energy sector and other categories of water users, including the agriculture sector, the energy sector, industry, domestic users, and the environment; and

(B) the impacts of energy production on the availability of water.

(2) REQUIRED ELEMENTS.—Under the water and energy sustainability program, the Deputy Assistant Secretary shall—

(A) in accordance with paragraph (3), develop a coordinated strategy to identify technology development and improved modeling capabilities needed to achieve the goal of continued water and energy sustainability;

(B) in accordance with paragraph (4), develop such advanced modeling and decision analysis tools as are necessary to assess and manage competing demands for water by various categories of water users specified in paragraph (1)(A); and

(C) in accordance with paragraph (5), carry out demonstration projects to test the models and tools developed under subparagraph (B).

(3) WATER AND ENERGY SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY.—In developing the strategy under paragraph (2)(A), the Deputy Assistant Secretary shall—

(A) collaborate with water management agencies, universities, industry, and stakeholder groups to define issues and needs; and

(B) develop a coordinated science and technology strategy to support future water use decisions that include issues of energy sustainability.

(4) ADVANCED MODELING AND DECISION ANALYSIS TOOLS.—

(A) APPLICABLE SCALES.—Modeling and decision analysis tools developed under paragraph (2)(B) shall address water and energy availability issues—

(i) physically, on the scale of river basins; and

(ii) temporally, on scales ranging from seasons to decades.

(B) COORDINATION.—Modeling and decision analysis tools developed under paragraph (2)(B) shall be coordinated with global climate change predictive capabilities supported by the Federal Government.

(C) MODELING TOOLS.—Modeling tools developed under paragraph (2)(B) shall include tools for modeling the effects of—

(i) atmospheric, surface, and subsurface phenomena;

(ii) rural and urban populations and land use changes;

(iii) energy, agriculture, and other industrial demands;

(iv) energy impacts on water quality and quantity; and

(v) changing marketplace behaviors and other economic forces.

(D) DECISION ANALYSIS TOOLS.—Decision analysis tools developed under paragraph (2)(B) shall include tools to support water and energy resources planning through—

(i) provision of direct support for policy and planning decisions;

(ii) optimization of water use for the energy sector and other categories of water users specified in paragraph (1)(A); and

(iii) assessment of the potential benefits of new technologies to improve water and energy sustainability.

(5) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Demonstration projects carried out under paragraph (2)(C) shall—

(A) test water and energy modeling and decision analysis tools for 3 river basins, at least 1 of which includes an international border;

(B) focus on assessing water resources and managing competing demands for, and impacts on, water by the energy sector and other categories of water users specified in paragraph (1)(A); and

(C) be conducted in collaboration with water resources management organizations in the basins described in subparagraph (A).

(6) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Deputy Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Secretary and Congress a report on the water and energy sustainability program that—

(A) describes the elements required under paragraph (2); and

(B) makes recommendations for a management structure and research and development plan for the water and energy sustainability program that optimizes use of Federal resources and programs.

(g) WATER SUPPLY SECURITY PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Deputy Assistant Secretary shall offer to enter into a contract with the Foundation under which the Foundation shall carry out a research program, in coordination with the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security, with the goal of developing low-cost, mass-produced, micro-analytical systems to provide early warning of potentially hazardous contaminants in municipal water systems.

(2) REQUIRED ELEMENTS.—In carrying out the water supply security program, the Foundation shall, to the maximum extent practicable, develop—

(A) means of reducing monitoring costs, including technologies to replace expensive sampling and analysis used, as of the date of enactment of this Act, for routine regulatory compliance;

(B) innovative, cost-effective monitoring technologies for detection of—

(i) chemical and biological threats; and

(ii) chemicals and pharmaceuticals subject to current or potential future regulation; and

(C) rapid and effective methodologies to transform monitoring data into information for decisionmaking and automated response.

(3) MONITORING TECHNOLOGIES.—In carrying out the water supply security program, the Foundation, in conjunction with municipal water systems, shall carry out peer-reviewed projects to develop and demonstrate monitoring technologies.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of implementation of the water supply security program, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the water supply security program.

(h) COST SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each demonstration project carried out under the Program shall be carried out on a cost-shared basis, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS; WAIVERS.—With respect to a demonstration project, the Secretary may—

(A) accept in-kind contributions; and

(B) waive the cost-sharing requirement in appropriate circumstances.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(1) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, of which—

(A) $8,000,000 shall be used to carry out subsection (d);

(B) $6,000,000 shall be used to carry out subsection (e);

(C) $7,000,000 shall be used to carry out subsection (f); and

(D) $4,000,000 shall be used to carry out subsection (g); and

(2) such sums as are necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 5. EXTENSIONS OF COMPLIANCE DEADLINES FOR SMALL PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS.

Section 1412(b)(10) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g–1(b)(10)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''A national primary'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a national primary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) EXTENSIONS.—

''(A) SMALL PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the report submitted to Congress by the Administrator entitled 'Small System Arsenic Implementation Issues', in addition to any 2-year extension described in paragraph (1), the Administrator (or a State, in the case of an individual system) may provide to a public water system that serves a population of not more than 10,000 an extension of 3 years in which to comply with a maximum contaminant level or treatment technique described in that paragraph.

''(ii) RENEWAL OF EXTENSIONS.—The Administrator (or a State, in the case of an individual system) may renew an extension granted to a small public water system under clause (i) if—

''(I) the small public water system serves a population of not more than 3,300; and

''(II) the small public water system demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Administrator (or the State), that the small public water system is taking all practicable steps to meet the requirements of this title.

''(B) ALL PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS.—In addition to any 2-year extension received under paragraph (1), the Administrator (or a State, in the case of an individual system) may provide to any public water system an extension of 4 years in which to comply with a maximum contaminant level or treatment technique described in that paragraph if the public water system is in the process of implementing arsenic removal technology developed under section 4(d) of the Water Supply Technologies Act of 2002.''.

STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 119—HONORING THE UNITED STATES MARINES KILLED IN ACTION DURING WORLD WAR II WHILE PARTICIPATING IN THE 1942 RAID ON MAKIN ATOLL IN THE GILBERT ISLANDS AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A SITE IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, NEAR THE SPACE SHUTTLE ''CHALLENGER'' MEMORIAL AT THE CORNER OF MEMORIAL AND FARRAGUT DRIVES, SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR A SUITABLE MONUMENT TO THE MARINE RAIDERS

Mr. BURNS (for himself and Mr. INOUYE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 119

Whereas Congress remembers with profound sorrow, gratitude, and respect the