EC–1899. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals dated February 12, 1996; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, Committee on Budget, Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Foreign Relations

EC–1900. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the compliance report for the session of Congress ending January 3, 1996; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget.

EC–1901. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on General Accounting Office employees detailed to congressional committees as of January 19, 1996; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–1902. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, case number 94–23; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–1903. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Performance of Department of Defense Commercial Activities'' for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1904. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice to award a particular contract without competition; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1905. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Defense Manpower Requirements Report (DMRR); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1906. A communication from the Principal Deputy General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to revise and amend the provisions of title 32, United States Code, relating to the jurisdiction and powers of courts-martial for the National Guard not in Federal service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1907. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–1908. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Finance:

Stuart E. Eizenstat, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.

James E. Johnson, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Barry R. McCaffrey, of Washington, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy, vice Lee Patrick Brown.

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that he be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 1580. A bill to provide funding for community-oriented policing, to reduce funding for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEWINE:

S. 1581. A bill to reinstate the License for, and extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of, a hydroelectric project in Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. SIMON):

S. 1582. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 1583. A bill to establish the Lower Eastern Shore American Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON (for himself, Mr. FRIST, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S. 1584. A bill to authorize appropriations for the preservation and restoration of historic buildings at historically black colleges and universities; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. PELL, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DODD, Mr. MACK, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. D'AMATO, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. Res. 228. A resolution condemning terror attacks in Israel; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. D'AMATO):

S. Res. 229. A resolution commemorating Black History Month and contributions of African-American United States Senators; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 230. A resolution to urge the President to announce at the earliest opportunity the results of the Senior Army Decorations Board which reviewed certain cases of gallantry and heroism by black Americans during World War II; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 1580. A bill to provide funding for community-oriented policing, to reduce funding for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE SAFER STREETS ACT OF 1996

•Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am today introducing the Safer Streets Act of 1996 that will address the anxiety of many citizens who believe that violence and crime are eating away at the social fabric of their communities. The Safer Streets Act would help to restore family security by funding an additional 100,000 police officers, above and beyond the 100,000 initially funded by the crime bill, to take their place on the streets of communities across our Nation.

Mr. President, to date, Massachusetts has received $53 million in funding from the 1994 crime bill for 1,020 new police officers, including the redeployment of 407 officers to the street from desk duty. Our communities must be able to respond to the threat of violent crime with an effort we know is already working in towns and cities across Massachusetts. I have listened to police officers and law enforcement officials, and citizens across my State, and they tell me that there is a real need for an even greater police presence on the streets of Massachusetts. Our first effort—putting 100,000 cops on the streets of our Nation—is already working to fight crime. There is no better deterrent to crime in our communities than a cop on the beat, so it is vital that we help communities obtain the police they need to keep neighborhoods safe. The Safer Streets Act will fund approximately 100,000 additional community police positions across the Nation—effectively doubling the number it was possible to provide from the first year's funding. It does this by cutting $6.5 billion from the 1996 fiscal year Defense Department appropriation and transferring it to the Justice Department to fund community policing efforts with grants that will be awarded to communities using the same formula as the first 100,000 cops on the street initiative. This is money the Defense Department did not ask for, and it is money we desperately need for more cops on the street.

Americans are understandably anxious about their economic and personal security. How we as a Congress respond to that anxiety—the kinds of partnerships we form between government and communities to address the concerns of families struggling to keep up and do well—will determine this Nation's future. That's why a strong, affordable effort to expand community policing, that has been proven to be extraordinarily successful, is not only our responsibility but is our obligation to the people we represent.

Mr. President, If we know that community policing works; and we know

that our constituents are anxious about their personal security, then it would be irresponsible not to act. This legislation addresses the personal frustrations of families who see a level of crime and violence on their streets and in their neighborhoods that is unacceptable. People want their government to respond with what we know can make a difference. Community policing with 200,000 more police on the streets will make a difference.

Mr. President, passing the Safer Streets Act is our duty.

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. 1580

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

SECTION 1. TRANSFER OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996 (P.L. 104–61), the Secretary of Defense shall transfer $6,500,000,000 of unobligated funds appropriated under such Act for fiscal year 1996 to the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund established under section 310001 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14211).

(b) ALLOCATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall allocate the amount transferred under subsection (a) from among any programs in the Department of Defense for which funding was not requested in the 1996 budget request of the President.

SEC. 2. FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICING PROGRAMS.

The amount transferred under section 1 shall only be used for community-oriented policing programs under section 1701(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)).●

By Mr. DEWINE:

S. 1581. A bill to reinstate the license for, and extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of, a hydroelectric project in Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT LEGISLATION

● Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, S. 1581 would reinstate the license for a 49.5 megawatt hydroelectric project in Ohio, which was originally issued on September 27, 1989, and extend the deadline for construction until September 24, 1999. The licensee for this project is the City of Orrville. The original license was stayed and held in abeyance until 1992, due to administrative and judicial challenges to FERC's decision to issue licenses for 16 projects in the upper Ohio River basin. In 1992, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals upheld FERC's licensing decision. Due to the delay caused by the litigation and difficulty securing adequate funding for the project, the city surrendered its license in June, 1993 and sought other sources of power to meet its immediate energy needs. This bill would reinstate the license and extend the construction deadline for this project. In a letter dated February 9, 1996, FERC chair, Elizabeth Moler, stated that she did not have any specific objections to legislation reinstating the license and extending the construction deadline for Pike Island Project No. 3218.●

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. SIMON):

S. 1582. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REAUTHORIZATION LEGISLATION

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am joining with Senator SIMON to introduce a bill reauthorizing a number of worthwhile programs that serve young people and their families in Vermont and across the country. In particular, I am referring to the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and related programs, whose authorizations are expiring later this year.

A few weeks ago, I had the privilege of meeting with Frances Dodd, coordinator of the Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth programs. The Vermont Coalition is a community-based network comprised of eight member programs that provide crisis response, emergency shelter, counseling, and other services to troubled youth throughout nine Vermont counties. This meeting also included a number of young Vermonters who knew first-hand the value of providing shelters and support for young people facing difficult times. I came away from that meeting more convinced than ever that the Federal assistance provided by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act continues to make an important difference in the lives of our young people and to play a critical role in reuniting families.

Those who provide services pursuant to these programs and those who are the beneficiaries of those services are far too important to be left hanging. In a Congress in which the budget and appropriations processes have given way to short-lived spending authority, they all deserve the reassurance of reauthorization and a commitment to funding. Only then will our State youth service bureaus and other shelter and service providers be able to plan, design and implement the local programs necessary to make the goals of the act a reality.

In 1974, Congress passed the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act as title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. The inclusion of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act in this legislation recognized that young people who were effectively homeless were in need of shelter, guidance and supervision, rather than punishment, and should be united with their families wherever possible.

Since 1974, the programs that make up the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act have evolved to meet the complex problems faced by our young people, their families and our communities. Over the last decade, as a nation, we have witnessed an increase in teen pregnancy rates, drug and alcohol abuse beginning as early as grade school, child physical and sexual abuse, and a soaring youth suicide rate.

Today, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act encompasses basic center grants, the transitional living program and drug abuse prevention program. These programs are vital to meeting the needs of troubled youth in rural Vermont and across the Nation. While the actual numbers of young people who run away or become homeless in rural areas might be small in comparison to that of large cities, emergency shelter and other services must still be accessible. It is an unfortunate reality that urban and rural youth can experience family conflict, and physical or sexual abuse.

The majority of these programs in my home State are coordinated through the Vermont Coalition. Young people find these services through friends and family as well as through referrals by police and our court diversion program.

Our Vermont programs and services have been very successful. Last year, for example 87 percent of runaways returned home or to a positive living situation after receiving services. Only 7 percent of those served in 1995 had new State social service cases open and less than 1 percent ended up in police custody. Since 1993, there has been a 42-percent increase in the total number of youths served by Vermont's programs. In 1995, these programs reached over 700 young people and over 1000 family members.

Two years ago, the Vermont Coalition was awarded a Federal rural demonstration grant to assist counties that lack adequate services for runaway youth in developing responsive programs. Through this grant, the Vermont Coalition was able to identify underserved counties, draw upon the expertise of its many programs and help develop programs for three additional Vermont counties in which services are now emerging.

Since 1989, the transitional living program, which was developed by my colleague, Senator SIMON, has filled a gap in the needs of older youth to help them make the transition to independent living situations. I know how hard Senator SIMON worked on creating this important program and I look forward to working with him now to continue it.

The programs we seek to reauthorize include those directed at young people who have had some kind of alcohol or other drug problem. The isolation in rural areas can lead to serious substance abuse problems. It is difficult to reach young people in rural areas and it is difficult for them to find the services they need. In Vermont, these drug abuse prevention programs provide essential outreach services.

Providing these types of community-based services to runaway and homeless youth seems to me to make good economic sense. We need only compare the cost of these programs to other services often needed by young people experiencing serious family conflict and associated social difficulties. Neglecting the needs of runaway and homeless youth and their families would have staggering economic implications. In Vermont, the average cost of services to youth by the Vermont Coalition of Runaway Youth Programs is $1,895. Compare this with $18,392, the average annual cost of maintaining someone in State custody through the social services department; the $50,000 it would cost to place someone in a substance abuse treatment facility; or the $60,000 a year it costs to incarcerate someone.

I receive letters from parents whose families have been kept together with the assistance of runaway and homeless programs as well as from young people who have been helped by these services. In one, a mother wrote of a program in the Northeast Kingdom:

> My teenage daughter ran away this spring. I feel fortunate to have been able to call upon the [Northeast Kingdom Youth Services] programs. I credit the quick, compassionate response by [the] on-call worker, with keeping my daughter out of state custody. Careful, immediate intervention was the key in helping my daughter feel comfortable about remaining at home. [Your] ongoing efforts to mediate issues which continue to arise have kept our family together.

These service providers are being challenged as never before with an increasingly complex set of problems affecting young people and their families. Now is not the time to abandon them. There is consensus among services providers that young people seeking services and their families are increasingly more troubled—as evidenced by reports of family violence, substance abuse and the effects of an array of economic pressures. These services may well be the key to breaking through the isolation of street youth, their mistrust of adults, and their reluctance to get involved with public or private providers.

Among the other critical programs reauthorized by our bill is the Missing Children's Assistance Act. Since its initial passage in 1984, we have made real progress on the tragedy of missing and exploited children. A national coordinated effort has proved essential in facing these problems. I understand that in Vermont alone there have been more than 30 cases of missing children resolved. Those children and their families know the value of this program.

This month, Senator THOMPSON has begun a series of hearings before the subcommittee on Youth Violence. I look forward to working with him and with Senator BIDEN, the ranking member on the subcommittee and on the Judiciary Committee, and our other colleagues in connection with these matters. In addition to the critical role that Senator BIDEN is playing, Senator KENNEDY and Senator KOHL have long been supporters of the juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs. Senator SPECTER has been actively involved in these matters for more than a decade, formerly chaired the Juvenile Justice Subcommittee and currently chairs the Appropriations Subcommittee with jurisdiction over many of these programs.

In light of the ongoing hearings and in deference to our colleagues who lead the subcommittee, we have chosen not to include the title II Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act programs in this reauthorization bill at this time. I understand that our colleagues, the administration, State program officers, the Ad Hoc Coalition on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and other groups are all currently developing proposals for the reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. We look forward to consideration of those proposals and to working together to continue the bipartisan traditional that has always attended this program. While we all need to work together to address the rise in serious, violent juvenile crime and the need to enhance public safety, I believe that we can do so while still preserving the essential elements of the act.

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act has helped foster strides nationwide through a series of funded mandates. Throughout the United States, the number of violations of the deinstitutionalization mandate for status offenders and non-offenders has been reduced from 171,581 to 3,146 among the participating States. In 1994, 55 States and territories participated in the program and only three received reduced funding because of compliance issues.

Over a decade ago, the Vermont General Assembly established the Children and Family Council for Prevention programs, which is the designated State advisory group that monitors and distributes our funds under the title II block grant. The Vermont co-chairs of the council, Ken Schatz and Pamela Smith, and its other members encourage community involvement in the development of effective prevention programs that promote the health and increase the self-reliance of Vermont children and families. I look forward to working closely with the council on the reauthorization of the title II programs.

In June 1993, the council used Federal assistance under the act to sponsor a youthful offender study project. The ensuing report recommended the development of a youthful offender program, which won the endorsement of the Vermont Department of Corrections and the Department of Social Rehabilitative Services. The council is now funding projects with Federal assistance to implement this recommendation.

In 1994, the council developed Vermont's 3-year plan for the formula grant monies by identifying State priority areas. The largest portion of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention funding is a State block grant program, not a one-size-fits-all solution. In Vermont, the priorities are violent family functioning, the lack of treatment resources for violent youthful offenders and the need to improve the juvenile justice system. Over the last decade, Vermont has seen a substantial increase in reported violence against women and children. The council's plan allowed it to target this problem. The decrease in substantial cases of child abuse last year signals that the State's prevention efforts are making a difference.

Using its Federal assistance, Vermont has made great progress in improving the juvenile justice system in recent years. These funds enable Vermont to replicate initiatives that are working across the State. Typically, the Federal funding is leveraged with State and private funds to support these efforts. Vermont's formula grant has gone to support such projects as community-based treatment, court diversion, diversity training, pilot programs on juvenile restitution, its Families First program, its Caring Communities program and teen centers where young people can gather in a safe, supervised environment for socializing, group activities and educational events. One Vermont youthful offender noted:

> The Diversion program works. The board's faith in me gave me something to live up to and gave me confidence. They trusted me at a time when almost all the trust I ever had was gone, and they gave me one extra chance and that one extra bit of trust that I needed.

Through the programs which make up the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, the Federal response to the problems of our youth has become comprehensive and collaborative. The Federal technical and financial resources have enabled States to undertake a number of system-wide improvements. The bill that we are introducing today recognizes the importance of a nonpunitive system for vulnerable youth.

In my view, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and the other Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act programs are working in Vermont and ought to be continued. Given the short time left in this Congress, I believe that changes proposed to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act will have to be those around which a consensus can be obtained very quickly if we are to meet our goal of reauthorizing it before the end of the year.●

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, this is the year that the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act needs to be reauthorized. This important act has vastly improved our handling of juveniles in our criminal justice system, and has provided funding for services to some of the most vulnerable young people in our society.

Today, Senator LEAHY and I are introducing a bill to reauthorize the runaway and homeless youth sections of the act. Although I feel strongly that the entire Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act should be reauthorized, I understand that Senators THOMPSON and BIDEN, chairman and ranking member of the Juvenile Violence Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, are holding hearings on the rest of the act. I applaud their work to examine these issues and construct a reauthorization plan, however I want to introduce this bill because the runaway and homeless youth parts of the act are particularly important to me.

In 1988, I held a hearing in Chicago on the problem of homeless youth. As a result of that hearing, I sponsored the Transitional Living Program. The Transitional Living Program was designed to fill a gap in the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. The basic centers part of the act provides grants to community centers which provide temporary shelter and services to runaways while they try to reunite with their families or are placed in a foster home. Unfortunately, as I discovered during my 1988 hearing, many young people never return to their family homes, largely because of neglect and abuse, but are too old to be placed with a foster family. These young people were not being adequately served by the temporary shelters which help so many others.

The Transitional Living Program awards new-start grants to community projects which provide longer-term residential services to older homeless youth ages 16 through 21. Nonprofit, community-based grantees teach these young people independent living skills to prepare them to live on their own. Young people live in host family homes, group houses, or in supervised apartments, and receive guidance from counselors to help them make the transition to independent living. The goal of this program is to help these young people live productive, self-sufficient lives, and prevent future dependency on social services. The total annual appropriations for this program has been approximately $12 million. That investment has assisted countless young people who otherwise would have found themselves on the street with no one to provide the support and resources they need to live independently.

In 1988, a third component of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act was also added. This Drug Abuse Prevention Program [DAPP] for runaway and homeless youth was initiated because of the recognition that drugs play a large role in these young people's lives. Their difficult living situations make them particularly vulnerable to the dangers of drug use, and such drug use severely hinders efforts to improve their circumstances. As anyone working in this field will testify, drug prevention and treatment are an essential element of any efforts to help runaway and homeless youth. Unfortunately, this DAPP component of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, along with a companion DAPP program for youth gangs, was not reauthorized last year and did not receive any funding this year. This bill recognizes the destructive role of illicit drug use in these young people's lives, and reauthorizes both of these essential programs.

Finally, this bill reauthorizes the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. This center, created in 1984, provides important services to the thousands of families who face the devastating, mysterious loss of a child. The center operates a toll-free number to gather tips about missing children, coordinates Federal, State and local efforts to locate missing children, serves as a clearinghouse of information on successful service and research efforts, provides grants to local agencies for research and service efforts and conducts a regular survey on the number of missing children. This center has helped us as a nation understand the scope of this problem and has helped families locate missing children. Unfortunately, the problem of missing children continues, as President Clinton recognized on January 19, 1996, when he signed an order instructing Federal agencies to post missing-children posters in Federal buildings. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children performs an essential function and should be reauthorized.

Mr. President, this bill should not be considered a substitute for a complete reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. I support the efforts of Senators THOMPSON, and BIDEN, and look forward to working with them to reauthorize the act. However, Senator LEAHY and I agree that the runaway and homeless youth part of the act provide essential support for a most vulnerable group of young people. Our bill is meant to highlight our support for these programs and our belief that they should be reauthorized.●

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 1583. A bill to establish the Lower Eastern Shore American Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE LOWER EASTERN SHORE AMERICAN HERITAGE AREA ACT OF 1996

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to designate the Lower Eastern Shore of Maryland as a National Heritage Area. The purpose of this legislation is to help conserve and promote the resources of the region's communities and their unique contribution to the fabric of the Nation, while revitalizing its local economies and improving its overall quality of life.

The Lower Eastern Shore is a very special place. It contains an unrivaled combination of resources and history which represent a unique and integral piece of the diverse tapestry of our national character. Situated on the Delmarva Peninsula between the Atlantic Ocean and the Chesapeake Bay—the largest and most productive estuary in North America, its nationally significant natural resources also include the Coastal Bays—Chincoteague, Sinepuxent, Isle of Wright, and Assawoman; the Wild and Scenic Pocomoke River; and one of the few relatively undisturbed strands of barriers islands on the east coast—to name only a few. Its unique land and water resources contain an extraordinary variety of habitat types—from old growth forests to cypress swamps—and a tremendous diversity of flora and fauna.

The Lower Eastern Shore has played an important role in the history and culture of our Nation from the earliest native American, African-American, and European-American settlements. Evidence of the Lower Shore's past is featured prominently in its daily life—including its watermen who for centuries have sailed the Bay's waters in the legendary Skipjacks—the last commercial sailing fleet left in North America—Bugeyes, and other vessels harvesting oysters, crabs, and fish. The area is recognized as the country's original historic and cultural center for the shell fishing industry. It holds the birth rights to the uniquely American art form of decoy carving through the internationally-recognized work of Lemuel and Steve Ward. The agriculture and water-related industries which flourished throughout the 1700's and 1800's, still contribute heavily to the regional economy. Many of the towns and communities on the Lower Shore including Crisfield, Deal Island, Smith Island, Snow Hill, and Princess Anne look much the same today as they did almost two centuries ago—and their numerous buildings and sites on the National Register of Historic Places still serve as important reminders of the history of the area.

The Lower Eastern Shore also boasts a wide array of national recreational amenities including: Ocean City, one of the Nation's premier ocean resorts; the Assateague Island National Seashore, one of the few pristine and unspoiled seashores remaining on the east coast; the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge, home to the largest population of bald eagles east of the Mississippi River; and the Beach to Bay Indian National Recreational Trail. Over 10 million tourists visit the area each year to enjoy not only the scenic waterways and recreational draws, but also the historic sites and cultural attractions.

Five years ago, State and local government officials, area residents, the National Park Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, the University of Maryland-Eastern Shore, businesses, and other private organizations joined together to harness and at the same time protect this area's distinctive potential. This was one of the early efforts in a growing national movement of concerned individuals, organizations, and governments working

together to develop a vision for the future of an area distinguished by its resources, communities, and ways of life. Through that effort, a regional public-private partnership was formed and the Lower Eastern Shore Heritage Committee has prepared and begun to implement a plan which is already showing results in the conservation, preservation, and the revitalization of the Lower Shore counties.

The bill which I have introduced will provide further impetus for the successful implementation of a heritage conservation and development plan, while providing the Lower Eastern Shore with the important national recognition it deserves. This legislation is not designed to create a new national park or in any way change existing authorities of Federal, State and local governments to regulate the use of land as provided for by current law or regulations. Rather, it provides Federal technical assistance and grants and seed moneys at the grassroots level to foster Federal, State, and local partnerships, and promote and protect the unique characteristics of the area.

The Lower Eastern Shore Heritage initiative has been endorsed by a number of communities and organizations including the town of Berlin, the city of Crisfield, Pocomoke City, the town of Princess Anne, the town of Snow Hill, the Beach to Bay Indian Trail Committee, the Pocomoke River Alliance, the Greater Crisfield Marketing Authority, the Jenkins Creek Environmental Research Center, Wicomico, Worcester, and Somerest County tourism offices, and local chambers of commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis be included in the RECORD. It is my hope that this bill can be included as part of the broader National Heritage Area legislation which is working its way through the Congress.●

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

S. 1583

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 ''Lower Eastern Shore American Heritage Area Act of 1996''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COORDINATING ENTITY.—The term ''coordinating entity'' means the Lower Eastern Shore Heritage Committee, Inc., a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of Maryland.

(2) HERITAGE AREA.—The term ''Heritage Area'' means the Lower Eastern Shore American Heritage Area established under section 5.

(3) PARTICIPATING PARTNER.—The term ''participating partner'' means a county that has entered into the compact under section 6.

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

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Lower Eastern Shore possesses important historical, cultural, and natural resources, representing themes of settlement, migration, transportation, commerce, and natural resource uses, as described in the Lower Eastern Shore Heritage Plan (1992), endorsed by local governments, and in the draft report, Investing in a Special Place: A Report by the National Park Service to Congress and the Public on Resources, Accomplishments, and Opportunities for Conservation and Sustainable Development: Lower Eastern Shore, Maryland (1995);

(2) the Lower Eastern Shore played an important role in the history of the American Revolution and the Civil War;

(3) the Lower Eastern Shore gave birth to the uniquely American art form of decoy-carving through the internationally recognized work of Lemuel and Steve Ward and played a central role in the recognition of the aesthetic value of waterfowl habitat and landscapes;

(4) the skipjack, a popular symbol of the Chesapeake Bay designed and used in Maryland for harvesting oysters, is the last commercial sailing vessel still used in North America;

(5) the Lower Eastern Shore played an important role in the evolution of the colonial and American agricultural, timbering, shipping, and seafood industries in the 17th through 20th centuries, exemplified in many structures and landscapes, including farms and plantations, railroad towns, seafood processing industries, docks, and what was once the largest cannery in the United States;

(6) the Lower Eastern Shore rural townscapes and landscapes—

(A) display exceptional surviving physical resources illustrating the themes of the Lower Eastern Shore and the social, industrial, and cultural history of the 17th through the early 20th centuries; and

(B) include many national historic sites and landmarks;

(7) the Lower Eastern Shore is the home of traditions and research efforts associated with native American, African-American, and European-American settlements dating to periods before, during, and after European contact, and retains physical, social, and cultural evidence of the traditions; and

(8) the State of Maryland has established a structure to enable Lower Eastern Shore communities to join together to preserve, conserve, and manage the Lower Eastern Shore's resources through the Maryland Greenways Commission, river conservation, trail development, and other means.

SEC. 4. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) recognize the importance of the history, culture, and living resources of the Lower Eastern Shore to the United States;

(2) assist the State of Maryland and the communities of the Lower Eastern Shore in protecting, restoring, and interpreting the Lower Eastern Shore's resources for the benefit of the United States; and

(3) authorize Federal financial and technical assistance to serve the purposes stated in paragraphs (1) and (2).

SEC. 5. LOWER EASTERN SHORE AMERICAN HERITAGE AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Lower Eastern Shore American Heritage Area.

(b) INITIAL GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the Heritage Area shall consist of the Maryland counties of Somerset, Wicomico, and Worcester.

(2) LOCAL AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE.—The government of each county listed under paragraph (1) and each municipality in a county listed under paragraph (1) shall become a participating partner by entering into the compact under section 6.

(3) ADDITIONAL PARTNERS.—The Secretary may include a county or municipality other than those listed in paragraph (1) to be part of the Heritage Area if the county becomes a participating partner by entering into the compact under section 6.

(4) COORDINATION.—The Secretary may coordinate with or allow participation by any county, city, town, or village in the Lower Eastern Shore.

SEC. 6. COMPACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a compact with the State of Maryland, the coordinating entity, and any county eligible to be a participating partner under section 5.

(b) INFORMATION.—The compact shall include information relating to the objectives and management of Heritage Area programs, including—

(1) a discussion of the goals and objectives of Heritage Area programs, including an explanation of a proposed approach to conservation and interpretation and a general outline of the measures committed to by the parties to the compact;

(2) a description of the respective roles of the participating partners;

(3) a list of the initial partners to be involved in developing and implementing a management plan for the Heritage Area and a statement of the financial commitment of the partners; and

(4) a description of the role of the State of Maryland.

SEC. 7. MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The coordinating entity and the participating partners shall develop a management plan for the Heritage Area that presents comprehensive recommendations for conservation, program funding, management, and development.

(b) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—The management plan shall—

(1) be consistent with State and local plans in existence prior to development of the management plan;

(2) involve residents, public agencies, universities, and private organizations working in the Heritage Area;

(3) specify the existing and potential sources of funding to protect, manage, and develop the Heritage Area; and

(3) include—

(A) a description of actions to be undertaken by units of government and private organizations;

(B) an inventory of the resources contained in the Heritage Area, including a list of any property in the Heritage Area that is related to the themes of the Heritage Area and that should be preserved, restored, managed, developed, or maintained because of the property's natural, cultural, historical, recreational, or scenic significance;

(C) a recommendation of policies for resource management that considers and details application of appropriate land and water management techniques, including the development of intergovernmental cooperative agreements to protect the Heritage Area's historical, cultural, recreational, and natural resources in a manner that is consistent with supporting appropriate and compatible economic viability;

(D) a program for implementation of the management plan, including plans for restoration and construction, and specific commitments of the participating partners for the first 5 years of operation;

(E) an analysis of ways in which Federal, State, and local programs may best be coordinated to promote the purposes of this Act; and

(F) an interpretation plan for the Heritage Area.

(c) TIME LIMIT FOR SUBMISSION OF A MANAGEMENT PLAN.—If the Secretary has not approved a management plan by the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Heritage Area shall be ineligible for Federal funding until a management plan is approved.

SEC. 8. THE COORDINATING ENTITY AND PARTICIPATING PARTNERS.

(a) DUTIES OF THE COORDINATING ENTITY AND PARTICIPATING PARTNERS.—The coordinating entity and participating partners shall—

(1) develop and submit to the Secretary for approval a management plan pursuant to section 7 not later than the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) give priority to implementing actions set forth in the compact and the management plan, including taking steps to—

(A) assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in—

(i) preserving the Heritage Area;

(ii) establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits in the Heritage Area;

(iii) developing recreational resources in the Heritage Area;

(iv) increasing public awareness of and appreciation for the natural, historical, and architectural resources and sites in the Heritage Area; and

(v) restoring any historic building relating to the themes of the Heritage Area;

(B) encourage by appropriate means economic vitality in the area consistent with the management plan for the Heritage Area;

(C) encourage local governments to adopt policies consistent with the management of the Heritage Area and the goals of the plan; and

(D) assist units of government, regional planning organizations, businesses, and nonprofit organizations to ensure that clear, consistent, and environmentally appropriate signs identifying access points and sites of interest are put in place throughout the Heritage Area;

(3) consider the interests of diverse governmental, business, and nonprofit groups within the Heritage Area;

(4) conduct public meetings not less frequently than quarterly regarding the implementation of the management plan;

(5) submit substantial changes (including any increase of more than 20 percent in the cost estimates for implementation) to the management plan to the Secretary for approval;

(6) for any year in which Federal funds have been received under this Act, submit an annual report to the Secretary setting forth the accomplishments and expenses and income of the coordinating entity and the participating partners and the entity to which any loans and grants were made during the year for which the report is made; and

(7) for any year in which Federal funds have been received under this Act, make available for audit all records pertaining to the expenditure of the Federal funds and any matching funds and require, for all agreements authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by other organizations, that the receiving organizations make available for audit all records pertaining to the expenditure of the funds.

(b) FEDERAL FUNDING.—

(1) OPERATIONS.—The Federal contribution to the operations of the coordinating entity and participating partners shall not exceed 50 percent of the annual operating cost of the entity and partners associated with carrying out this Act.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—A grant to the coordinating entity or a participating partner for implementation of this Act may not exceed 75 percent of the cost of the entity and partners for implementing this Act.

(c) PROHIBITION OF ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The coordinating entity may not use Federal funds received under this Act to acquire real property or an interest in real property.

(d) ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the coordinating entity shall be eligible to receive funds to carry out this Act for a period of 10 years after the date on which the compact under section 6 is signed by the Secretary and the coordinating entity.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The coordinating entity may receive funding under this Act for a period of not more than 5 additional years, if—

(A) the coordinating entity determines that the extension is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this Act and the coordinating entity notifies the Secretary of the determination not later than 180 days prior to the termination date;

(B) not later than 180 days prior to the termination date, the coordinating entity presents to the Secretary a plan of activities for the period of the extension, including a plan for becoming independent of the funds made available through this Act; and

(C) the Secretary, in consultation with the Governor of Maryland, approves the extension of funding.

(e) OTHER FEDERAL FUNDS.—Nothing in this Act shall affect the use of Federal funds received by the coordinating entity or a participating partner under any other Act.

SEC. 9. DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF THE SECRETARY.—

(1) GRANTS TO THE COORDINATING ENTITY AND PARTICIPATING PARTNERS.—The Secretary shall make grants available to the coordinating entity and the participating partners to carry out this Act.

(2) TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On request of the coordinating entity, the Secretary may provide technical and financial assistance to the coordinating entity and participating partners to develop and implement the management plan.

(B) PRIORITY.—In assisting the coordinating entity and participating partners, the Secretary shall give priority to actions that—

(i) conserve the significant natural, historic, and cultural resources of the Heritage Area; and

(ii) provide educational, interpretive, and recreational opportunities consistent with the resources and associated values of the Heritage Area.

(B) EXPENDITURES FOR NONFEDERALLY OWNED PROPERTY.—The Secretary may expend Federal funds on nonfederally owned property to further the purposes of this Act, including assisting units of government in appropriate treatment of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

(2) APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL OF COMPACTS AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Governor of Maryland, shall approve or disapprove a compact or management plan submitted under this Act not later than 90 days after receiving the compact or management plan.

(B) ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary disapproves a compact or management plan, the Secretary shall advise the coordinating entity in writing of the reasons for rejecting the compact or plan and shall make recommendations for revisions in the compact or plan.

(ii) APPROVAL OF REVISION.—The Secretary shall approve or disapprove a proposed revision not later than 90 days after the date the revision is submitted.

(3) APPROVING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall review substantial amendments to the management plan for the Heritage Area.

(B) FUNDS FOR AMENDMENT.—Funds made available under this Act may not be expended to implement a substantial amendment to the management plan until the Secretary approves the amendment.

(4) ISSUING REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act.

(b) DUTIES OF FEDERAL ENTITIES.—A Federal entity conducting or supporting an activity directly affecting the Heritage Area, and any unit of government acting pursuant to a grant of Federal funds or a Federal permit or agreement conducting or supporting an activity directly affecting the Heritage Area, shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

(1) consult with the Secretary and the coordinating entity with respect to the activity;

(2) cooperate with the Secretary and the coordinating entity in carrying out the duties of the Secretary and the coordinating entity under this Act; and

(3) conduct or support the activity in a manner consistent with the management plan.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

Establishes the title of the bill, the Lower Eastern Shore Heritage Area Act of 1996.

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS

Defines the terms, ''Coordinating Entity,'' ''Heritage Area,'' ''Participating Partner,'' and ''Secretary.''

SECTION 3. FINDINGS

Identifies historical, cultural, and natural resources of National significance on the Lower Eastern Shore.

SECTION 4. PURPOSE

States that the purpose of the Act is to: 1.) recognize the importance of the history, culture and living resources of the Lower Eastern Shore to the United States; 2.) assist the State of Maryland and the communities of the Lower Eastern Shore in protecting, restoring, and interpreting the Lower Eastern Shore's resources; and 3.) to authorize Federal financial and technical assistance to serve these purposes.

SECTION 5. LOWER EASTERN SHORE AMERICAN HERITAGE PLAN

Directs the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Lower Eastern Shore as an American Heritage Area. Establishes a process for the counties and municipalities of Somerset, Worcester, and Wicomico and other surrounding jurisdictions that wish to be included therein to participate in the Heritage Area.

SECTION 6. COMPACT

Directs the Secretary of Interior to enter into a compact with the State of Maryland, the coordinating entity, and any county eligible to participate in the heritage plan and also defines roles, objectives and goals for

management and implementation of the Lower Eastern Shore Heritage Area.

SECTION 7. MANAGEMENT PLAN

Requires, within two years, that the Secretary of the Interior, the coordinating entity and participating partners develop a management plan, that presents comprehensive recommendations for conservation, program funding, management, and development. The plan must be consistent with State and local plans in existence prior to its development and include a description of actions to be taken by units of government and private organizations and an inventory of resources contained within the area.

SECTION 8. COORDINATING ENTITY AND PARTICIPATING PARTNERS

Defines duties of Coordinating Entity and Participating Partners to include: 1.) coordination with state and local authorities in the development of the management plan; and 2.) holding of quarterly public meetings regarding the implementation of the plan. Establishes federal cost shares at 50 percent of the operating costs and 75 percent of the implementation costs.

SECTION 9. DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

Auhtorizes the Department of the Interior to provide technical and grant assistance to the coordinating entity and participating partners to develop and implement the management plan.

SECTION 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Authorizes such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.●

By Mr. THOMPSON (for himself, Mr. FIRST, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S. 1584. A bill to authorize appropriations for the preservation and restoration of historic buildings at historically black colleges and universities; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES HISTORIC BUILDING RESTORATION AND PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, today I am pleased to offer on behalf of myself, Senator FRIST, and Senator MOSELY-BRAUN authorization legislation for historic preservation activity for buildings at historically black colleges and universities. This bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to administer a program of grants-in-aid, from amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out the National Historic Preservation Act for fiscal year 1996 through 1999, to eligible historically black colleges and universities for the preservation and restoration of historic buildings and structures on their campuses.

This being African-American History Month, I believe it is important for us to step back and reflect on the contributions that African-Americans have made to the founding and building of this Nation. And more importantly, to reflect on the institutions and organizations that were built by African-Americans to meet the challenges, goals, and needs of their people. Historically black colleges and universities stand as a testament to the hopes, dreams, achievements, and struggle of a people previously denied opportunity and justice to overcome extreme adversity and who succeeded despite the imposition of almost insurmountable legal and social obstacles.

This bill authorizes the Secretary to: First, obligate funds for a grant with respect to a building or structure listed on the National Register of Historic Places only if the grantee agrees to match the amount of such grant, with funds derived from non-Federal sources; and second, waive this matching requirement if an extreme emergency exists or is such a waiver is in the public interest to assure the preservation of historically significant resources.

It authorizes funds for to complete preservation operations at Fisk University and 13 historically black colleges and universities in Delaware, the District of Columbia and throughout the South, based on the 1991 National HBCU Historic Preservation Initiative. In September 1987, the Office of Historically Black College and University Programs within the Department of the Interior developed a proposal for a project designed to restore and preserve historic structures on the campuses of HBCU's. In 1988, a special survey to identify candidates for inclusion in the program generated responses from 46 HBCUs nominating 144 structures for consideration. The initiative selected 11 of the most historically significant and critically threatened structures which will require an estimated $20 million to restore and preserve the structure. Projects to be funded under the program include: Gains Hall, Morris Brown College, Atlanta, GA; Leonard Hall, Shaw University, Raleigh, NC; Hill Hall, Savannah State College, Savannah, GA; St. Agnes, St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, NC; The Mansion, Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, MS; White Hall, Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach, FL; Graves Hall, Morehouse College, Atlanta, GA; Howard Hall, Howard University, Washington, DC; Virginia Hall, Hampton University, Hampton, VA; Parkard Hall, Spelman College, Atlanta, GA; Administration Building, Fisk University, Nashville, TN; Lookerman Hall, Delaware State College, Dover, DE; Cooper Hall, Sterling College, Sterling, KS; and Science Hall, Simpson College, Indianola, IA.

This bill is exactly the same as the bill that passed both the House and Senate in 1994 but died in conference due to the end of the session. The only changes made were to the effective dates. I am happy to be a part of preserving this important part of American history and urge my colleagues to join me in the effort.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 173

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 173, a bill to provide for restitution of victims of crimes, and for other purposes.

S. 295

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 295, a bill to permit Labor management cooperative efforts that improve America's economic competitiveness to continue to thrive, and for other purposes.

S. 581

At the request of Mr. FAIRCLOTH, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL] were added as cosponsors of S. 581, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to repeal those provisions of Federal law that require employees to pay union dues or fees as a condition of employment, and for other purposes.

S. 592

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 592, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 and the National Labor Relations Act to modify certain provisions, to transfer certain occupational safety and health functions to the Secretary of Labor, and for other purposes.

S. 628

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 628, a bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 684, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs of research regarding Parkinson's disease, and for other purposes.

S. 743

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 743, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for investment necessary to revitalize communities within the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1028

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to provide increased access to health care benefits, to provide increased portability of health care benefits, to provide increased security of health care benefits, to increase the purchasing power of individuals and small employers, and for other purposes.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1039, a bill to require Congress to specify the source of authority under the United States Constitution for the