proper constitutional authority and reject—not ratify—this unconstitutional tax.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, MR. REID, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. DODD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 706. A bill to create a National Museum of Women's History Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF WOMEN'S HISTORY

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, in honor of Women's History Month, today I am introducing legislation to create an Advisory Committee for the National Museum of Women's History. I am pleased to be joined by 17 of my colleagues: Senators HUTCHISON, MURRAY, MIKULSKI, BOXER, COLLINS, ROCKEFELLER, REID, BIDEN, AKAKA, KERRY (MA), ASHCROFT, DODD, DURBIN, TORRICELLI, INOUYE, LEIBERMAN, and SARBANES.

For far too long, women have contributed to history, but have largely been forgotten in our history books, in our monuments, and in our museums. It is long past time that the roles women have played be removed from the shadows of indifference and given a place where they can shine.

The bill we are introducing today will create a 26 member Advisory Committee to look at the following three issues and report back to Congress concerning (1) identification of a site for the museum in the District of Columbia; (2) development of a business plan to allow the creation and maintenance of the museum to be done solely with private contributions and 3) assistance with the collection and program of the museum.

It is important to note that this bill does not commit Congress to spending any money for this museum. The Committee's report will tell us the feasibility of funding the museum privately. And I believe that the Museum's Board has shown that they have the ability to do just that.

The concept for the National Museum of Women's History (NMWH) was created back in 1996. Since that time, the Board of Directors, lead by President Karen Staser, has worked tirelessly to build support and interest for this project. And judging by the fact that they have raised more than $10.5 million for the project, lent their support to the moving of the Suffragette statute from the crypt to the Rotunda, and raised $85,000 for that effort, I'd say they are well on their way to success.

They have also spent a lot of time answering the question ''why do we need a women's museum when we have the SMITHsonian.'' The first answer to that comes from Edith Mayo, Curator Emeritus of the Smithsonian National Museum of American History, who notes that since 1963 only two exhibits—two—were dedicated to the role of women in history.

The fact is, in the story of America's success, the chapter on women's contributions has largely been left on the editing room floor. Here's what I mean: Many of us know that women fought and got the vote in 1920, with the ratification of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution. But how many know that Wyoming gave women the right to vote in 1869, 51 years earlier, and that by 1900 Utah, Colorado and Idaho had granted women the right to vote? Or that the suffragette movement took 72 years to meet its goal? And few know that the women of Utah sewed dresses made from silk for the Suffragettes on their cross country tour.

History is filled with other little known but significant milestones: like the first woman elected to the United States Senate was Hattie Wyatt Caraway from Louisiana in 1932. That Margaret Chase Smith, from my home state of Maine, was the first woman elected to the US Senate in her own right in 1948, and in 1962 became the first women to run for the US Presidency in the primaries of a major political party. Or that the first female cabinet member was Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor for FDR.

How many people know that Margaret Reha Seddon was the first US woman to achieve the full rank of astronaut, and flew her first space mission aboard the Space Shuttle ''Discovery'' in 1985, twenty three years after the distinguished former Senator from the State of Ohio, John Glenn completed his historic first flight in space?

And I can guarantee you more people know the last person to hit over .400 in baseball—Ted Williams—than can name the first woman elected to Congress—Jeannette Rankin of Montana, who was elected in 1916, four years before ratification of the 19th Amendment gave women the right to vote.

Hardly household names. But they should be. And with a place to showcase their accomplishments, perhaps one day they will take their rightful place beside America's greatest minds, visionary leaders, and groundbreaking figures. But until then, we have a long way to go.

Whatever period of history you chose—women played a role. Sybil Ludington, a 16-year-old, rode through parts of New York and Connecticut in April of 1777 to warn that the Redcoats were coming. Sacajawea, the Shoshone Indian guide, helped escort Lewis and Clark on their 8000 mile expedition. Rosa Parks, Jo Ann Robinson and Myrlie Evers played important roles in the civil rights movement in the 50's and 60's. And as we move into the 21st century, the role of women—who now make up 52 percent of the population—will continue to be integral to the future success of this country.

In fact the real question about the building of a women's museum is not so much where it will be built—although that remains to be explored. And it's not even who will pay for it—as I've said, it will be done entirely with private funds. The real question when it comes to a museum dedicated to women's history is, where will they put it all!

I would argue that we have a solemn responsibility to teach our children, and ourselves, about our rich past—and that includes the myriad contributions of women, in all fields and every endeavor. These women can serve as role models and inspire our youth. They can teach us about our past and guide us into our future. They can even prompt young women to consider a career in public service—as Senator Smith of Maine did for me.

Instead, today in America, more young women probably know the names of the latest super models then the names of the female members of this Administration's Cabinet. That is why we need a National Museum of Women's History, that is why I am proud to sponsor this legislation, and that is why I hope that my colleagues will join us in supporting the creation of this Advisory Committee as a first step toward writing the forgotten chapters of the history of our nation.●

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. CHAFEE, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. KERREY):

S. 708. A bill to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts and the quality and availability of training for judges, attorneys, and volunteers working in such courts, and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE STRENGTHENING ABUSE AND NEGLECT COURTS ACT OF 1999

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act of 1999, a bill to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the juvenile and family courts, as well as the quality and availability of training for judges, attorneys and guardian ad litems. I am joined in this introduction by Senator ROCKEFELLER, and I thank him for all of his hard work on behalf of abused and neglected children and I look forward to working with him as we move forward with this legislation.

I have been involved with children's issues for over two decades, not just as the father of eight, but also as a local county elected official. I know the kinds of problems that exist at the ground level, and I think it's very important that we work together to address them.

This is especially true today, as opposed to a couple of years ago, because the child welfare agencies and the

courts have an important new task—the implementation of the Adoption and Safe Families Act.

Almost one and a half years ago, Congress passed this historic piece of legislation, which was designed to encourage safe and permanent family placements for abused and neglected children—and to decrease the amount of time that a child spends in the foster care system. With this law, we make it clear that the health and safety of the child must come first when making any decision for a child in the abuse and neglect system. This law shortens the time line for children in foster care. Specifically, the law requires initiation of proceedings to terminate parental rights for any child who has been in the foster care system for 15 of the last 22 months.

These timelines are very important. Foster care was meant to be a temporary solution—but for too many children foster care has become a way of life. However, the institution of these timelines has created additional pressure on an already overburdened court system.

To give you an idea of the burden that already exists, consider this: When the Family Court was established in New York in 1962, it reviewed 96,000 cases the first year. By 1997, the case load had increased to 670,000 cases.

A September 1997 report by the Fund for Modern Courts found that Family Court judges were overburdened and forced to provide, quote, ''assembly line justice''—because they only had a few minutes to review each case. The report found that in Brooklyn, cases receive an average of 4 minutes before a judge on a first appearance and little more than 11 minutes on subsequent appearances. The report concluded that, quote: ''It is easy to understand how a tragedy can result from decisions made based on so little actual time in court.'' End of quote.

And that's not the only problem in the system. In Cuyahoga County, Ohio, the juvenile court identified 3,000 cases that were open, but inactive. In most of these cases, the child had been charged with a minor crime, but never had his or her case scheduled for trial. But more than 100 of these cases involved children who remained in foster care for months or even years, despite the fact that a judge had ordered them to be returned home to their parents.

Another problem faced in Cuyahoga County, and in many other places, is the missing file. Until recently, the court had no central clerk's file, so there was no way of tracking the location of a particular file. If the file could not be found on the day of a hearing or review, it would result in a postponement, adding months to a child's stay in foster care. It is undisputed that children need permanency as quickly as possible. It is simply unconscionable that children should be trapped in foster care by a Dickensian nightmare of paperwork.

And you also have to wonder where the lawyers, case workers and guardians for these children were—and what they were doing as these cases dragged on for months or even years longer than necessary. It is a symptom of the overburdened child welfare system and the lack of resources available for everyone involved —the child welfare agencies, the attorneys, the guardians, the courts. It's not their fault, but it's not tolerable either.

We, collectively—as public servants, and as a society—must do better.

Some abuse and neglect courts have already found innovative ways to eliminate their backlog of cases and move children toward permanency. One example is in Hamilton County, Ohio, where the Juvenile Court, under the leadership of Judge David Grossmann, has instituted a system that successfully has reduced the amount of time a child spends in care. Hamilton County added hearing officers so that more time could be spent on each case—leading to better quality decision making and reduced case loads. The court also developed a computer tracking system so that the judge could have essential information on each case at his or her fingertips, and the ''missing file'' would no longer be a bar to permanency.

The state of Connecticut has also created an innovative way of dealing with the backlog of cases in its child welfare system. The Child Protection Session is a court dedicated to settling the most difficult abuse and neglect cases—contested cases of abuse and neglect and termination of parental rights proceedings. Connecticut has recognized that these types of cases need to be handled expeditiously, and as a result of the special session, these cases are now being handled in months, rather than years, to the benefit of all of the children involved.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) recently reported to Congress the results of its review of juvenile and family courts performance in achieving permanence for children. GAO identified three elements that are essential to successful court reform.

(1) Judicial leadership and collaboration among the child welfare participants.

(2) Timely information regarding the court's operations and processing of cases; and

(3) Sufficient financial resources to initiate and sustain reform.

The Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act of 1999 incorporates all of these elements. The bill provides competitive grants to courts to create computerized case tracking systems and to encourage the replication and implementation of successful systems in other courts. The bill also provides grants to courts to reduce pending backlogs of abuse and neglect cases so that courts are able to comply with the time lines established in the Adoption and Safe Families Act.

The bill also includes a provision to allow judges, attorneys and court personnel to qualify for training under Title IV–E's existing training provisions. Finally, the bill includes a provision that would expand the CASA program to underserved and urban areas so that more children are able to benefit from its services.

When Congress passed the Adoption and Safe Families Act, I said that the bill is a good start, but that Congress will have to do more to make sure that every child has the opportunity to live in a safe, stable, loving and permanent home. One of the essential ingredients in this process is an efficiently operating court system. After all, that's where a lot of delays occur. As well-intentioned as the strict time lines of the Adoption and Safe Families Act are, mandatory filing dates won't be enough to promote permanency if the court docket is too clogged to move the cases through the system. We need to provide assistance to the courts so that administrative efficiency and effectiveness are improved and the goals of the Adoption and Safe Families Act will be more readily achieved. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation and I am committed to pushing for its timely consideration.

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

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

S. 708

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 ''Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Under both Federal and State law, the courts play a crucial and essential role in the Nation's child welfare system and in ensuring safety, stability, and permanence for abused and neglected children under the supervision of that system.

(2) The Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–89; 111 Stat. 2115) establishes explicitly for the first time in Federal law that a child's health and safety must be the paramount consideration when any decision is made regarding a child in the Nation's child welfare system.

(3) The Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 promotes stability and permanence for abused and neglected children by requiring timely decision-making in proceedings to determine whether children can safely return to their families or whether they should be moved into safe and stable adoptive homes or other permanent family arrangements outside the foster care system.

(4) To avoid unnecessary and lengthy stays in the foster care system, the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 specifically requires, among other things, that States move to terminate the parental rights of the parents of those children who have been in foster care for 15 of the last 22 months.

(5) While essential to protect children and to carry out the general purposes of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, the accelerated timelines for the termination of parental rights and the other requirements imposed under that Act increase the pressure on the Nation's already overburdened abuse and neglect courts.

(6) The administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts would be substantially improved by the acquisition and implementation of computerized case-tracking systems to identify and eliminate existing backlogs, to move abuse and neglect caseloads forward in a timely manner, and to move children into safe and stable families. Such systems could also be used to evaluate the effectiveness of such courts in meeting the purposes of the amendments made by, and provisions of, the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

(7) The administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts would also be improved by the identification and implementation of projects designed to eliminate the backlog of abuse and neglect cases, including the temporary hiring of additional judges, extension of court hours, and other projects designed to reduce existing caseloads.

(8) The administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts would be further strengthened by improving the quality and availability of training for judges, court personnel, agency attorneys, guardians ad litem, volunteers who participate in court-appointed special advocate (CASA) programs, and attorneys who represent the children and the parents of children in abuse and neglect proceedings.

(9) While recognizing that abuse and neglect courts in this country are already committed to the quality administration of justice, the performance of such courts would be even further enhanced by the development of models and educational opportunities that reinforce court projects that have already been developed, including models for caseflow procedures, case management, representation of children, automated interagency interfaces, and ''best practices'' standards.

(10) Judges, magistrates, commissioners, and other judicial officers play a central and vital role in ensuring that proceedings in our Nation's abuse and neglect courts are run efficiently and effectively. The performance of those individuals in such courts can only be further enhanced by training, seminars, and an ongoing opportunity to exchange ideas with their peers.

(11) Volunteers who participate in court-appointed special advocate (CASA) programs play a vital role as the eyes and ears of abuse and neglect courts in proceedings conducted by, or under the supervision of, such courts and also bring increased public scrutiny of the abuse and neglect court system. The Nation's abuse and neglect courts would benefit from an expansion of this program to currently underserved communities.

(12) Improved computerized case-tracking systems, comprehensive training, and development of, and education on, model abuse and neglect court systems, particularly with respect to underserved areas, would significantly further the purposes of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 by reducing the average length of an abused and neglected child's stay in foster care, improving the quality of decision-making and court services provided to children and families, and increasing the number of adoptions.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(a) ABUSE AND NEGLECT COURTS.—The term ''abuse and neglect courts'' means the State and local courts that carry out State or local laws requiring proceedings (conducted by or under the supervision of the courts)—

(1) that implement part B and part E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 620 et seq.; 670 et seq.) (including preliminary disposition of such proceedings);

(2) that determine whether a child was abused or neglected;

(3) that determine the advisability or appropriateness of placement in a family foster home, group home, or a special residential care facility; or

(4) that determine any other legal disposition of a child in the abuse and neglect court system.

(b) AGENCY ATTORNEY.—The term ''agency attorney'' means an attorney or other individual, including any government attorney, district attorney, attorney general, State attorney, county attorney, city solicitor or attorney, corporation counsel, or privately retained special prosecutor, who represents the State or local agency administrating the programs under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 620 et seq.; 670 et seq.) in a proceeding conducted by, or under the supervision of, an abuse and neglect court, including a proceeding for termination of parental rights.

(c) ATTORNEY REPRESENTING A CHILD.—The term ''attorney representing a child'' means an attorney or a guardian ad litem who represents a child in a proceeding conducted by, or under the supervision of, an abuse and neglect court.

(d) ATTORNEY REPRESENTING A PARENT.—The term ''attorney representing a parent'' means an attorney who represents a parent who is an official party to a proceeding conducted by, or under the supervision of, an abuse and neglect court.

SEC. 4. GRANTS TO STATE COURTS AND LOCAL COURTS TO AUTOMATE THE DATA COLLECTION AND TRACKING OF PROCEEDINGS IN ABUSE AND NEGLECT COURTS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO AWARD GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Attorney General, acting through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Office of Justice Programs, shall award grants in accordance with this section to State courts and local courts for the purposes of—

(A) enabling such courts to develop and implement automated data collection and case-tracking systems for proceedings conducted by, or under the supervision of, an abuse and neglect court;

(B) encouraging the replication of such systems in abuse and neglect courts in other jurisdictions; and

(C) requiring the use of such systems to evaluate a court's performance in implementing the requirements of parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 620 et seq.; 670 et seq.).

(2) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) NUMBER OF GRANTS.—Not less than 20 nor more than 50 grants may be awarded under this section.

(B) PER STATE LIMITATION.—Not more than 2 grants authorized under this section may be awarded per State.

(C) USE OF GRANTS.—Funds provided under a grant made under this section may only be used for the purpose of developing, implementing, or enhancing automated data collection and case-tracking systems for proceedings conducted by, or under the supervision of, an abuse and neglect court.

(b) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State court or local court may submit an application for a grant authorized under this section at such time and in such manner as the Attorney General may determine.

(2) INFORMATION REQUIRED.—An application for a grant authorized under this section shall contain the following:

(A) A description of a proposed plan for the development, implementation, and maintenance of an automated data collection and case-tracking system for proceedings conducted by, or under the supervision of, an abuse and neglect court, including a proposed budget for the plan and a request for a specific funding amount.

(B) A description of the extent to which such plan and system are able to be replicated in abuse and neglect courts of other jurisdictions that specifies the common case-tracking data elements of the proposed system, including, at a minimum—

(i) identification of relevant judges, court, and agency personnel;

(ii) records of all court proceedings with regard to the abuse and neglect case, including all court findings and orders (oral and written); and

(iii) relevant information about the subject child, including family information and the reason for court supervision.

(C) In the case of an application submitted by a local court, a description of how the plan to implement the proposed system was developed in consultation with related State courts, particularly with regard to a State court improvement plan funded under section 13712 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 670 note) if there is such a plan in the State.

(D) In the case of an application that is submitted by a State court, a description of how the proposed system will integrate with a State court improvement plan funded under section 13712 of such Act if there is such a plan in the State.

(E) After consultation with the State agency responsible for the administration of parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 620 et seq.; 670 et seq.)—

(i) a description of the coordination of the proposed system with other child welfare data collection systems, including the Statewide automated child welfare information system (SACWIS) and the adoption and foster care analysis and reporting system (AFCARS) established pursuant to section 479 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 679); and

(ii) an assurance that such coordination will be implemented and maintained.

(F) Identification of an independent third party that will conduct ongoing evaluations of the feasibility and implementation of the plan and system and a description of the plan for conducting such evaluations.

(G) A description or identification of a proposed funding source for completion of the plan (if applicable) and maintenance of the system after the conclusion of the period for which the grant is to be awarded.

(H) An assurance that any contract entered into between the State court or local court and any other entity that is to provide services for the development, implementation, or maintenance of the system under the proposed plan will require the entity to agree to allow for replication of the services provided, the plan, and the system, and to refrain from asserting any proprietary interest in such services for purposes of allowing the plan and system to be replicated in another jurisdiction.

(I) An assurance that the system established under the plan will provide data that allows for evaluation (at least on an annual basis) of the following information:

(i) The total number of cases that are filed in the abuse and neglect court.

(ii) The number of cases assigned to each judge who presides over the abuse and neglect court.

(iii) The average length of stay of children in foster care.

(iv) With respect to each child under the jurisdiction of the court—

(I) the number of episodes of placement in foster care;

(II) the number of days placed in foster care and the type of placement (foster family home, group home, or special residential care facility);

(III) the number of days of in-home supervision; and

(IV) the number of separate foster care placements.

(v) The number of adoptions, guardianships, or other permanent dispositions finalized.

(vi) The number of terminations of parental rights.

(vii) The number of child abuse and neglect proceedings closed that had been pending for 2 or more years.

(viii) With respect to each proceeding conducted by, or under the supervision of, an abuse and neglect court—

(I) the timeliness of each stage of the proceeding from initial filing through legal finalization of a permanency plan (for both contested and uncontested hearings);

(II) the number of adjournments, delays, and continuances occurring during the proceeding, including identification of the party requesting each adjournment, delay, or continuance and the reasons given for the request;

(III) the number of courts that conduct or supervise the proceeding for the duration of the abuse and neglect case;

(IV) the number of judges assigned to the proceeding for the duration of the abuse and neglect case; and

(V) the number of agency attorneys, children's attorneys, parent's attorneys, guardians ad litem, and volunteers participating in a court-appointed special advocate (CASA) program assigned to the proceeding during the duration of the abuse and neglect case.

(J) A description of how the proposed system will reduce the need for paper files and ensure prompt action so that cases are appropriately listed with national and regional adoption exchanges, and public and private adoption services.

(K) An assurance that the data collected in accordance with subparagraph (I) will be made available to relevant Federal, State, and local government agencies and to the public.

(L) An assurance that the proposed system is consistent with other civil and criminal information requirements of the Federal government.

(M) An assurance that the proposed system will provide notice of timeframes required under the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–89; 111 Stat. 2115) for individual cases to ensure prompt attention and compliance with such requirements.

(c) CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—

(1) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A State court or local court awarded a grant under this section shall expend $1 for every $3 awarded under the grant to carry out the development, implementation, and maintenance of the automated data collection and case-tracking system under the proposed plan.

(B) WAIVER FOR HARDSHIP.—The Attorney General may waive or modify the matching requirement described in subparagraph (A) in the case of any State court or local court that the Attorney General determines would suffer undue hardship as a result of being subject to the requirement.

(C) NON-FEDERAL EXPENDITURES.—

(i) CASH OR IN KIND.—State court or local court expenditures required under subparagraph (A) may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

(ii) NO CREDIT FOR PRE-AWARD EXPENDITURES.—Only State court or local court expenditures made after a grant has been awarded under this section may be counted for purposes of determining whether the State court or local court has satisfied the matching expenditure requirement under subparagraph (A).

(2) NOTIFICATION TO STATE OR APPROPRIATE CHILD WELFARE AGENCY.—No application for a grant authorized under this section may be approved unless the State court or local court submitting the application demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the court has provided the State, in the case of a State court, or the appropriate child welfare agency, in the case of a local court, with notice of the contents and submission of the application.

(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In evaluating an application for a grant under this section the Attorney General shall consider the following:

(A) The extent to which the system proposed in the application may be replicated in other jurisdictions.

(B) The extent to which the proposed system is consistent with the provisions of, and amendments made by, the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–89; 111 Stat. 2115), and parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 620 et seq.; 670 et seq.).

(C) The extent to which the proposed system is feasible and likely to achieve the purposes described in subsection (a)(1).

(4) DIVERSITY OF AWARDS.—The Attorney General shall award grants under this section in a manner that results in a reasonable balance among grants awarded to State courts and grants awarded to local courts, grants awarded to courts located in urban areas and courts located in rural areas, and grants awarded in diverse geographical locations.

(d) LENGTH OF AWARDS.—No grant may be awarded under this section for a period of more than 5 years.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds provided to a State court or local court under a grant awarded under this section shall remain available until expended without fiscal year limitation.

(f) REPORTS.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORT FROM GRANTEES.—Each State court or local court that is awarded a grant under this section shall submit an annual report to the Attorney General that contains—

(A) a description of the ongoing results of the independent evaluation of the plan for, and implementation of, the automated data collection and case-tracking system funded under the grant; and

(B) the information described in subsection (b)(2)(I).

(2) INTERIM AND FINAL REPORTS FROM ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(A) INTERIM REPORTS.—Beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and biannually thereafter until a final report is submitted in accordance with subparagraph (B), the Attorney General shall submit to Congress interim reports on the grants made under this section.

(B) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the termination of all grants awarded under this section, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a final report evaluating the automated data collection and case-tracking systems funded under such grants and identifying successful models of such systems that are suitable for replication in other jurisdictions. The Attorney General shall ensure that a copy of such final report is transmitted to the highest State court in each State.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $10,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

SEC. 5. GRANTS TO REDUCE PENDING BACKLOGS OF ABUSE AND NEGLECT CASES TO PROMOTE PERMANENCY FOR ABUSED AND NEGLECTED CHILDREN.

Part E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 670 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 479B. GRANTS TO REDUCE BACKLOGS OF ABUSE AND NEGLECT CASES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the amount appropriated under subsection (f), the Secretary shall make grants to State courts or local courts for the purposes of—

''(1) promoting the permanency goals established in the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–89; 111 Stat. 2115); and

''(2) enabling such courts to reduce existing backlogs of cases pending in abuse and neglect courts, especially with respect to cases to terminate parental rights and cases in which parental rights to a child have been terminated but an adoption of the child has not yet been finalized.

''(b) APPLICATION.—A State court or local court shall submit an application for a grant under this section, in such form and manner as the Secretary shall require, that contains a description of the following:

''(1) The barriers to achieving the permanency goals established in the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 that have been identified.

''(2) The size and nature of the backlogs of children awaiting termination of parental rights or finalization of adoption.

''(3) The strategies the State court or local court proposes to use to reduce such backlogs and the plan and timetable for doing so.

''(4) How the grant funds requested will be used to assist the implementation of the strategies described in paragraph (3).

''(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds provided under a grant awarded under this section may be used for any purpose that the Secretary determines is likely to successfully achieve the purposes described in subsection (a), including temporarily—

''(1) establishing night court sessions for abuse and neglect courts;

''(2) hiring additional judges, magistrates, commissioners, hearing officers, referees, special masters, and other judicial personnel for such courts;

''(3) hiring personnel such as clerks, administrative support staff, case managers, mediators, and attorneys for such courts; or

''(4) extending the operating hours of such courts.

''(d) NUMBER OF GRANTS.—Not less than 15 nor more than 20 grants shall be awarded under this section.

''(e) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds awarded under a grant made under this section shall remain available for expenditure by a grantee for a period not to exceed 3 years from the date of the grant award.

''(f) REPORT ON USE OF FUNDS.—Not later than the date that is halfway through the period for which a grant is awarded under this section, and 90 days after the end of such period, a State court or local court awarded a grant under this section shall submit a report to the Secretary that includes the following:

''(1) The barriers to the permanency goals established in the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 that are or have been addressed with grant funds.

''(2) The nature of the backlogs of children that were pursued with grant funds.

''(3) The specific strategies used to reduce such backlogs.

''(4) The progress that has been made in reducing such backlogs, including the number of children in such backlogs—

''(A) whose parental rights have been terminated; and

''(B) whose adoptions have been finalized.

''(5) Any additional information that the Secretary determines would assist jurisdictions in achieving the permanency goals established in the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

''(g) DEFINITION OF ABUSE AND NEGLECT COURT.—In this section, the term 'abuse and neglect court' has the meaning given that term in section 3(a) of the Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act of 1999.

''(h) APPROPRIATION.—Out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated for fiscal year 2000 $10,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section.''.

SEC. 6. TRAINING IN CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT PROCEEDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 474(a)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B), the following:

''(C) 75 percent of so much of such expenditures as are for the training (including cross-training with personnel employed by, or under contract with, the State or local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision, training on topics relevant to the legal representation of clients in proceedings conducted by or under the supervision of an abuse and neglect court (as defined in section 3(a) of the Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act of 1999), and training on related topics such as child development and the importance of developing a trusting relationship with a child) of judges, judicial personnel, law enforcement personnel, agency attorneys (as defined in section 3(b) of such Act), attorneys representing parents in proceedings conducted by, or under the supervision of, an abuse and neglect court (as so defined), attorneys representing children in such proceedings, guardians ad litem, and volunteers who participate in court-appointed special advocate (CASA) programs, to the extent such training is related to provisions of, and amendments made by, the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–89; 111 Stat. 2115), provided that any such training that is offered to judges or other judicial personnel shall be offered by, or under contract with, the State or local agency in collaboration with the judicial conference or other appropriate judicial governing body operating in the State,''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 473(a)(6)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 673(a)(6)(B)) is amended by striking ''474(a)(3)(E)'' and inserting ''474(a)(3)(F)''.

(2) Section 474(a)(3)(D) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)(3)(D)) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)(A)) is amended by striking ''subparagraph (C)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (D)''.

(3) Section 474(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 674(c)) is amended by striking ''subsection (a)(3)(C)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(3)(D)''.

SEC. 7. STATE STANDARDS FOR AGENCY ATTORNEYS.

Section 471(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (22), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (23), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(24) provides that, not later than January 1, 2001, the State shall develop and encourage the implementation of guidelines for all agency attorneys (as defined in section 3(b) of the Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act of 1999), including legal education requirements for such attorneys regarding the handling of abuse, neglect, and dependency proceedings.''.

SEC. 8. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND DEPENDENCY MATTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in coordination with the Attorney General, shall provide the technical assistance, training, and evaluations authorized under this section through grants, contracts, or cooperative arrangements with other entities, including universities, and national, State, and local organizations. The Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Attorney General should ensure that entities that have not had a previous contractual relationship with the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Justice, or another Federal agency can compete for grants for technical assistance, training, and evaluations.

(b) PURPOSE.—Technical assistance shall be provided under this section for the purpose of supporting and assisting State and local courts that handle child abuse, neglect, and dependency matters to effectively carry out new responsibilities enacted as part of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–89; 111 Stat. 2115) and to speed the process of adoption of children and legal finalization of permanent families for children in foster care by improving practices of the courts involved in that process.

(c) ACTIVITIES.—Technical assistance consistent with the purpose described in subsection (b) may be provided under this section through the following:

(1) The dissemination of information, existing and effective models, and technical assistance to State and local courts that receive grants under section 4 concerning the automated data collection and case-tracking systems and outcome measures required under that section.

(2) The provision of specialized training on child development that is appropriate for judges, referees, nonjudicial decision-makers, administrative, and other court-related personnel, and for agency attorneys, attorneys representing children, guardians ad litem, volunteers who participate in court-appointed special advocate (CASA) programs, or parents.

(3) The provision of assistance and dissemination of information about best practices of abuse and neglect courts for effective case management strategies and techniques, including automated data collection and case-tracking systems, assessments of caseload and staffing levels, management of court dockets, timely decision-making at all stages of a proceeding conducted by, or under the supervision of, an abuse and neglect court, and the development of streamlined case flow procedures, case management models, early case resolution programs, mechanisms for monitoring compliance with the terms of court orders, models for representation of children, automated interagency interfaces between data bases, and court rules that facilitate timely case processing.

(4) The development and dissemination of training models for judges, attorneys representing children, agency attorneys, guardians ad litem, and volunteers who participate in court-appointed special advocate (CASA) programs.

(5) The development of standards of practice for agency attorneys, attorneys representing children, guardians ad litem, volunteers who participate in court-appointed special advocate (CASA) programs, and parents in such proceedings.

(d) TRAINING REQUIREMENT.—Any training offered in accordance with this section to judges or other judicial personnel shall be offered in collaboration with the judicial conference or other appropriate judicial governing body operating with respect to the State in which the training is offered.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to carry out this section $5,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

SEC. 9. GRANTS TO EXPAND THE COURT-APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATE PROGRAM IN UNDERSERVED AREAS.

(a) GRANTS TO EXPAND CASA PROGRAMS IN UNDERSERVED AREAS.—The Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice shall make a grant to the National Court-Appointed Special Advocate Association for the purposes of—

(1) expanding the recruitment of, and building the capacity of, court-appointed special advocate programs located in the 15 largest urban areas;

(2) developing regional, multijurisdictional court-appointed special advocate programs serving rural areas; and

(3) providing training and supervision of volunteers in court-appointed special advocate programs.

(b) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES.—Not more than 5 percent of the grant made under this subsection may be used for administrative expenditures.

(c) DETERMINATION OF URBAN AND RURAL AREAS.—For purposes of administering the grant authorized under this subsection, the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice shall determine whether an area is one of the 15 largest urban areas or a rural area in accordance with the practices of, and statistical information compiled by, the Bureau of the Census.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to make the grant authorized under this section, $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to join Mr. DEWINE in his introduction of the *Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act.* I would like to thank Mr. DEWINE for his leadership on behalf of vulnerable children, including our bipartisan work on this legislation. Work on this legislation is based on the bipartisan work of the Senate coalition that supported the 1997 Adoption and Safe Families Act.

A unique bipartisan coalition formed in 1997 worked hard to forge consensus on the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997. This law, for the first time ever, establishes that a child's health and safety must be paramount when any decisions are made regarding children in the abuse and neglect system. The law was the most sweeping and comprehensive piece of child welfare legislation passed in over a decade. It promotes safety, stability and permanence for all abused and neglected children and requires timely decision-making in all proceedings to determine whether children can safely return home, or whether they should be moved to permanent, adoptive homes. More specifically, the law requires a State to move to terminate the parental rights of any parent whose child has been in foster care for 15 out of the last 22 months.

Throughout the process of developing the Adoption Act we heard about the vital role the Nation's abuse and neglect courts play in achieving the goals of safety and permanence for children. We also heard that these courts were seriously overburdened and challenged by insufficient resources. Now, nearly a year and a half after the passage of the law, courts are struggling to meet the guidelines. Judges and child welfare professionals in my state of West Virginia tell me that the law is helping move children through the system more quickly, that the accelerated timelines are, indeed, essential for the protection of children, and that the effect of this is that the courts are becoming even more overburdened. We are hearing this same type of feedback from other judges and child advocates around the country.

These courts—and the judges, lawyers and other court personnel—make some of the most difficult and important decisions made by any members of the judiciary. Adjudications of abuse and neglect, terminations of parental rights, approval of adoptions, and life-changing determinations require the appropriate level of information, thoughtfulness and care. Judges throughout the country, like West Virginia's Chief Justice Margaret Workman, are committed to the fair and efficient administration of justice in these cases. In 1987, just over 2 million children, nationally, were reported or neglected. By 1997, this number had swelled to well over 3 million children. During this period, my own state of West Virginia experienced a 100% increase in child abuse cases. These staggering increases in child abuse have placed an unconscionable burden on these courts.

Working within their own communities, judges, attorneys, volunteers from the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) programs and others have found creative and effective new ways to eliminate their caseload backlogs and move children more efficiently and safely through the court system. In West Virginia, Judge Workman and others have developed a comprehensive plan to increase the accountability and efficient administration of abuse and neglect cases. In Cincinatti, Ohio, Judge Grossman's abuse and neglect courts have implemented state-of-the-art computer tracking systems which help them smooth the legal paths of children in foster care.

Even when courts have the dedication and initiative to implement these innovative reforms, they simply cannot do it without sufficient resources. The purpose of the Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act is to help remove the burdens on an ever greater number of courts by increasing both their efficiency and their effectiveness. The bill provides much needed resources and allows state and local communities the flexibility to develop their own solutions to administrative problems and caseload backlogs. In January of this year, the General Accounting Office released a report conducted at the request of Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources Chairman SHAW, which concluded that there are three essential ingredients for successful court reform, all of which are incorporated in this Act. There are four ways this bill will help abuse and neglect courts better serve children and families.

The bill first provides a program of grants to states and local courts for the implementation of computerized case-tracking systems, similar to the one Judge Grossman created in Ohio. Through the establishment of such systems, courts are able to more easily track how long a child spends in foster care and the status of their cases. When courts have such ''user-friendly'' access to vital case information children truly benefit—they move more quickly through foster care and on to adoptive homes or other permanent placements. This grant program will enable state and local courts to design similar computer systems, to replicate models that have proven successful in other jurisdictions and to receive technical assistance as they implement their new programs.

A second important provision of the bill is the grant program that provides State and local courts the resources they need to eliminate the backlog of abuse and neglect cases. Throughout the discussions on the Adoption and Safe Families Act, we heard from dozens of judges and advocates who said that far and away the biggest problem facing their courts was the overwhelming backlog of these cases. Without creative ways to eliminate these backlogs, and with the tightened timeframes we created with the new law, the judges emphasized that children's cases will simply not move through the court system in a timely manner. Each court may have their own effective approach to eliminating such backlogs. For some, hiring additional staff may be necessary. For others, creating a ''Night Court'' or ''Saturday Court'' to hear these cases would work. Still others may need to restructure duties of court personnel. This bill will provide grants to those court projects that are designed to result in the effective and rapid elimination of current backlogs to smooth the way for more efficient courts in the future.

The Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act also recognizes that judges, attorneys, court personnel, law enforcement representatives, guardians-ad-litem and all others who participate in abuse and neglect proceedings can benefit from continuing education opportunities, improved training and the development of models for effective practice in these settings. The Act, therefore, extends federal reimbursement for training that is currently provided to agency caseworkers to judges, attorneys and key court personnel who must make decision effecting the lives and future of vulnerable children. In addition to this basic, necessary training for court personnel, we hope it will also foster between cooperation between child welfare agencies and court personnel that is imperative to make system work to ensure the health and safety of children.

Finally, the bill provides for an expansion of the successful CASA—Court Appointed Special Advocates—volunteer program. This superb volunteer program has demonstrated its ability to improve outcomes for abused and neglected children. CASA are volunteers specially trained to speak for the best interests of children who have been abused or neglected. There are over 710 CASA programs nationwide, whose volunteers represented nearly 200,000 children last year alone. Recently, the Department of Justice recognized CASA as an ''Exemplary Program''. CASA has been operating in West Virginia since 1991 with programs currently serving children in 13 of our counties. Of course, there is more work to be done so that children in all 55 West Virginia counties, and all underserved areas throughout the country can benefit from the services of these trained and dedicated volunteers. In fact, despite CASA's phenomenal volunteer commitment and national praise by courts, and community leaders, 70% of the children in foster care are still without CASA representation. This bill will begin to address this gap by providing a $5 million grant to expand its programs into under-served areas and to improve its ability to recruit, train and supervise volunteers.

When we talk about how to help abused and neglected children in this country, our abuse and neglect courts are too often left out of the discussion. With the numbers of abused and neglected children rising dramatically—in West Virginia alone child abuse reports have doubled—from 13,000 in 1986 to over 26,000 in 1996—we need to include every system in our efforts to make a difference. The courts play a crucial role and I am confident that the Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act will be a valuable step in making our courts stronger, more efficient and more able to effectively address the needs of our Nation's most vulnerable children. I ask that my colleagues join us in this important effort.

I ask that a fact sheet about the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

FACT SHEET—STRENGTHENING ABUSE AND NEGLECT ACT OF 1999

A bill to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts and the quality and availability of training for judges, attorneys, and volunteers working in such courts, and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

SECTION 1, 3, & 3: TITLE, FINDINGS, AND DEFINITIONS

The Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act of 1999

SECTION 4: GRANTS TO COURTS FOR COMPUTER AUTOMATION AND CASE TRACKING SYSTEMS

A program to provide competitive state and local grants to abuse and neglect courts to create computerized case tracking systems, and to encourage the replication and implementation of successful systems in other court systems. Grant will be awarded based on eligibility criteria designed to encourage applications from both state and local courts, and a balance of urban and rural courts. Guidelines will also ensure that successful models can be disseminated to other courts. Applicants will need to include evaluation plans as part of the grant request.

Grant program is $10 million, with a 25% state matching requirement, but a hardship exemption.

SECTION 5: GRANTS TO REDUCE BACKLOGS OF ABUSE AND NEGLECT CASES

A program to provide grants to court systems to reduce pending backlogs of abuse and neglect cases so that courts are able to comply with the time frames established in the Adoption and Safe Families Act. Competitive grants will be awarded to court systems to reduce backlogs by using night court sessions, hiring additional personnel to manage reduce caseloads, or other innovative strategies.

Grant program is $10 million, and courts can use funding for up to 3 years.

SECTION 6: TRAINING FOR JUDGES AND COURT PERSONNEL

A provision to allow judges, attorneys, and court personnel to qualify for training under Title IV–E's existing training provisions, which is a federal-state matching program set at 75%–25%.

CBO to score provision.

SECTION 7: STATE STANDARDS FOR AGENCY ATTORNEYS

States shall develop and encourage by January 1, 2001, basic guidelines for education and training needed to handle abuse and neglect cases within the state and local court systems.

SECTION 8: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD ABUSE, NEGLECT AND DEPENDENCY MATTERS

A program for competitive grants, administered by HHS in coordination with the Attorney General, to provide technical assistance to state and local courts to carry out their new responsibilities, including efforts to speed the process of adoption of children.

Technical assistance will be $5 million for each year, from 2000 to 2004, for a five year total of $25 million.

SECTION 9: GRANTS TO EXPAND THE COURT-APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATES (CASA) PROGRAM IN UNDERSERVED AREAS

A special grant program to expand the well-respected CASA program to the most needy areas, including the 15 largest urban areas and regional programs for rural areas.

A single start up grant of $5 million in 2000.

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

S. 709. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to establish and sustain viable rural and remote communities, and to provide affordable housing and community development assistance to rural areas with excessively high rates of outmigration and low per capital income levels; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

THE RURAL AND REMOTE COMMUNITY FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Rural and Remote Community Fairness Act. This Act will lead to a brighter future for rural and remote communities by establishing three new programs that will address the unique economic and environmental challenges faced by small communities in rural and remote areas across this country. I am pleased that this legislation is co-sponsored by the Minority Leader, Senator DASCHLE.

The bill authorizes up to $100 million a year in grant aid from 2000 through 2006 for any communities across the nation with populations of less than 10,000 which face electric rates in excess of 150 percent of the national average retail price. The money can go for electricity system improvements, energy efficiency and weatherization efforts, water and sanitation improvements or work to solve leaking fuel storage tanks.

The bill also amends the Rural Electrification Act to authorize Rural and Remote Electrification Grants of an additional $20 million a year to the same communities. The grants can be used to increase energy efficiency, lower electricity rates or provide for the modernization of electric facilities.

The bill also establishes a new program providing rural recovery community development block grants. This will provide for the development and maintenance of viable rural areas through the provision of affordable housing and community development assistance for rural areas with excessively high rates of outmigration and low per capita income levels.

This nation has well-established programs for community development grants. The majority of these programs were established to help resolve the very real problems found in this Nation's urban areas. However, our most rural and remote communities experience different, but equally real, problems that are not addressed by existing law. Not only are these communities generally ineligible for the existing programs, their unique challenges, while sometimes similar to those experienced by urban areas, require a different focus and approach.

The biggest single economic problem facing small communities is the expense of establishing a modern infrastructure. These costs, which are always substantial, are exacerbated in remote and rural areas. The existence of this infrastructure, including efficient housing, electricity, bulk fuel storage, waste water and water service, is a necessity for the health and welfare of our children, the development of a prosperous economy and minimizing environmental problems.

There is a real cost in human misery and to the health and welfare of everyone, especially our children and our elderly from poor or polluted water or bad housing or an inefficient power system. Hepatitis B infections in rural Alaska are five times more common than in urban Alaska. We just have to do better if we are to bring our rural communities into the 21 Century.

The experience of many of Alaskans is a perfect example. Most small communities or villages in Alaska are not interconnected to an electricity grid, and rely upon diesel generators for their electricity. Often, the fuel can only be delivered by barge or airplane, and is stored in tanks. These tanks are expensive to maintain, and in many cases, must be completely replaced to prevent leakage of fuel into the environment. While the economic and environmental savings clearly justify the construction of new facilities, these communities simply don't have the ability to raise enough capital to make the necessary investments.

As a result, these communities are forced to bear an oppressive economic and environmental burden that can be eased with a relatively small investment on the part of the Federal government. I can give you some examples: in Manley Hot Springs, Alaska, the citizens pay almost 70 cents per kilowatt hour for electricity. In Igiugig, Kokhanok, Akiachak Native Community, and Middle Kuskokwim, consumers all pay over 50 cents per kilowatt hour for electricity. The national average is around 7 cents per kilowatt hour.

Further, in Alaska, for example, many rural villages still lack modern water and sewer sanitation systems taken for granted in all other areas of America. According to a Federal Field Working Group, 190 of the state's villages have ''unsafe'' sanitation systems, 135 villages still using ''honey buckets'' for waste disposal. Only 31 villages have a fully safe, piped water system; 71 villages having only one central watering source.

These are not only an Alaskan problem. The highest electricity rates in America are paid by a small community in Missouri, and communities in Maine, as well as islands in Rhode Island and New York will likely qualify for this program. Providing safe drinking water and adequate waste treatment facilities is a problem for very small communities all across this land.

What will this Act do to address these problems? First, the Act authorizes $100 million per year for the years 2000–2006 for block grants to communities of under 10,000 inhabitants who pay more than 150% of the national average retail price for electricity.

The grants will be allocated by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development among eligible communities proportionate to cost of electricity in the community, as compared to the National average. The communities may use the grants only for the following eligible activities:

Low-cost weatherization of homes and other buildings;

Construction and repair of electrical generation, transmission, distribution, and related facilities;

Construction, remediation and repair of bulk fuel storage facilities;

Facilities and training to reduce costs of maintaining and operating electrical generation, distribution, transmission, and related facilities;

Professional management and maintenance for electrical generation, distribution and transmission, and related facilities;

Investigation of the feasibility of alternate energy services;

Construction, operation, maintenance and repair of water and waste water services;

Acquisition and disposition of real property for eligible activities and facilities; and

Development of an implementation plan, including administrative costs for eligible activities and facilities.

In addition this bill will amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to authorize Rural and Remote Electrification Grants for $20 million per year for years 2000–2006 for grants to qualified borrowers under the Act that are in rural and remote communities who pay more than 150% of the national average retail price for electricity. These grants can be used to increase energy efficiency, lower electricity rates, or provide or modernize electric facilities.

This Act makes a significant step toward resolving the critical social, economic and environmental problems faced by our Nation's rural and remote communities. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

For the information of the Senate and the public, the bill can also be obtained from the Internet at: http://thomas.loc.gov.

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

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

S. 709

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Rural and Remote Community Fairness Act.''

TITLE I—RURAL AND REMOTE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–383) is amended by inserting at the end the following new title:

''TITLE IX—RURAL AND REMOTE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

''FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

''SEC. 901. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds and declares that—

''(1) a modern infrastructure, including efficient housing, electricity, bulk fuel, waste water and water service, is a necessary ingredient of a modern society and development of a prosperous economy with minimal environmental impacts;

''(2) the Nation's rural and remote communities face critical social, economic and environmental problems, arising in significant measure from the high cost of infrastructure development in sparsely populated and remote areas, that are not adequately addressed by existing Federal assistance programs;

''(3) in the past, Federal assistance has been instrumental in establishing electric and other utility service in many developing regions of the Nation, and that Federal assistance continues to be appropriate to ensure that electric and other utility systems in rural areas conform with modern standards of safety, reliability, efficiency and environmental protection; and

''(4) the future welfare of the Nation and the well-being of its citizens depend on the establishment and maintenance of viable rural and remote communities as social, economic and political entities.

''(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is the development and maintenance of viable rural and remote communities through the provision of efficient housing, and reasonably priced and environmentally sound energy, water, waste water, and bulk fuel and utility services to those communities that do not have those services or who currently bear costs for those services that are significantly above the national average.

''DEFINITIONS

''SEC. 902. As used in this title:

''(1) The term 'unit of general local government' means any city, county, town, township, parish, village, borough (organized or unorganized) or other general purpose political subdivision of a State, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Palau, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa; a combination of such political subdivisions that is recognized by the Secretary; and the District of Columbia; or any other appropriate organization of citizens of a rural and remote community that the Secretary may identify.

''(2) The term 'population' means total resident population based on data compiled by the United States Bureau of the Census and referable to the same point or period in time.

''(3) The term 'Native American group' means any Indian tribe, band group, and nation, including Alaska Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos, and any Alaskan Native Village, of the United States, which is considered an eligible recipient under the Indian Self Determination and Education Assistance Act (Public Law 93–638) or was considered an eligible recipient under chapter 67 of title 31, United States Code, prior to the repeal of such chapter.

''(4) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

''(5) The term 'rural and remote community' means a unit of local general government or Native American group which represents or contains a population not in excess of 10,000 permanent inhabitants, and that has an average retail cost per kilowatt hour of electricity that is equal to or greater than 150 percent of the average retail cost per kilowatt hour of electricity for all consumers in the United States, as determined by data provided by the Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration.

''(6) The term alternative energy sources include non-traditional means of providing electrical energy, including, but not limited to, wind, solar, biomass, geothermal and tidal power.

''(7) The term 'average retail cost per kilowatt hour of electricity' has the same meaning as 'average revenue per kilowatthour of electricity' as defined by the Energy Information Administration.

''AUTHORIZATIONS

''SEC. 903. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to rural and remote communities to carry out activities in accordance with the provisions of this title. For purposes of assistance under section 906, there are authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2006.

''STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES AND REVIEW

''SEC. 904. (a) Prior to the receipt in any fiscal year of a grant under section 906 by any rural and remote community, the grantee shall have prepared and submitted to the Secretary a final statement of rural and remote community development objectives and projected use of funds.

''(b) In order to permit public examination and appraisal of such statements, to enhance the public accountability of grantees, and to facilitate coordination of activities with different levels of government, the grantee shall in a timely manner—

''(1) furnish citizens informaiton concerning the amount of funds available for rural and remote community development activities and the range of activities that may be undertaken;

''(2) publish a proposed statement in such manner to afford affected citizens an opportunity to examine its content and to submit comments on the proposed statement and on the community development performance of the grantee;

''(3) provide citizens with reasonable access to records regarding the past use of funds received under section 906 by the grantee; and

''(4) provide citizens with reasonable notice of, and opportunity to comment on, any substantial change proposed to be made in the use of funds received under section 906 from one eligible activity to another.

The final statement shall be made available to the public, and a copy shall be furnished to the Secretary. Any final statement of activities may be modified or amended from time to time by the grantee in accordance with the same procedures requried in this paragraph for the preparation and submission of such statement.

''(c) Each grantee shall submit to the Secretary, at a time determined by the Secretary, a performacne and evaluation report, concerning the use of funds made available under section 906, together with an assessment by the grantee of the relationship of such use to the objectives identified in the grantee's statement under subsection (a) and to the requirements of subsection (b). The grantee's report shall indicate its programmatic accomplishments, the nature of and reasons for any changes in the grantee's program objectives, and indications of how the grantee would change its programs as a result of its experiences.

''(d) Any rural and remote community may retain any program income that is realized from any grant made by the Secretary under section 906 if (1) such income was realized after the initial disbursement of the funds received by such unit of general local government under such section; and (2) such unit of general local government has agreed that it will utilize the program income for eligible rural and remote community development activities in accordance with the provisions of this title; except that the Secretary may, by regulation, exclude from consideration as program income any amounts determined to be so small that compliance with this subsection creates an unreasonable administrative burden on the rural and remote community.

''ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

''SEC. 905. (a) Eligible activities assisted under title may include only—

''(1) the provision of assistance, including loans, grants, and services, for low-cost weatherization and other cost-effective energy-related repair of homes and other buildings;

''(2) the acquisition, construction, repair, reconstruction, or installation of reliable and cost-efficient facilities for the generation, transmission or distribution of electricity for consumption in a rural and remote community or communities;

''(3) the acquisition, construction, repair, reconstruction, remediation or installation of facilities for the safe storage and efficient management of bulk fuel by rural and remote communities, and facilities for the distribution of such fuel to consumers in a rural and remote community or communities;

''(4) facilities and training to reduce costs of maintaining and operating generation, distribution or transmission systems to a rural and remote community or communities;

''(5) the institution of professional management and maintenance services for electricity generation, transmission or distribution to a rural and remote community or communities;

''(6) the investigation of the feasibility of alternate energy sources for a rural and remote community or communities;

''(7) acquisition, construction, repair, reconstruction, operation, maintenance, or installation of facilities for water or waste water service;

''(8) the acquisition or disposition of real property (including air rights, water rights, and other interest therein) for eligible rural and remote community development activities; and

''(9) activities necessary to develop and implement a comprehensive rural and remote development plan, including payment of reasonable administrative costs related to planning and execution of rural and remote community development activities.

''(b) Eligible activities may be undertaken either directly by the rural and remote community, or by the rural and remote community through local electric utilities.

''ALLOCATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

''SEC. 906. For each fiscal year, of the amount approved in an appropriation Act under section 903 for grants in any year, the Secretary shall distribute to each rural and remote community which has filed a final statement of rural and remote community development objectives and projected use of funds under section 904, an amount which shall be allocated among the rural and remote communities that filed a final statement of rural and remote community development objectives and projected use of funds under section 904 proportionate to the percentage that the average retail cost per kilowatt hour of electricity for all classes of consumers in the rural and remote community exceeds the national average retail cost per kilowatt hour for electricity for all consumers in the United States, as determined by data provided by the Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration. In allocating funds under this section, the Secretary shall give special consideration to those rural and remote communities that increase economies of scale through consolidation of services, affiliation and regionalization of eligible activities under this title.

''REMEDIES FOR NONCOMPLIANCE

''SEC. 907. The provisions of section 111 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 shall apply to assistance distributed under this title.''.

TITLE II—RURAL AND REMOTE COMMUNITY ELECTRIFICATION GRANTS

After section 313(b) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, add the following new subsection:

''(c) RURAL AND REMOTE COMMUNITY ELECTRIFICATION GRANTS.—The Secretary is authorized to provide grants to eligible borrowers under this Act for the purpose of increasing energy efficiency, lowering or stabilizing electric rates to end users, or providing or modernizing electric facilities in rural and remote communities that have an average retail cost per kilowatt hour of electricity that is equal to or greater than 150 percent of the average retail cost per kilowatt hour of electricity for all consumers in the United States, as determined by data provided by the Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration.

''(d) For purposes of subsection (c), there is authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000–2006.''.

TITLE III—RURAL RECOVERY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 123. RURAL RECOVERY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS.

''(a) FINDINGS; PURPOSE.—

''(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

''(A) a modern infrastructure, including affordable housing, wastewater and water service, and advanced technology capabilities is a necessary ingredient of a modern society and development of a prosperous economy with minimal environmental impacts;

''(B) the Nation's rural areas face critical social, economic, and environmental problems, arising in significant measure from the growing cost of infrastructure development in rural areas that suffer from low per capita income and high rates of outmigration and are not adequately addressed by existing Federal assistance programs; and

''(C) the future welfare of the Nation and the well-being of its citizens depend on the establishment and maintenance of viable rural areas as social, economic, and political entities.

''(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for the development and maintenance of viable rural areas through the provision of affordable housing and community development assistance to eligible units of general local government and eligible Native American groups in rural areas with excessively high rates of outmigration and low per capita income levels.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ELIGIBLE UNIT OF GENERAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'eligible unit of general local government' means a unit of general local government that is the governing body of a rural recovery area.

''(2) ELIGIBLE INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'eligible Indian tribe' means the governing body of an Indian tribe that is located in a rural recovery area.

''(3) GRANTEE.—The term 'grantee' means an eligible unit of general local government or eligible Indian tribe that receives a grant under this section.

''(4) NATIVE AMERICAN GROUP.—The term 'Native American group' means any Indian tribe, band, group, and nation, including Alaska Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos, and any Alaskan Native Village, of the United States, which is considered an eligible recipient under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (Public Law 93–638) or was considered an eligible recipient under chapter 67 of title 31, United States Code, prior to the repeal of such chapter.

''(5) RURAL RECOVERY AREA.—The term 'rural recovery area' means any geographic area represented by a unit of general local government or a native American group—

''(A) the borders of which are not adjacent to a metropolitan area;

''(B) in which—

''(i) the population outmigration level equals or exceeds 1 percent over the most recent five year period, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and,

''(ii) the per capita income is less than that of the national nonmetropolitan average; and

''(C) that does not include a city with a population or more than 15,000.

''(6) UNIT OF GENERAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'unit of general local government' means any city, county, town, township, parish, village, borough (organized or unorganized), or other general purpose political subdivision of a State; Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa, or a general purpose political subdivision thereof; a combination of such political subdivisions that, except as provided in section 106(d)(4), is recognized by the Secretary; the District of Columbia; and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

''(B) OTHER ENTITIES INCLUDED.—The term also includes a State or a local public body or agency (as defined in section 711 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970), community association, or other entity, that is approved by the Secretary for the purpose of providing public facilities or services to a new community as part of a program meeting the eligibility standards of section 712 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 or title IV of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

''(c) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may make grants in accordance with this section to eligible units of general local government Native American groups and eligible Indian tribes that meet the requirements of subsection (d) to carry out eligible activities described in subsection (f).

''(d) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) STATEMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES.—In order to receive a grant under this section for a fiscal year, an eligible unit of general local government, Native American group or eligible Indian tribe—

''(A) shall—

''(i) publish a proposed statement of rural development objectives and a description of the proposed eligible activities described in subsection (f) for which the grant will be used; and

''(ii) afford residents of the rural recovery area served by the eligible unit of general local government, Native American groups or eligible Indian tribe with an opportunity to examine the contents of the proposed statement and the proposed eligible activities published under clause (i), and to submit comments to the eligible unit of general local government, Native American group or eligible Indian tribe, as applicable, on—

''(I) the proposed statement and the proposed eligible activities; and

''(II) the overall community development performance of the eligible unit of general local government, Native American groups or eligible Indian tribe, as applicable; and

''(B) based on any comments received under subparagraph (A)(ii), prepare and submit to the Secretary—

''(i) a final statement of rural development objectives;

''(ii) a description of the eligible activities described in subsection (f) for which a grant received under this section will be used; and

''(iii) a certification that the eligible unit of general local government, Native American groups or eligible Indian tribe, as applicable, will comply with the requirements of paragraph (2).

''(2) PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.—In order to enhance public accountability and facilitate the coordination of activities among different levels of government, an eligible unit of general local government, Native American groups or eligible Indian tribe that receives a grant under this section shall, as soon as practicable after such receipt, provide the residents of the rural recovery area served by the eligible unit of general local government, Native American groups or eligible Indian tribe, as applicable, with—

''(A) a copy of the final statement submitted under paragraph (1)(B);

''(B) information concerning the amount made available under this section and the eligible activities to be undertaken with that amount;

''(C) reasonable access to records regarding the use of any amounts received by the eligible unit of general local government, Native American groups or eligible Indian tribe under this section in any preceding fiscal year; and

''(D) reasonable notice of, and opportunity to comment on, any substantial change proposed to be made in the use of amounts received under this section from 1 eligible activity to another.

''(e) DISTRIBUTION OF GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In each fiscal year, the Secretary shall distribute to each eligible unit of general local government, Native American groups and eligible Indian tribe that meets the requirements of subsection (d)(1) a grant in an amount described in paragraph (2).

''(2) AMOUNT.—Of the total amount made available to carry out this section in each fiscal year, the Secretary shall distribute to each grantee the amount equal to the greater of—

''(A) the pro rata share of the grantee, as determined by the Secretary, based on the combined annual population outmigration level (as determined by Secretary of Agriculture) and the per capita income for the rural recovery area served by the grantee; or

''(B) $200,000.

''(f) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Each grantee shall use amounts received under this section for 1 or more of the following eligible activities, which may be undertaken either directly by the grantee, or by any local economic development corporation, regional planning district, non-profit community development corporation, or statewide development organization authorized by the grantee:

''(1) The acquisition, construction, repair, reconstruction, operation, maintenance, or installation of facilities for water and wastewater service or any other infrastructure needs determined to be critical to the further development or improvement of a designated industrial park.

''(2) The acquisition or disposition of real property (including air rights, water rights, and other interests therein) for rural community development activities.

''(3) The development of telecommunications infrastructure within a designated industrial park that encourages high technology business development in rural areas

''(4) Activities necessary to develop and implement a comprehensive rural development plan, including payment of reasonable administrative costs related to planning and execution of rural development activities.

''(5) Affordable housing initiatives.

''(g) PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each grantee shall annually submit to the Secretary a performance and evaluation report, concerning the use of amounts received under this section.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include a description of—

''(i) publish a proposed statement of rural development objectives and a description of the proposed eligible activities described in subsection (f) for which the grant will be used; and

''(A) the eligible activities carried out by the grantee with amounts received under this section, and the degree to which the grantee has achieved the rural development objectives included in the final statement submitted under subsection (d)(1);

''(B) the nature of and reasons for any change in the rural development objectives or the eligible activities of the grantee after submission of the final statement under subsection (d)(1); and

''(C) any manner in which the grantee would change the rural development objectives of the grantee as a result of the experience of the grantee in administering amounts received under this section.

''(h) RETENTION OF INCOME.—A grantee may retain any income that is realized from the grant, if—

''(1) the income was realized after the initial disbursement of amounts to the grantee under this section; and

''(2) the—

''(A) grantee agrees to utilize the income for 1 or more eligible activities; or

''(B) amount of the income is determined by the Secretary to be so small that compliance with subparagraph (A) would create an unreasonable administrative burden on the grantee.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2006''.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to help address the economic malaise that has gripped certain rural and remote areas of our country and the problems arising from the high cost of developing and maintaining infrastructure in remote communities. The legislation will provide grants to rural communities suffering from out-migration and low per-capita income and will help ensure that remote communities are not unfairly penalized by the high cost of services, such as water, waste water, fuel and utility services. I want to thank my colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, for his work on this legislation. His contribution in addressing these problems is most welcome.

Rural areas of our Nation continue to experience vast fluctuations in their economic well-being due to their dependence on worldwide agricultural markets. The link between global economic forces and local economic conditions is nowhere as pronounced as it is in rural America. And yet, rural communities are often those least capable of weathering the severe periodic downturns that occur in global markets.

Statistics bear out these fluctuations in economic activity, but they fail to fully capture the human suffering that lies just beyond the numbers. Economic downturns lead to the migration away from farm-dependent, rural communities, further stifling economic opportunities for those left behind. The 1990 Census highlighted these migratory trends, and I anticipate that similar trends will be captured by the upcoming Census, as well.

In short, the bandwagon of prosperity that has carried many Americans along through the past decade has left many rural areas standing by the wayside. If this trend continues, more and more young people will be forced to leave the towns they grew up in for opportunities in urban areas. In towns like Webster, Sisseton, and White River, South Dakota, we are seeing farm families broken up, populations decline, and main street businesses close their doors. While there is no doubt that economic growth in our urban areas has benefited our Nation, the disparity of economic development between our rural and urban areas cannot be ignored. If nothing is done to address the economic challenges facing these areas, we will jeopardize the future of rural America.

That is why Senator MURKOWSKI and I are introducing legislation to provide the Nation's rural areas with the resources necessary to make critical investments in their future and, by doing so, to create economic opportunities that will help them sustain a valuable and important way of life. While Federal agencies, such as the United States Department of Agriculture's Office of Rural Development and the Economic Development Administration, provide assistance for rural development purposes, there are no Federal programs that provide a steady source of funding for rural areas most affected by severe out-migration and low per-capita income. For these areas, the process of economic development is often most arduous. The Rural and Remote Community Fairness Act of 1999 will provide the basic, long-term assistance necessary to aid the coordinated efforts of local community leaders as they begin economic recovery efforts to ensure a bright future for rural America.

Specifically, the Rural and Remote Community Fairness Act of 1999 will provide a minimum of $200,000 per year to counties and Indian tribes with (1) out-migration levels of one percent or more over a five-year period, (2) per-capita income levels that are below the national average, and (3) borders that are not adjacent to a metropolitan area. This legislation authorizes the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development to set aside $50 million in Community Development Block Grant funding for this purpose. The money, which is already included in the agency's budget, will be allocated on a formula basis to rural counties and Indian tribes suffering from out-migration and low-per capita income levels.

County and tribal governments will be able to use this federal funding to improve their industrial parks, purchase land for development, build affordable housing and create economic recovery strategies according to their needs. All of these important steps will help rural communities address their economic problems and plan for long-term growth and development.

In addition to addressing the problems of out-migration from low per-capita income areas, this legislation also focuses on the unique problems associated with those communities located in areas with high energy costs. Specifically, the legislation sets aside $100,000,000 for weatherization efforts, the construction of cost-efficient power facilities and fuel storage facilities, energy management programs, water and waste water facilities, the acquisition or disposition of real property for rural and remote development activities, and for the implementation of a comprehensive rural and remote development plan.

Mr. President, the Rural and Remote Community Fairness Act of 1999 holds great potential for revitalizing many of

our nation's most neglected and vulnerable areas. I urge my colleagues to support its enactment this Congress.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. 710. A bill to authorize the feasibility study on the preservation of certain Civil War battlefields along the Vicksburg Campaign Trail; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

VICKSBURG CAMPAIGN TRAIL BATTLEFIELDS PRESERVATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. LOTT. Mr, President, on February 20, 1899, the 56th Congress took an important step toward preserving one of our nation's most significant historical resources when it established the Vicksburg National Military Park. The campaign and siege at Vicksburg, the ''Gibraltar of the Confederacy,'' was a pivotal moment in American History. As the gateway to the Mississippi River, the region was of vital strategic importance to both the South and the North. For this reason, the Vicksburg engagement is heralded as one of the most brilliant offensive campaigns ever fought on U.S. soil.

Every year, the Vicksburg National Military Park plays host to over one million visitors who are able to take advantage of this national historic treasure. Like many other National Parks, Vicksburg contributes to the cultural, recreational, scenic, and economic vitality of the region.

As America celebrates the centennial anniversary of the Park's founding, it is important to recognize that a number of other campaign related sites throughout Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Tennessee, used by both the Union and Confederate Armies during the 1862 to 1863 Vicksburg conflict, are in desperate need of study, interpretation, management, and protection.

These are sites that have been listed as historically significant properties on both state and national registries. Unfortunately, many of these same sites, buildings, fortifications, earthworks, and other landmarks along the Vicksburg Campaign Trail route have been identified by the National Trust for Historic Preservation as being among the 11 most endangered historic places in America. The Mississippi Heritage Trust, based in Jackson, also named the Campaign Trail as one of its highest priorities and placed the Vicksburg Trail on its list of most threatened historic areas in the state.

Mr. President, that is why I am introducing legislation today to authorize the Park Service to conduct a feasibility study on the Vicksburg Campaign Trail. A study that will identify options for preserving some of our nation's most important Civil War battlefields and sites.

At the outbreak of the American Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln gathered his ranking civil and military leaders to develop a strategy for ending the war. While seated around a large table examining a map of the nation, Lincoln made a wide sweeping gesture with his hand, and then placed his finger on the map at Vicksburg. He said, ''See what a lot of land these fellows hold of which Vicksburg is the key. The war can never be brought to a close until that key is in our pocket.''

It was a crucial for the Federal government to regain control of the lower Mississippi River. The goal was to enable troops, supplies and commerce to flow unhindered from the Northwest. Taking the Gibraltar of the Confederacy would sever vital Southern supply routes, achieve a major objective of the Anaconda Plan, and effectively seal the doom of the Confederate capital in Richmond.

Even with Major General Ulysses S. Grant leading the charge, Vicksburg would prove a tough nut to crack. Its powerful Southern batteries were trained on the river and an 8 mile-long swath of earthworks guarded all land based approaches. The reinforced line consisted of nine major forts connected by trenches and rifle pits manned by a garrison of 30,000 troops and 172 mounted guns. These fortifications posed the greatest challenge to Union domination of the Mississippi River.

The campaign to capture Vicksburg, to ''pocket the key'' to Union victory, lasted 18 months and involved more than 100,000 soldiers. It was here that entire regiments of black soldiers wore the uniform of the United States Army for only the second time in American history. The battle of Vicksburg also involved a number of historic naval engagements between Union gunboats and Confederate warships.

After months of frustration and failure to capture the Confederate bastion, General Grant marched his force of over 45,000 men down the west side of the Mississippi River. With the assistance of the U.S. fleet, Union troops crossed the river below Vicksburg and swiftly moved deep into Mississippi. After five fierce battles, the state capital of Jackson was taken. The Union Army then turned west and marched along the rail line towards Vicksburg. Lt. Gen. John C. Pemberton led the defense of Vicksburg and held the Rebel line for some time. Pemberton refused to succumb to unconditional surrender even after 47 days of siege. He finally relinquished the city on July 4, 1863 after securing paroles for his resistance forces.

Mr. President, many historians consider the battle of Vicksburg to be the most decisive campaign of the Civil War. It was also the most complex combined operation ever undertaken by American armed forces prior to World War II. In fact, the Vicksburg Campaign is required study at the United States Military Academy, the Army War College, and the Commanding General Staff College. These are the men and women who will eventually lead our armed forces. Rather than just read about the conflict in textbooks, troops from military units throughout the country ride the battlefields to experience first hand the tactics of war.

At a time when the movie ''Saving Private Ryan'' is recognized for its true-to-life depiction of the battlefield on Omaha Beach, Normandy, France, our nation must continue to reflect on the hardships suffered here on our own soil. Those suffered by soldiers and civilians throughout the North and South.

The Vicksburg campaign is truly an example of the pathos of war here on America's shores. Brother fought against brother on opposite sides of the battle lines. In defense of ideals each held dear. During the siege, soldiers fed off the land while the civilian population lived underground to escape the constant bombardment of Union guns—enduring exposure, sickness, and little food. It was a military operation where tens of thousands of lives were lost.

Vicksburg is also an illustration of the healing and reunification that followed Reconstruction. Union and Confederate veterans joined forces to establish Vicksburg National Military Park. We owe these former combatants a debt of gratitude for their efforts. Not only for their distinguished bravery during the most trying of times, but also for the vital legacy they left us all.

Now it is our solemn duty to safeguard the memory of those who fought so dearly during the many battles that occurred to secure Vicksburg by studying the entire campaign trail. For its contribution to our understanding of the Civil War and for its continued influence on American history. This great contest encompassed a vast geographical region. Battle related sites are scattered throughout Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Tennessee. While some landmarks have been lost to age and neglect, it is not to late to protect the hundreds of remnants associated with the campaign that remain to tell the story.

Mr. President, the non-partisan measure offered today is also a key. The key to protecting our national heritage. This bill will begin a much needed process to protect the integrity of the many historic venues associated with the battle of Vicksburg that still exist. Literally hundreds of miles of roads, fields, and bayous were covered by Yankee and Rebel troops during this engagement. To truly understand and appreciate this historic conflict, it is important to look beyond the confines of the Vicksburg National Military Park as it exists today. The 106th Congress needs to build upon the legacy our forefathers left us by developing a comprehensive plan leading to the eventual preservation of the many endangered sites along the four state campaign trail. This Congress needs to authorize this much needed study—the second key. President Lincoln got the first key over one hundred years ago.

Now that 136 years have past, the current President needs the second key.

Without Congressional action, historians, soldiers, re-enactors, and tourists will forever lose direct access to the many at-risk landmarks and battlefields along the Vicksburg campaign route that have not yet disappeared. Sites, that while inexorably linked by time and honor, will simply vanish into the wind without the development of coordinated and comprehensive preservation strategies. Sites where the true experience of history will only be left to words.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join with me in support of this non-partisan measure. Let us take this first and necessary step to protect our national heritage for those who have gone before us and for those yet to come.

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. 710

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 ''Vicksburg Campaign Trail Battlefields Preservation Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) there are situated along the Vicksburg Campaign Trail in the States of Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Tennessee the sites of several key Civil War battles;

(2) the battlefields along the Vicksburg Campaign Trail are collectively of national significance in the history of the Civil War; and

(3) the preservation of those battlefields would vitally contribute to the understanding of the heritage of the United States.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to authorize a feasibility study to determine what measures should be taken to preserve certain Civil War battlefields along the Vicksburg Campaign Trail.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CAMPAIGN TRAIL STATE.—The term ''Campaign Trail State'' means each of the States of Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Tennessee, including political subdivisions of those States.

(2) CIVIL WAR BATTLEFIELD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''Civil War battlefield'' means the land and interests in land that is the site of a Civil War battlefield, including structures on or adjacent to the land, as generally depicted on the Map.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''Civil War battlefield'' includes—

(i) the battlefields at Helena and Arkansas Post, Arkansas;

(ii) Goodrich's Landing near Transylvania, and sites in and around Lake Providence, East Carroll Parish, Louisiana;

(iii) the battlefield at Milliken's Bend, Madison Parish, Louisiana;

(iv) the route of Grant's march through Louisiana from Milliken's Bend to Hard Times, Madison and Tensas Parishes, Louisiana;

(v) the Winter Quarters at Tensas Parish, Louisiana;

(vi) Grant's landing site at Bruinsburg, and the route of Grant's march from Bruinsburg to Vicksburg, Claiborne, Hinds, and Warren Counties, Mississippi;

(vii) the battlefield at Port Gibson (including Shaifer House, Bethel Church, and the ruins of Windsor), Claiborne County, Mississippi;

(viii) the battlefield at Grand Gulf, Claiborne County, Mississippi;

(ix) the battlefield at Raymond (including Waverly, (the Peyton House)), Hinds County, Mississippi;

(x) the battlefield at Jackson, Hinds County, Mississippi;

(xi) the Union siege lines around Jackson, Hinds County, Mississippi;

(xii) the battlefield at Champion Hill (including Coker House), Hinds County, Mississippi;

(xiii) the battlefield at Big Black River Bridge, Hinds and Warren Counties, Mississippi;

(xiv) the Union fortifications at Haynes Bluff, Confederate fortifications at Snyder's Bluff, and remnants of Federal exterior lines, Warren County, Mississippi;

(xv) the battlefield at Chickasaw Bayou, Warren County, Mississippi;

(xvi) Pemberton's Headquarters at Warren County, Mississippi;

(xvii) the site of actions taken in the Mississippi Delta and Confederate fortifications near Grenada, Grenada County, Mississippi;

(xviii) the site of the start of Greirson's Raid and other related sites, LaGrange, Tennessee; and

(xix) any other sites considered appropriate by the Secretary.

(3) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the map entitled ''Vicksburg Campaign Trail National Battlefields'', numbered _____, and dated _____.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 4. FEASIBILITY STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a feasibility study to determine what measures should be taken to preserve Civil War battlefields along the Vicksburg Campaign Trail.

(b) COMPONENTS.—In completing the study, the Secretary shall—

(1) enter into contracts with entities to use advanced technology such as remote sensing, river modeling, and flow analysis to determine which property included in the Civil War battlefields should be preserved, restored, managed, maintained, or acquired due to the national historical significance of the property;

(2) evaluate options for the establishment of a management entity for the Civil War battlefields consisting of a unit of government or a private nonprofit organization that—

(A) administers and manages the Civil War battlefields; and

(B) possesses the legal authority to—

(i) receive Federal funds and funds from other units of government or other organizations for use in managing the Civil War battlefields;

(ii) disburse Federal funds to other units of government or other nonprofit organizations for use in managing the Civil War battlefields;

(iii) enter into agreements with the Federal government, State governments, or other units of government and nonprofit organizations; and

(iv) acquire land or interests in land by gift or devise, by purchase from a willing seller using donated or appropriated funds, or by donation;

(3) make recommendations to the Campaign Trail States for the management, preservation, and interpretation of the natural, cultural, and historical resources of the Civil War battlefields;

(4) identify appropriate partnerships among Federal, State, and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector, including nonprofit organizations and the organization known as ''Friends of the Vicksburg Campaign and Historic Trail'', in furtherance of the purposes of this Act; and

(5) recommend methods of ensuring continued local involvement and participation in the management, protection, and development of the Civil War battlefields.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of completion of the study under this section, the Secretary shall submit a report describing the findings of the study to—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $1,500,000.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 711. A bill to allow for the investment of joint Federal and State funds from the civil settlement of damages from the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

CIVIL SETTLEMENT OF DAMAGES FROM THE ''EXXON VALDEZ'' OIL SPILL

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are ten years older, but are we ten years wiser since the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill?

With the anniversary of the Nation's worst oil spill occurring today, the question most asked by national media is how the environment and wildlife of Alaska has fared. In fact, just last week on a ''60 minutes'' story this exact question was asked. It was asked not only by the network doing the story, but by the Alaskans being interviewed.

What's particularly frustrating is that in many cases it is still not possible to give informed answers.

In the years since 11.3 million gallons of crude oil bubbled into the sea, the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill (EVOS) Trustees Council has had nearly $800 million of the eventual $900 million that Exxon will pay at their disposal to fund scientific studies. Those studies should have determined the health of marine life, wildlife and the ecosystem of Prince William Sound. But according to the latest summary of scientific studies, while it is possible to say that some species have or are recovering, it is not possible to give a full accounting.

According to a report from the council last month very little is known about the health of cutthroat trout, Dolly Varden, rockfish or Kittlitz's murrelets. And there is only slightly more information on the health of killer whales, pigeon guillemots, cormorants, and common loon, harbor seals and harlequin ducks.

While it is heartening that the Sound appears to be recovering sooner than many thought likely, and that herring and salmon stocks are recovering as

are bald eagles and river otters, it is frustrating that more hard scientific data has not been gathered.

That is why, Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation, on behalf of myself and Senator STEVENS, that will provide for more science to be done on the impacted spill area. The legislation I am introducing will allow for a higher rate of interest to be earned through outside investments of the settlement funds from the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill.

The legislation specifies that the interest on investments received under this new authority must be used to support marine research and economic restoration projects for the fishing industry and local fishermen. If the trustees choose to use this authority, an additional $20 million to $30 million could be generated for research and restoration between now and 2001.

The legislation further requires the trustees to present a report to Congress recommending a structure the trustees believe would be most effective and appropriate for the administration and expenditure of remaining funds and interest received. This provision is also consistent with comments from the public suggesting that an independent science-oriented board should control the process of funding science projects, rather than trustees who represent agencies that may be seeking project funding.

I, for one, believe the Council's priorities have been misplaced which has necessitated this legislation. They have been unwilling to admit that science does not yet provide many mitigation answers; instead, the spill trustees have decided to go on a land buying spree as an alternative.

This is a mistake, Mr. President.

In a State where 68 percent of all land is federally owned and where individuals own less than 1 percent of all property, the trustees have allocated $416 million of the initial $900 million court settlement just for land acquisitions. They have nearly completed the purchase of 647,000 acres in and around Prince William Sound and just recently voted to set aside an additional $55 million to fund acquisitions, literally, forever even though most of the land being bought was not directly affected by the spill.

Alaska Natives worked for decades to win the 1971 land settlement that gave them control of 44 million acres of Alaska. Now, in less than a quarter of a century, Natives have lost much of the land they had fought to gain—a good part of the Native lands in the region have been reacquired through the actions of the trustees. It is ironic, indeed, that the United States purchased Alaska for $7.2 million in 1867 and that 60 times more money already has been committed to buy back parts of it.

Back in 1994 when $600 million of the settlement was still uncommitted, I urged the trustees to commit the bulk of the settlement to a ''permanent fund'' that would provide a perpetual source of significant funding for research or mitigation projects. I also urged the trustees to utilize the expertise of the University of Alaska in undertaking those studies. I warned that if too much funding was allocated to land acquisition, or spent on marginal science, less money would be available to fund sound studies to shed light on the mysteries affecting commercial and sport fisheries and marine life and wildlife in the Sound.

In the intervening years we have seen General Accounting Office audits documenting that the trustees have pad on average 56 percent above government-appraised value for the lands it has acquired. We've seen a situation this year where the trustees paid nearly $80 million for lands on Kodiak Island, while the Department of the Interior set the value of those same lands at about one-third that amount when it came to funding revenue sharing payments to the Kodiak Island Borough.

While the trustees recently voted to place about $115 million of the settlement aside to provide interest to fund future scientific studies, I believe the earnings from all of the roughly $170 million still owed by Exxon should be devoted to pay for marine research and monitoring including applied fisheries research. I believe this approach will give us answers, not leave us guessing, about what is happening to the Sound and what we can do to improve the habitat of the region. The legislation we introduce today will begin to address this need.

Long after the Sound has healed its wounds, those lands bought by the trustees will be lost forever to economic activity and to the Native heritage. Nowhere could this be clearer than the example of one Native corporation that agreed to sell its lands with the intent to invest in a perpetual trust to help children go to school and provide solutions to other problems. Instead it was pressured to make a one time payment to each shareholder.

The longest-lasting legacy of the tragedy may be that some of the Natives find themselves like the Biblical Esau who sold his birthright to Jacob for a mess of pottage and bread. When the meal was gone so was his heritage. When that one-time payment has been spent, what will have been gained and what will pass on to their children?

Today, another tragedy is clear, we still do not have the answers to the effects of the spill, even though we had the wherewithal to have obtained them.

Mr. President, immediately following the spill, I sponsored a provision in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, which was passed by Congress, to create Regional Citizens Advisory Councils, giving local residents the authority and the resources to improve all aspects of oil transport planning and cleanup. Patterned after a concept then in place at the Port of Sullom Voe in the North Sea's Shetland Islands, there is no question that the oversight and creativity that the councils engendered have done the most to make Alaska's oil transportation system the best in the world.

It is time for Congress to act again today, to ensure that we have the resources to obtain the best science available in understanding Prince William Sound. I believe this bill will allow us to do just that.●

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I join Senator MURKOWSKI in introducing this bill to allow greater interest to be earned on funds from the civil settlement between Exxon and the State of Alaska and the Federal Government resulting from the 1989 *Exxon Valdez* oil spill. This is another silver lining from the spill.

Under the civil settlement, Exxon has paid $900 million to the State of Alaska and Federal Government. The settlement established the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council to administer these funds. The Trustee Council is comprised of three Federal and three State representatives.

While I disagree with the Council's decisions to spend much of the funds to acquire land in Alaska, I was pleased by their decision on March 1, 1999 to dedicate $115 million for an endowment for marine research, monitoring, and restoration.

Our bill would allow the Council to invest these funds outside the court registry, where it would earn greater interest than under the court's authority. The bill is similar to the legislation we pursued during the 105th Congress. We are encouraged that the Trustee Council has directed its Executive Director to work with us on this measure, and we will keep an open mind when those discussions begin.

I also intend to explore whether we can merge the EVOS research endowment with the North Pacific Marine Research endowment I created last year with funds received by the Federal Government in the case involving Dinkum Sands oil lease revenue. The EVOS funds can only be used in the spill area, while the Dinkum Sands funds can be used for research relating to any of the marine waters off Alaska. Merging the two would maximize research benefits for Alaska and the Nation, and minimize potential duplication.

In 1997, we established the 19-member North Pacific Research Board to prepare the marine research plan for the Dinkum Sands funds. In 1998, however, during the first year of funding, we simplified the approach so that the University of Alaska has the responsibility for preparing the plan, and the plan must then be approved by the State of Alaska, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Commerce. Our goal is to update the North Pacific Research Board so that the University will have the central role, but the other entities on the North Pacific Marine Research Board will also have an advisory role in the long term in setting the research priorities.

During our work on this, we will also see whether it is possible to merge the

EVOS research endowment with the Dinkum Sands endowment. The bill that Senator MURKOWSKI and I are introducing is the critical piece of the puzzle that will allow greater interest to be earned on the EVOS marine research endowment whether or not we are ultimately able to merge the two.●

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 712. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for highway-rail grade crossing safety through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE ''LOOK, LISTEN, AND LIVE STAMP ACT''

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today I, along with Senators HUTCHISON, BREAUX, and WYDEN, introduce the ''Look, Listen, and Live Stamp Act.'' This bill would authorize the U.S. Postal Service to establish a special-rate postage stamp to promote highway-rail grade crossing safety.

There are approximately 150,000 public crossings in America today, the majority of which are equipped with only passive warning devices. In 1998, there were 3,446 grade-crossing collisions involving motor vehicles resulting in 1,950 serious injuries and 422 deaths. A motorist is 40 times more likely to die in a crash involving a train than in a collision involving another motor vehicle. Most recently, this nation witnessed the horror of the Amtrak grade-crossing collision in Bourbonnais, Illinois last week.

Sadly, Mr. President, grade-crossing deaths are preventable. Unfortunately, the cost of separating or eliminating all of these crossings would run into the trillions of dollars, and even the cost of equipping every crossing with the most effective active warning devices would run into the billions of dollars. While the railroad industry and Federal, state, and local governments are slowly reducing the number of grade-crossings and improving others, the process will take decades to complete. Also, about half of all collisions at highway-rail grade crossings occur at crossings equipped with active warning systems in place: flashing lights, bells and gates.

To save lives now, we must intensify our efforts to educate our citizens on the hazards of, and proper method for, crossing a railroad track. The ''Look, Listen, and Live Stamp Act'' would promote this worthy cause in two ways. First, the stamp itself, and its display in post offices throughout America, would serve as a reminder to all to treat the crossing of a railroad track as a life or death situation. Second, it would provide an additional source of revenue to the Department of Transportation to fund Operation Lifesaver programs. Operation Lifesaver is non-profit, nationwide public education program dedicated to reducing collisions, injuries, and fatalities at intersections where America's roadways meet railways and along railroad rights-of-way. ''Look, Listen, and Live'' is an Operation Lifesaver slogan intended to remind motor vehicle drivers how to protect their lives when they approach a highway-rail grade crossing.

Mr. President, the bill would authorize the U.S. Postal Service to sell the stamp at up to 25 percent more than the cost of a first-class stamp, with the difference going to the Department of Transportation to provide additional Operation Lifesaver funding. U.S. Postal Service customers could choose to buy these special stamps, and thereby contribute to this worthy cause, or continue to purchase regular first-class stamps at the going rate. The choice would be theirs. Most importantly, the stamp will provide a constant reminder of the need to exercise caution in crossing railroad tracks. Public memory of the Bourbonnais, Illinois incident, and similar fatal collisions, will fade as media interest shifts to new topics. Operation Lifesaver's public awareness programs are an effort to change driver behavior, but additional reminders, such as this stamp, are required.

The lives lost by a driver's careless crossing of a railroad track are usually those in the motor vehicle, but many times include the passengers and crew members of the train. Even when the train crew survives, they are haunted by the memories of helplessly watching these needless deaths. This is a nationwide problem, but a March 22, 1999, USA Today article detailed the dangers of this problem in my home state of Mississippi. I want to dedicate this bill to the families of the victims of the Amtrak ''City of New Orleans'' collision in Bourbonnais last week, especially to the families of the five victims from Mississippi: June Bonnin and Jessica Tickle of Nesbit, Mississippi, Lacey Lipscomb and Rainey Lipscomb of Lake Cormorant, Mississippi, and Sheena Dowe of Jackson, Mississippi.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this bill.

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. 712

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 ''Look, Listen, and Live Stamp Act''.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMPS TO BENEFIT HIGHWAY-RAIL GRADE CROSSING SAFETY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 414 the following:

''§ 414a. Special postage stamps for highway-rail grade crossing safety

''(a) In order to afford the public a convenient way to contribute to funding for highway-rail grade crossing safety, the Postal Service shall establish a special rate of postage for first-class mail under this section.

''(b) The rate of postage established under this section—

''(1) shall be equal to the regular first-class rate of postage, plus a differential of not to exceed 25 percent;

''(2) shall be set by the Governors in accordance with such procedures as the Governors shall by regulation prescribe (in lieu of the procedures under chapter 36); and

''(3) shall be offered as an alternative to the regular first-class rate of postage.

''(c) The use of the special rate of postage established under this section shall be voluntary on the part of postal patrons.

''(d)(1) Amounts becoming available for highway-rail grade crossing safety under this section shall be paid by the Postal Service to the Department of Transportation for Operation Lifesaver. Payments under this section shall be made under such arrangements as the Postal Service shall by mutual agreement with the Department of Transportation establish in order to carry out the purposes of this section, except that, under those arrangements, payments to the Department of Transportation shall be made at least twice a year.

''(2) For purposes of this section, the term 'amounts becoming available for highway-rail grade crossing safety under this section' means—

''(A) the total amounts received by the Postal Service that the Postal Service would not have received but for the enactment of this section, reduced by

''(B) an amount sufficient to cover reasonable costs incurred by the Postal Service in carrying out this section, including those attributable to the printing, sale, and distribution of stamps under this section,

as determined by the Postal Service under regulations that it shall prescribe.

''(e) It is the sense of Congress that nothing in this section should—

''(1) directly or indirectly cause a net decrease in total funds received by the Department of Transportation for Operation Lifesaver below the level that would otherwise have been received but for the enactment of this section; or

''(2) affect regular first-class rates of postage or any other regular rates of postage.

''(f) Special postage stamps under this section shall be made available to the public beginning on such date as the Postal Service shall by regulation prescribe, but in no event later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this section.

''(g) The Postmaster General shall include in each report rendered under section 2402 with respect to any period during any portion of which this section is in effect information, concerning the operation of this section, except that, at a minimum, each report shall include—

''(1) the total amount described in subsection (d)(2)(A) which was received by the Postal Service during the period covered by such report; and

''(2) of the amount under paragraph (1), how much (in the aggregate and by category) was required for the purposes described in subsection (d)(2)(B).

''(h) This section shall cease to be effective at the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which special postage stamps under this section are first made available to the public.''.

(b) REPORT BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—Not later than 3 months (but not earlier than 6 months) before the end of the 2-year period referred to in section 414a(h) of title 39, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the operation of such section. Such report shall include—

(1) an evaluation of the effectiveness and the appropriateness of the authority provided by such section as a means of fundraising; and

(2) a description of the monetary and other resources required of the Postal Service in carrying out such section.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 414 and inserting the following:

''414. Special postage stamps for breast cancer research.

''414a. Special postage stamps for highway-rail grade crossing safety.''.

(2) SECTION HEADING.—The heading for section 414 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§414. Special postage stamps for breast cancer research.''.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 223

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 223, a bill to help communities modernize public school facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 327

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 327, a bill to exempt agricultural products, medicines, and medical products from U.S. economic sanctions.

S. 333

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 333, a bill to amend the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to improve the farmland protection program.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to remove the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 348

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 348, a bill to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance training, research and development, energy conservation and efficiency, and consumer education in the oilheat industry for the benefit of oilheat consumers and the public, and for other purposes.

S. 443

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 443, a bill to regulate the sale of firearms at gun shows.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, supra.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-exempt private activity bonds to be issued for highway infrastructure construction.

S. 472

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 472, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide certain medicare beneficiaries with an exemption to the financial limitations imposed on physical, speech-language pathology, and occupational therapy services under part B of the medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 531

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 531, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks in recognition of her contributions to the Nation.

S. 565

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 565, a bill to provide for the treatment of the actions of certain foreign narcotics traffickers as an unusual and extraordinary threat to the United States for purposes of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain farm rental income from net earnings from self-employment if the taxpayer enters into a lease agreement relating to such income.

S. 596

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to provide that the annual drug certification procedures under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 not apply to certain countries with which the United States has bilateral agreements and other plans relating to counterdrug activities, and for other purposes.

S. 597

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 597, a bill to amend section 922 of chapter 44 of title 28, United States Code, to protect the right of citizens under the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

S. 617

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 617, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the medicare program of insulin pumps as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to provide assistance for poison prevention and to stabilize the funding of regional poison control centers.

S. 636

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 636, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act and part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish standards for the health quality improvement of children in managed care plans and other health plans.

S. 660

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 660, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under part B of the medicare program of medical nutrition therapy services furnished by registered dietitians and nutrition professionals.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to encourage States to incarcerate individuals convicted of murder, rape, or child molestation.

S. 676

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 676, a bill to locate and secure the return of Zachary Baumel, a citizen of the United States, and other Israeli soldiers missing in action.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to authorize appropriations for the United States Customs Service for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.