the reserve components of the Armed Forces, to improve such programs, and for other purposes.

S. 664

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 664, a bill to provide adequate funding for local governments harmed by Hurricane Katrina of 2005 or Hurricane Rita of 2005.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 682, a bill to award a congressional gold medal to Edward William Brooke III in recognition of his unprecedented and enduring service to our Nation.

S. RES. 33

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 33, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should expand its relationship with the Republic of Georgia by commencing negotiations to enter into a free trade agreement.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2007

By Mr. PRYOR:

S. 602. A bill to develop the next generation of parental control technology; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PRYOR:

S. 639. A bill to establish digital and wireless networks to advance online higher education opportunities for minority students; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce two communications bills.

First, I am introducing the Child Safe Viewing Act, a bill to develop the next generation of parental control technology. Last year, following several hearings and forums on decency, I concluded that the V-Chip is not an adequate solution for parents to prevent their children from viewing adult content, especially in a world of 500 channels and video streaming.

During the 1996 Telecommunications Act debate, President Clinton urged inclusion of a mandatory V-Chip device, and in collaboration with Congress, the FCC, and the entertainment industry, the V-Chip was born. The V-Chip was an important beginning to control child access to adult material. Over a decade has passed since the 1996 Act, and the world of communications has changed. However, the issues that inspired the V-Chip continue to exist today for not only television but for the Internet and other video streaming devices.

The Child Safe Viewing Act is a pragmatic approach to addressing the pitfalls of video content not intended for kids, and it acts on current law. It simply directs the Federal Communications Commission to begin a proceeding on the requirements in Section 551 of the V-Chip law. Section 551 states that the Commission shall take action on alternative blocking technology as it is developed. This mandate is clear and the time has come. We must engage in this issue now to ensure that families have the tools to keep inappropriate and sometimes dangerous material out of their children's view.

I am also introducing ED 1.0, a bill to advance online higher education opportunities for minorities. Last Congress, Senator ALLEN and I introduced a bill that would establish a digital and wireless network technology program for minority-serving institutions, and it was reported favorably by the Commerce Committee. Regrettably, I am concerned that the cost of the bill will prohibit it from moving in this Congress. But the needs of this Nation's minorities are not standing still.

ED 1.0 would allow some of our goals to move forward now by creating a pilot online degree program at four minority-serving institutions. African-American, Hispanic, and Tribal serving colleges and universities in socially and economically disadvantaged areas would be eligible to participate in this program to help define what works in ensuring that minorities are obtaining higher education degrees

With the high costs of networks and limited availability of resources, the program would provide a national ''lessons learned'' about how to develop and implement flexible degree programs in fields such as health or education, which are currently underserved in the disadvantaged community. The goals of ED 1.0 will make education a reality for thousands of Americans, and I hope this bill will have the support of my colleagues.

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. 602

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 ''Child Safe Viewing Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Video programming has a direct impact on a child's perception of safe and reasonable behavior.

(2) Children imitate actions they witness on video programming, including language, drug use, and sexual conduct.

(3) Studies indicate that the strong appeal of video programming erodes the ability of parents to develop responsible attitudes and behavior in their children.

(4) The average American child watches 4 hours of television each day.

(5) Seventy-five percent of adults surveyed believe that television content marketed toward children should be subject to compulsory principles.

(6) Ninety-nine and nine-tenths percent of all consumer complaints logged by the Federal Communications Commission in the first quarter of 2006 regarding radio and television broadcasting were because of obscenity, indecency, and profanity.

(7) There is a compelling government interest in empowering parents to limit their children's exposure to harmful television content.

(8) Section 1 of the Communications Act of 1934 requires the Federal Communications Commission to promote the safety of life and property through the use of wire and radio communications.

(9) In the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Congress authorized Parental Choice in Television Programming and the V-Chip. Congress further directed action on alternative blocking technology as new video technology advanced.

SEC. 3. EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE PARENTAL CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) RULEMAKING PROCEEDING REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall initiate a proceeding to consider measures to encourage or require the use of advanced blocking technologies that are compatible with various communications devices or platforms.

(b) CONTENT OF PROCEEDING.—In conducting the proceeding required under subsection (a), the Federal Communications Commission shall consider advanced blocking technologies that—

(1) may be appropriate across a wide variety of distribution platforms, including wired, wireless, and Internet platforms;

(2) may be appropriate across a wide variety of devices capable of transmitting or receiving video or audio programming, including television sets, DVD players, VCRs, cable set top boxes, satellite receivers, and wireless devices;

(3) can filter language based upon information in closed captioning;

(4) operate independently of ratings pre-assigned by the creator of such video or audio programming; and

(5) may be effective in enhancing the ability of a parent to protect his or her child from indecent or objectionable programming, as determined by such parent.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advanced blocking technologies'' means technologies that can improve or enhance the ability of a parent to protect his or her child from any indecent or objectionable video or audio programming, as determined by such parent, that is transmitted through the use of wire, wireless, or radio communication.

S. 639

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 ''ED 1.0 Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Education is a fundamental right for all Americans, regardless of ethnicity, socioeconomic background, or other factors.

(2) Minority-serving institutions historically have an important role in reaching underserved populations.

(3) Minority-serving institutions in economically disadvantaged areas face particular hardships in acquiring funds to sustain and expand their resources.

(4) Low-income areas are technologically underserved.

(5) Congress and the technological community should do all that they can to find new and creative ways to bridge the current technology gap.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

(2) ELIGIBLE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''eligible educational institution'' means an institution that is—

(A) a historically Black college or university;

(B) a Hispanic-serving institution as that term is defined in section 502(a)(5) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a(a)(5));

(C) a tribally controlled college or university as that term is defined in section 2(a)(4) of the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1801(a)(4));

(D) an Alaska Native-serving institution as that term is defined in section 317(b)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b)(2)); or

(E) a Native Hawaiian-serving institution as that term is defined in section 317(b)(4) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b)(4)).

(3) HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term ''historically Black college or university'' means a part B institution as that term is defined in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)).

SEC. 4. MINORITY ONLINE DEGREE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established within the National Telecommunications and Information Administration a pilot program to develop online educational programs of study within eligible educational institutions under which the Administrator shall award 4 grants to eligible educational institutions to assist the eligible educational institutions in establishing an online curriculum for undergraduate and graduate programs of study.

(2) GRANT NUMBER, DURATION, AND AMOUNT.—

(A) NUMBER.—The Administrator shall award a total of 4 grants under this section.

(B) DURATION.—Each grant under this section shall be awarded for a period of 6 years.

(C) ANNUAL GRANT PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—The Administrator shall make grant payments under this section in the amount of—

(i) $1,000,000 for the first fiscal year of a grant awarded under this section;

(ii) $600,000 for each of the second through fifth such fiscal years; and

(iii) $100,000 for the sixth such fiscal year.

(b) PRIORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this section the Administrator shall give priority to an eligible educational institution that, according to the most recent data available (including data available from the Bureau of the Census), serves a county—

(A) in which 50 percent of the residents of the county are members of a racial or ethnic minority;

(B) in which less than 18 percent of the residents of the county have obtained a baccalaureate degree or a higher education;

(C) that has an unemployment rate of 7 percent or greater;

(D) in which 19 percent or more of the residents of the county live in poverty;

(E) that has a negative population growth rate; or

(F) that has a median family income of $32,000.

(2) HIGHEST PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section the Administrator shall give the highest priority to an eligible educational institution that meets the greatest number of requirements described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (1).

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) MANDATORY CURRICULUM REQUIREMENT.—An eligible educational institution receiving a grant under this section shall use the grant funds to develop a curriculum that—

(A) leads to a baccalaureate or graduate degree;

(B) is focused on the needs and interests of working minority students in disadvantaged areas; and

(C) in the case of an online curriculum, strives to include a mix of—

(i) online lectures, including guest speakers;

(ii) reference material;

(iii) quiz and test preparation; and

(iv) class room participation.

(2) PERMISSIVE USES.—An eligible educational institution receiving a grant under this section may use the grant funds—

(A) to assist in establishing the technical capacity of the eligible educational institution to provide online or distance learning; and

(B) to develop curriculum, including pod broadcasts.

(3) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds made available under this section shall not be used—

(A) for any purpose other than a purpose associated with the direct costs incurred by the eligible educational institution in developing the curriculum or services described in paragraph (1) or (2); or

(B) for building expenses, administrative travel budgets, or other expenses that are not directly related to the costs described in subparagraph (A).

(d) MATCHING NOT REQUIRED.—The Administrator shall not require an eligible educational institution to provide matching funds for a grant awarded under this section.

(e) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 1 of each year, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report evaluating the progress, during the preceding fiscal year, of the pilot program assisted under this section.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include a description of each of the programs of study developed with the grant funds provided under this section, including—

(A) the date of the grant award;

(B) statistics on the marital status, employment status, and income level of students participating in a program of study assisted under this section; and

(C) the degree objectives of students participating in a program of study assisted under this section.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(A) $4,500,000 for fiscal year 2008;

(B) $3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2012; and

(C) $500,000 for fiscal year 2013.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

(g) LIMITATION ON USE OF OTHER FUNDS.—The Administrator shall carry out this section only with amounts appropriated in advance specifically to carry out this section.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DORGAN:

S. 684. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the management of the elk population located in the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to the Committee of Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last week I was in my State of North Dakota where we have a wonderful national park. It is named after Teddy Roosevelt. He is the conservation-minded President who established the National Park System. What a remarkable man he was. What a remarkable leader for this country.

We have a national park in the Badlands called the Theodore Roosevelt National Park. I picked up a newspaper to read that there are too many elk in the park, an overpopulation of elk, which is going to be a serious problem for the national park. The Park Service has had some discussion about what they might want to do to thin out or cull the elk herd in the national park. It has grown dramatically. They were talking in the newspaper article I read about considering hiring Federal sharpshooters to kill some elk and then use helicopters to remove their carcasses from the national park, for meat, I guess.

It occurred to me there are times when the Government is completely devoid of common sense. I understand the Park Service says there is a prohibition on hunting in the national parks. On the other hand, it seems to me if you are hiring Federal sharpshooters to kill elk, they are going to be hunting those elk. It would make a lot more sense, to me, for a limited opportunity for qualified hunters to be able to hunt the elk in cooperation with Federal and State authorities. You do not need Federal sharpshooters to be paid. You do not need helicopters to haul the carcasses out of the park. All you need are hunters with a pickup truck or two, and you will be fine.

Today I am introducing a piece of legislation that would allow the Park Service to allow local hunters in my State to work on a cooperative basis with the Federal and State authorities to thin that elk herd. Culling or thinning the elk herd, apparently, is a necessity. It is going to happen. The question is how. Do we spend a lot of money hiring sharpshooters and helicopters or do we do this in a commonsense way and allow hunters to go in, in a coordinated way and a careful way, to thin and cull that elk herd? It seems to me the latter is the better approach.