

on D.C. Act 13-233, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 1942, S.O. 98-21, of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7344. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled "Well Classification for Downhole Hydrocarbon/Water Separators; UIC Program Guidance #82"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7345. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire; Plan for Controlling Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators" (FRL #6532-2), received February 1, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7346. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL #6530-6), received January 28, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7347. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland, Post-1996 Rate of Progress Plan for Cecil County and Revisions to the 1990 Base Year Emissions Inventory" (FRL #6530-8), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7348. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan for the Baltimore Ozone Nonattainment Area" (FRL #6531-1), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7349. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Kern County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL #6529-4), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7350. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District" (FRL #6528-5), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7351. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and

Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Kern County, San Diego County, San Joaquin Valley Unified County Air Pollution Control Districts and South Coast Air Quality Management Districts" (FRL #6529-6), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7352. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Revisions to Performance Testing Regulation" (FRL #6527-2), received January 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7353. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, South Coast Air Quality Management District" (FRL #6529-1), received January 24, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7354. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia: Approval of Revisions to Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Portion" (FRL #6528-9), received January 24, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 2027. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to design and construct a warm water fish hatchery at Fort Peck Lake, Montana; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2028. A bill to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple, and discriminatory taxes on the Internet; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. ROBB, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S. 2029. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit telemarketers from interfering with the caller identification service of any person to whom a telephone solicitation is made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2030. A bill to authorize microfinance and food assistance for communities affected by the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2031. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit the

issuance of a certificate for subminimum wages for individuals with impaired vision or blindness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 2032. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to address the issue of mother-to-child transmission of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2033. A bill to provide for negotiations for the creation of a trust fund to be administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or the International Development Association to combat the AIDS epidemic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 2034. A bill to establish the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the service by members of the Armed Forces during such war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 2027. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to design and construct a warm water fish hatchery at Fort Peck Lake, Montana; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE FORT PECK FISH HATCHERY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2000

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Fort Peck Fish Hatchery Authorization Act of 2000. As you may know, the Fort Peck project was built in the 1930s to dam the Upper Missouri River. The original authorization legislation for the Fort Peck project, and subsequent revisions and additions, left a great many promises unmet. A valley was flooded, but originally Montana was promised increased irrigation, low-cost power, and economic development. Since the original legislation, numerous laws have been enacted promising increased recreational activities on the lake, and also that the federal government would do more to support the fish and wildlife resources in the area.

In this day and age, economic development in rural areas is becoming more and more dependent upon recreation and strong fish and wildlife numbers. The Fort Peck area is faced with a number of realities. First, the area is in dire need of a fish hatchery. The only hatchery in the region to support warm water species is found in Miles City, Montana. It is struggling to meet the needs of the fisheries in the area, yet it continues to fall short. Additionally, an outbreak of disease or failure in the infrastructure at the Miles City hatchery would leave the entire region reeling with no secondary source to support the area's fisheries.

We are also faced with the reality that despite the promises given, the State of Montana has had to foot the bill for fish hatchery operations in the area. Since about 1950 the State has been funding these operations with little to no support from the Corps of Engineers. A citizens group spanning the State of Montana finally decided to make the federal government keep its promises.

Last year the citizens group organized, and state legislation subsequently passed to authorize the sale of a warm water fishing stamp to begin collecting funds for the eventual operation and maintenance of the hatchery. I helped the group work with the Corps of Engineers to ensure that \$125,000 in last year's budget was allocated to a feasibility study for the project, and Montanans kept their end of the bargain by finding another \$125,000 to match the Corps expenditure. Clearly, we are putting our money, along with our sweat, where our mouth is.

Recreation is part of the local economy. But the buzzword today is diversity. Diversify your economy. The Fort Peck area depends predominately on agriculture. More irrigated acres probably aren't going to help the area pull itself up by its boot straps. But a stronger recreational and tourism industry sure will help speed things up.

A lot of effort has already gone into this project. A state bill has been passed. The Corps has dedicated a project manager to the project. Citizens have raised money and jumped over more hurdles than I care to count. But the bottom line is that this is a great project with immense support. It is a good investment in the area, and it helps the federal government fulfill one thing that it ought to—its promises.

Mr. President, I want to acknowledge that this legislation is still a work in progress and many of the specifics will change as the Corps completes its feasibility study on the project. It may cost slightly more. It may cost less. The cost share requirement may need to be altered to make the project work, but I feel this legislation must be introduced now to expedite its consideration.●

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2028. A bill to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple, and discriminatory taxes on the Internet; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTERNET NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Internet Non-Discrimination Act. The central principle of this bill is that our tax policy should not discriminate against the most vibrant part of our nation's economy. The legislation would extend indefinitely the Internet Tax Freedom Act's three-year moratorium on discriminatory taxes against the Internet

and electronic commerce. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Senators ABRAHAM and LEAHY.

Three years ago, when Congressman CHRIS COX and I introduced the Internet Tax Freedom Act (ITFA), we said you can't squeeze the new economy into a set of rules written for smoke-stack industry. At that time, opponents predicted that retailers would vanish from Main Streets across America. Transcripts from hearings held on the legislation in the summer of 1997 are replete with opponents' predictions that a parade of horrors would be visited on every small merchant in every town in the United States. I am pleased to report that none of the horrors has come to pass.

In fact, this is what has happened in the 15 months since the Internet Tax Freedom Act was passed by the Senate 98-2 and became law.

States and localities have continued to collect sales and use taxes, and state budgets ended fiscal 1999 with a \$35 billion surplus. In California—one of the most wired states—1999 sales tax collections are up 20 percent over 1998.

Traditional bricks and mortar retailers had one of their best holiday seasons, recording a nearly 8% jump in sales over the previous year.

A recent survey of 1,500 Main Street businesses nationwide found that 74 percent have gone online since 1997.

E-commerce has become part of the retail landscape, but still accounts for only 3/100s of one percent of total retail sales.

States with the highest level of Internet use are also those with some of the largest gains in tax revenues.

It is clear to me that while state and local tax collectors sat wringing their hands, America's merchants were working on web pages. Main Street merchants seized the opportunity to expand their sales to new markets by going online. They also recognized the efficiencies of conducting their business-to-business transactions online. Rather than weaken Main Street merchants, the Internet has strengthened them. Rather than drain state and local tax coffers, the technological neutrality of the Internet Tax Freedom Act allowed online business to grow and state and local authorities to continue to collect lawful, nondiscriminatory taxes. The technological neutrality of the ITFA contributed to the rapid transformation of a bricks and mortar economy into a clicks and mortar economy.

I want the success of the bricks and clicks economy to continue, but consumers and businesses need some certainty. They need to know they won't have to start paying new taxes targeted specifically at e-commerce when the current moratorium expires in October 2001. That's why the ban on discriminatory taxes against the Internet and e-commerce should be made permanent.

The Internet Non-Discrimination Act we are introducing today will do just

that. It continues the policy of technological neutrality. It allows state and local tax authorities to continue to collect lawful, nondiscriminatory sales or use taxes on online sales. It will give the governors time to see if they can move forward with their technological fix for collecting remote sales and use tax—a voluntary plan which will require the cooperation of every business in this nation, from Bandon, Oregon to Bangor, Maine. And, finally, it extends permanently a policy that has worked well for the last 15 months and under which consumers, businesses and state and local tax collectors have lived—and thrived.

In about two months the Advisory Commission on Electronic Commerce will issue its final report. After having talked yesterday with the Chairman of the Commission, Virginia Governor James Gilmore, I am hopeful that the Commission will endorse the approach we are taking in this bill.

If Congress does not act this year to extend the technologically neutral policy that is at the heart of the Internet Non-Discrimination Act, consumers and businesses will face thousands of tax authorities in this country jumping into their pockets when the current moratorium expires in October 2001. Consumers and businesses want certainty that they won't suddenly be facing an onslaught of new, confusing and discriminatory taxes.

A companion bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives today by Congressman CHRIS COX, with whom I've worked on this issue for four years now. I am hopeful that this, our fourth bipartisan Internet effort, will be as successful as our previous three. 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. 2028

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 "Internet Nondiscrimination Act".

SEC. 2. REPLACEMENT OF MORATORIUM WITH PERMANENT BAN ON NEW, MULTIPLE, AND DISCRIMINATORY TAXES ON THE INTERNET.

Section 1101(a) of title XI of division C of Public Law 105-277 is amended by striking "during the period beginning on October 1, 1998, and ending 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act" and inserting "on or after October 1, 1998."

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague, Senator WYDEN, in introducing legislation to extend indefinitely the current moratorium on new and discriminatory Internet taxes. Once again, Senator WYDEN has demonstrated his grasp of the crucial issues surrounding electronic commerce and has moved rapidly to assure that potential barriers to the new economy are eliminated before they do any harm. I am pleased to join him in his latest effort.

By now, it is obvious to everyone that e-commerce is the wave of the future. As a matter of fact, it's safe to say that the future is already here. During the week of December 6 alone, Americans bought \$1.22 billion of merchandise online. Sales for 1999 should reach \$64.8 billion. Beyond shopping, 5.3 million households had access to financial transactions like electronic banking and stock trading by the end of last year.

The rate of growth for Internet commerce has been exponential for the past several years. Unfortunately, it's also a tempting target for taxation by the Federal Government, States and localities. And that could slow the growth of e-commerce and of our entire economy.

We responded to this potential problem by passing Senator WYDEN's legislation in 1998, to place a three-year moratorium on new or discriminatory Internet taxes, fees or charges. That legislation also established a Commission to explore the issue of Internet taxation and to submit to Congress a list of recommendations on how the Federal Government should legislate in this area.

We are only halfway through the moratorium, but already it seems there are only two possible conclusions to the Commission. The first is that the wide differences of opinion within the Commission will make it impossible for the members to muster the majority of support necessary to submit a report. This is worrisome, Mr. President, because, unless action is taken by this Congress, the moratorium will expire and the door will be opened to new, discriminatory taxes on the Internet.

The other possibility, more recently offered, is that the Commission may actually recommend an extension of the current moratorium. Whatever the conclusion therefore, the role of Congress is clear; the Internet Tax Moratorium must be extended indefinitely. And because of the limited number of legislative days scheduled in this election year, the process of doing so should begin now.

As everyone knows, the current moratorium only precludes new and discriminatory taxes. It does not address the more difficult question of how to apply existing, State sales taxes to Internet transactions. The Supreme Court has spoken to this issue, ruling that States can indeed impose taxes on transactions much like Internet sales—namely catalog sales. However, States cannot force a business to collect sales taxes on purchases made to States where they have no physical presence or "nexus." This discrepancy in sales taxation between main street businesses and those that sell goods over the Internet will be difficult to address for the following reasons:

First, very soon every business will be an e-business in the sense that they will be using the Internet for sales, supplies, contracting and other purposes. We couldn't stop this process if

we wanted to, and we shouldn't want to. According to one recent survey, 74 percent of brick and mortar, main street businesses have added "click and mortar" Internet services to their business.

Second, the borderless nature of the Internet is going to make it difficult—if not impossible—to determine what constitutes "nexus." For example, what happens when someone in California uses America Online in Virginia to order fudge from the "shopmackinac" website in Michigan, and ships them to a friend in Rhode Island? Which State should claim "nexus"?

Perhaps a "destination-based" Internet sales tax regime would be more effective in terms of collecting State sales taxes. Whatever the eventual outcome, I believe that in light of the present uncertainty it would not be proper for Congress to intervene on this issue. The States must have every opportunity to debate and possibly even initiate a model for addressing the current impasse.

What is necessary is Congressional action to ensure that new, discriminatory taxes are not levied on the Internet by States or localities as a means of substituting perceived lost revenue. Many Governors—including Governor Engler of Michigan—support an extension of the current Internet tax moratorium.

Access fees and similar Internet taxes, whether imposed by the States, localities, or the Federal government, pose a grave threat to the continued evolution of the Internet. America is experiencing a record period of growth and prosperity. In my view, the continued expansion of the economy is due primarily to electronic commerce. The spirit of entrepreneurship which has energized our nation, the adoption of new business models to more fully explore marketing and sales possibilities and the dramatic increase in consumer and business services are all largely the product of our new e-economy. Why on earth would anyone, or any government, want to threaten this dynamic medium when it is still in its infancy by increasing the cost of doing business over the Internet? I certainly do not, and I will continue to work to ensure that neither the Federal government nor other units of government threaten electronic commerce.

If we are able to keep the government focused on removing impediments to electronic commerce rather than interfering in the development and implementation of new technologies then very soon the e-economy will simply be the economy, and our nation will be more prosperous as a result.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. ROBB, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. HOLINGS):

S. 2029. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit telemarketers from interfering with the caller identification service of any person to whom a telephone solicitation is made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE KNOW YOUR CALLER ACT OF 2000

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I'm pleased to join today with my friend from Tennessee, Senator FRIST, to introduce the Know Your Caller Act of 2000—a bill that will make a real and immediate difference in the lives of all Americans.

Not a week goes by that I don't hear from Virginians about the intrusion of telemarketers into their homes. Although Congress passed the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, or TCPA, in 1991, the law is widely abused—telemarketers openly disregard the law, refusing to identify themselves when asked, and ignoring requests to be placed on "do not call lists."

In recent years, consumers have turned to caller ID services to help them screen out unwanted calls and report those who violate current law to the authorities. Unfortunately, most telemarketers actively block their number from being displayed on caller ID systems, making it difficult to determine the name and employer of the telemarketer. We already require telemarketers to identify themselves when they call, and we should apply this same requirement to their caller ID information.

The Know Your Caller Act of 2000 will prevent companies from blocking their identities on caller ID. Our legislation will require every phone solicitor to reveal the name of the telemarketer who is making the call, as well as a valid telephone number where that company can be reached for purposes of being placed on the do-not-call lists required under current law.

It's time that we gave consumers a way to fight back against these intrusions into their homes, and this bill is the perfect way to do so: by putting an end to caller ID blocks, we can empower the consumer to take action against violators of the TCPA and regain control of their telephones. I urge all of my colleagues to join Senator FRIST and me in supporting this important consumer protection bill.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 2032. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to address the issue of mother-to-child transmission of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MOTHER-TO-CHILD HIV PREVENTION ACT OF 2000

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce, along with my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD, the Mother-to-child HIV Prevention Act, a bill that seeks to address mother-to-child transmission of HIV in developing regions of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

According to the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), nearly 4.5 million children below the age of 15 years have been infected with HIV since the AIDS epidemic began. More than 3 million have already died of AIDS. Children are becoming infected at the rate of nearly one child every minute, and the overwhelming majority of these children acquired the infection from their mothers.

In July 1999, the National Institutes of Health released a report on the effectiveness of a drug called nevirapine (NVP) in preventing mother-to-child transmission of HIV. NVP is given just once to the mother during labor and once to the baby within three days after birth. It costs \$4 per tablet. The discovery of this relatively simple and inexpensive drug regimen—along with others like it—has created an unprecedented opportunity for international cooperation in the fight against the vertical transmission of HIV.

USAID is currently engaged in four of the eleven vertical transmission pilot projects in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. These studies will be completed within the year, at which point the intervention programs can undergo a significant increase in scale. But additional funding is needed.

The cost-effectiveness of these programs is clear. New antiretroviral drug strategies can be a force for social change, providing the opportunity and impetus needed to address long-standing problems in the health care system and the profound stigma associated with HIV-infection and the AIDS disease.

Naturally, primary prevention strategies should remain the top priority in the fight against AIDS, which is why I am requesting these funds in addition to our current efforts. This legislation would give the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) an additional \$25 million every year—for the next five years—to address the growing international dilemma of child victims of the AIDS epidemic.

Mr. President, this bill has the potential to improve the lives of hundreds of thousands of children whose lives are marred by this disease. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I urge its swift passage into law.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 2034. A bill to establish the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE CANYONS OF THE ANCIENTS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA ACT

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that will help ensure that priceless public lands, including the Yellow Jacket Canyon in the Southwestern corner of my beautiful home state of Colorado, are preserved and managed in the most farsighted and balanced manner possible.

I have developed this legislation with the Department of the Interior and the

local government bodies. It successfully takes into account the concerns of all interested parties. The lands I hope we can protect were the home to a rich civilization before the existence of this hemisphere was known to the western world.

It is imperative we protect these lands now in a reasonable manner to recognize the historical, archeological and cultural value they hold. But, I do not believe we should lock these lands from the public. When public lands are suddenly grabbed away by executive decree it creates ill feelings and distrust.

The hardest hit are those people who live near the land, know it the best and whose livelihood is most connected to it. These are almost always hard working families. Elected local and state governments are also losers. Land grabs seriously erode the very tax base that enables towns, counties and states to provide the services the people need, including schools, law enforcement, and fire protection. Finally, participatory democracy, our nation's bedrock, also loses when an executive decree is used to end run the American people and those they have chosen to represent them in Congress.

Through close consultation with the acting BLM director, Tom Fry, I have drafted a bill which should take into consideration the views of interested parties. I will submit for the record at the conclusion of my statement a number of letters from local organizations and elected officials who support this effort to designate a National Conservation Area. It will allow many of the area's current uses to stay intact while preserving the ancient treasures found there.

I consider the declaration of national monuments by this administration by executive order another example of restricting the use of more public land without working with Congressional delegations, local officials, and other interested parties, as was the case with the Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument designation in Utah.

My bill makes sure that the involved parties take part in land management decisions in Colorado. I am trying to ensure that all of the concerns of the people who live and work in the area are heard and addressed before any designation is made by the administration on these public lands.

My bill would require public hearings which would allow everyone involved from local ranchers, recreational users, and all local elected officials to be involved with preserving this area.

As I stated in a letter to Interior Secretary Babbitt on June 8, 1999, Coloradans do not want to see another Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument designation in Colorado. Secretary Babbitt in a letter to Mr. Ed Zink dated November 9, 1999, declared his intent to designating the Anasazi area a national monument by the authority of the Antiquities Act of 1906. My bill proposes a compromise to preserve this

area with local input, and avoid the heavy handed action of a monument designation by the President.

My legislation will create a National Conservation Area which will allow the historic uses to take place while efforts are made to conserve the area. I am introducing this legislation to alert the president and the secretary that the citizens in Southwest Colorado desire protection of the area but oppose an executive action that bypasses Congress. This can be accomplished through the legislative process with a hearing scheduled on my bill early this year during the second half of the 106th Congress.

Some in the administration will say that they are currently trying to work with the local community since they held a series of six scheduled town meetings on the proposed withdrawal. From the input that I have received, no one seems sold on the idea at the local level that a monument designation is the only option available to protect the ancient treasures in Southwestern Colorado.

The Southwest Resource Advisory Council was formed to bring forth a wide variety of issues to take into consideration before the Secretary of the Interior moves forward with his intended move to remove the public from the area. The report addresses everything from recreation and tourism to oil and gas development in the area which is how these small communities survive economically. In our efforts to preserve the culture of the area, we cannot continue to lock up all of our public land which so many small towns in the West depend upon.

Our small communities in Southwestern Colorado know how to be good stewards of the land and my bill allows everyone from the local citizens, the Department of Interior, and Congress to work in a collective effort to save this area for future generations.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2034

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 "Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that certain areas located in Dolores and Montezuma Counties, Colorado—

(1) contain unique and valuable historical, cultural, scientific, archaeological, natural, and educational resources; and

(2) should be protected and enhanced for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to establish the Canyons of the Ancients, Colorado, as a National Conservation Area.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CONSERVATION AREA.**—The term “Conservation Area” means the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area established by section 4(a).

(2) **COUNCIL.**—The term “Council” means the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area Advisory Council established under section 5(a).

(3) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term “management plan” means the management plan developed for the Conservation Area under section 4(e).

(4) **MAP.**—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Canyon of the Ancients National Conservation Area Proposal” and dated January 6, 2000.

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 4. CANYONS OF THE ANCIENTS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area in the State of Colorado.

(b) **AREAS INCLUDED.**—The Conservation Area shall consist of approximately 164,000 acres of public land in Dolores and Montezuma Counties, Colorado, as generally depicted on the Map.

(c) **MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a map and legal description of the Conservation Area.

(2) **FORCE AND EFFECT.**—The map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and legal description.

(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Copies of the map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in—

(A) the Office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management;

(B) the appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management in Colorado; and

(C) the offices of the county clerks of Montezuma and Dolores Counties, Colorado.

(d) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Conservation Area in a manner that—

(A) conserves, protects, and enhances the resources of the Conservation Area specified in section 2(a); and

(B) is in accordance with—

(i) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(ii) other applicable law, including this Act.

(2) **USES.**—The Secretary shall allow only such uses of the Conservation Area as the Secretary determines will further the purposes for which the Conservation Area is established.

(3) **VEHICULAR ACTIVITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and as needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport in the Conservation Area shall be permitted only on roads and trails designated for vehicular use under the management plan.

(B) **ACCESS TO LEASES.**—Nothing in this Act prohibits vehicular access to any oil, gas, or carbon dioxide lease by road or pipeline right-of-way.

(4) **WITHDRAWALS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights (including lease rights) and historic rights of access, and except as provided in subparagraph (B), all Federal land within the

Conservation Area and all land and interests in land acquired for the Conservation Area by the United States are withdrawn from—

(i) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(ii) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(iii) disposal under the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(B) **OIL AND GAS LEASING.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), nothing in this Act prohibits the leasing of oil, gas, or carbon dioxide (including resulting operations) within the Conservation Area under the mineral leasing laws.

(5) **HUNTING AND TRAPPING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), nothing in this Act affects hunting and trapping within the Conservation Area conducted in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations) of—

(i) the United States; and

(ii) the State of Colorado.

(B) **HUNTING AND TRAPPING ZONES.**—The Secretary, after consultation with the Colorado Division of Wildlife, may promulgate regulations designating zones where and establishing periods when no hunting or trapping shall be permitted in the Conservation Area for reasons of—

(i) public safety;

(ii) administration; or

(iii) public use and enjoyment.

(6) **GRAZING.**—The Secretary shall issue and administer any grazing leases or permits in the Conservation Area in accordance with the same laws (including regulations) and executive orders followed by the Secretary in issuing and administering grazing leases and permits on other land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(e) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a comprehensive plan for the long-range protection and management of the Conservation Area.

(2) **PURPOSES.**—The management plan shall—

(A) describe the appropriate uses and management of the Conservation Area in accordance with—

(i) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(ii) other applicable law, including this Act;

(B) incorporate, as appropriate, decisions contained in any other management or activity plan for the land within or adjacent to the Conservation Area;

(C) take into consideration any information developed in studies of the land within or adjacent to the Conservation Area; and

(D) give appropriate consideration to the historical involvement of the local community in the interpretation and protection of the resources of the Conservation Area.

(f) **NO BUFFER ZONES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There shall be no protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Conservation Area.

(2) **ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE CONSERVATION AREA.**—The fact that an activity on land or a use of land in the Conservation Area is not permitted inside the Conservation Area shall not preclude the activity on land or use of land outside the boundary of the Conservation Area (or, in the Conservation Area, on land that is privately held), consistent with other applicable law.

(g) **ACQUISITION OF LAND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may acquire non-federally owned land in the Conservation Area only—

(A) from a willing seller; and

(B) through purchase, exchange, or donation.

(2) **MODIFICATION OF BOUNDARY.**—On acquisition of land under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall modify the boundary of the Conservation Area to include the acquired land.

(3) **MANAGEMENT.**—Land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be managed as part of the Conservation Area in accordance with this Act.

(h) **INTERPRETIVE SITES.**—The Secretary may establish sites in the Conservation Area to interpret the historical, cultural, scientific, archaeological, natural, and educational resources of the Conservation Area.

(i) **WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this Act constitutes an express or implied reservation of any water right.

(j) **WILDERNESS ACTS.**—Nothing in this Act alters any provision of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) or the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) that applies to wilderness resources within the Conservation Area.

(k) **NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LANDS.**—Nothing in this Act affects the management of land that is within the Conservation Area and under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.

SEC. 5. ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish an advisory council to be known as the “Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area Advisory Council”.

(b) **DUTY.**—The Council shall advise the Secretary with respect to preparation and implementation of the management plan.

(c) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The Council shall be subject to—

(1) the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.); and

(2) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(d) **MEMBERS.**—The Council shall consist of 15 members, to be appointed by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) A member of or nominated by the Dolores County Commission.

(2) A member of or nominated by the Montezuma County Commission.

(3) 13 members residing in, or within reasonable proximity to, southwestern Colorado with recognized backgrounds reflecting—

(A) the purposes for which the Conservation Area was established; and

(B) the interests of the stakeholders that are affected by the planning and management of the Conservation Area.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

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

GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
STATE OF COLORADO, DENVER,
January 10, 2000.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: We are writing in support of your efforts to introduce National Conservation Area legislation to address the future of the BLM Anasazi ACEC in Southwest Colorado. Our support is predicated on legislation that addresses the concerns and recommendations outlined in the Working Group Report that was issued by the local ACEC Subcommittee and transmitted by the Southwestern RAC in August of 1999.

We are in agreement with the Montezuma County Commission that the Working Group Report provides the local consensus upon which to develop a legislative framework that addresses the protection of archaeological resources in a manner that protects critical multiple uses on BLM land, respects adjacent private property rights, and insures future opportunities for meaningful local involvement. The prospects for a constructive

and locally acceptable outcome through an open legislative process are far superior to a unilateral National Monument designation, which would be totally unacceptable to the local community.

We offer our assistance to you and the coalition that is emerging in support of a responsible and locally acceptable legislative resolution concerning the future of the ACEC in Southwest Colorado.

Sincerely,

MARK LARSON,
State Representative.
KAY ALEXANDER,
State Representative.
JIM DYER,
State Senator.

MONTEZUMA COUNTY,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Cortez, CO, December 13, 1999.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: We are writing to ask for your leadership in the drafting of National Conservation Area Legislation for the BLM Anasazi ACEC, most of which lies in Western Montezuma County. We ask that the NCA legislation be drafted in keeping with the summary report drafted by the ACEC Working Group.

After carefully considering the public input reflected in the Working Group Report, we have spent several months exploring our options. We have concluded that NCA Legislation is the only way to avoid a unilateral National Monument designation which would be totally unacceptable.

We are prepared to work with you and the Department of Interior in any way necessary to support the development and adoption of NCA legislation that is in keeping with the goals and concerns outlined in the Working Group Report.

Sincerely yours,

G. EUGENE STORY,
GLENN E. WILSON, Jr.,
J. KENT LINDSAY.

COLORADO FARM BUREAU,
Denver, CO, December 27, 1999.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: Colorado Farm Bureau, the state's largest farming and ranching organization, opposes the designation of the Anasazi Cultural Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) as a national monument. As an alternative, we encourage you to introduce legislation that would designate the Anasazi Area of Critical Environmental Concern as a National Conservation Area. After reviewing many options with our members, we feel that legislation to designate the area as a National Conservation Area would be in the best interests of farmers and ranchers in southwest Colorado.

Farm Bureau policy supports local communities, counties, landowners and cities must be allowed input into any designation of national monuments, national parks or conservation use areas as these designations change the current multiple use of public lands and adversely effect adjacent private property rights.

It is our understanding that a National Conservation Area designation would allow continued multiple use on these lands, a Farm Bureau priority. There would also be increased funding to the Bureau of Land Management to protect significant archaeological sites and develop a management plan. A designation would also allow for more local input and avoid a National Monument designation by the administration, which Farm Bureau is opposed to.

Colorado Farm Bureau would like to thank you for your continued support of multiple uses on public lands and offers any assistance in developing legislation. If you have any further questions, please contact Bob Frankmore, Director, National Affairs, (303) 749-7508.

Sincerely,

RAY CHRISTENSEN,
Executive Vice-President.

CLUB 20, "VOICE OF THE WESTERN
SLOPE, SINCE 1953,"

Grand Junction, CO, January 17, 2000.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: On behalf of the Board of Directors of CLUB 20, I would like to convey our support of legislation designating a National Conservation Area which will encompass the Anasazi ACEC. CLUB 20 has been following the efforts of Montezuma County and the BLM RAC group throughout their study process. Designation of the area to be protected needs to be done by legislation, not administrative directives!

CLUB 20 will make every effort to support you and our Montezuma County membership in attaining a legislative solution to the needs of the resource to be protected.

On February 8, 2000, our Natural Resources and Public Lands Committee will be meeting to review issues and recommend resolutions to our Board of Directors. If you feel it beneficial, I will recommend they take action on a definitive resolution that supports the National Conservation Area legislation.

Please keep us posted and let me know how we can help your effort. Thanks for your continued hard work on West Slope issues!

Sincerely,

STAN BROOME,
President.

COLORADO ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION—SIERRA CLUB—THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,

December 26, 1999.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: We are writing concerning the management of the Anasazi Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) in Southwest Colorado. As you know, Secretary Babbitt convened a working group of local interested parties to gather and compile public input on how the area should be managed so as to protect its plethora of archaeological sites and natural values. The ACEC contains not only the highest concentration of ancient Puebloan sites anywhere in the nation, but pristine wilderness values as well. We have long advocated for the designation of the Cross, Cahone, and Squaw/Papoose Wilderness Study Area (WSA) in the ACEC as wilderness, as the most effective way to protect these unique resources.

There are several options for protecting the area's resources that would provide real protection for sensitive sites, and maintain the region's traditional character. First, the Montezuma County Commission has proposed a draft budget for BLM management of the ACEC that significantly increases the funding for research, site preservation, NEPA analysis, and law enforcement. We think that this budget is a good starting point for discussions on how to adequately fund needed management by the BLM.

In addition, two protective designations for the area have been discussed: National Monument and National Conservation Area. We believe either of these could provide the needed management for the area if they provide strong protection for archaeological

sites from impacts of motorized recreation and oil and gas development. However, in deference to local concerns about increased impacts of tourism with a National Monument, our preference is for the delegation to work together on legislation establishing a National Conservation Area, including the designation of the above-mentioned WSA's as wilderness. We believe this represents the best middle ground mechanism for protecting the area's archaeological resources while also maintaining its rural character.

Wilderness designation for Cross, Cahone, and Squaw/Papoose Canyons would give the best protection to their archaeological sites, while allowing the continuance of traditional activities such as the grazing leases currently in effect. There would be little effect on oil and gas development in the area, since there has been no activity in the canyons, and any future development of existing leases could be accommodated with directional drilling from outside the wilderness boundaries.

Finally, we support Montezuma County's notion of funding part of BLM's management activities for the area through royalties from oil and gas production. Since oil and gas development represents some of the greatest impacts in the area, it stands to reason that some of the royalty funds should remain in the area and provide for its protection.

We urge you to consider these various approaches—increasing funding for management of the area, and designating a National Conservation Area, with wilderness status for the most pristine parts of the ACEC—as a workable solution that addresses local concerns as well as critical protection needs. We look forward to working with you on legislation to address all of these needs.

Sincerely,

JEFF WIDEN,
Colorado Environmental Coalition.

MARK PEARSON,
Sierra Club.

SUZANNE JONES,
The Wilderness Society.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the service by members of the Armed Forces during such war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE 50TH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President. This year will mark the 50th anniversary of America's effort in Korea to halt the spread of Communist aggression. Today, I am introducing a bill that is of great importance to me and the more than 1.5 million American men and women who so valiantly fought and supported the U.S. effort in Korea.

On June 25, 1950, the Communist North Korean military invaded South Korea, provoking a swift U.S. response. Two days later, President Truman ordered the intervention that eventually involved 22 nations. In the three years that the U.S. led this multinational force, more than 54,000 Americans gave their lives in the fight to preserve our freedom and democratic way of life. As many as 92,000 soldiers were wounded and more than 8,000 were left behind.

Despite this struggle and sacrifice, I can clearly remember as a young man,

returning home from my years in Korea, feeling as if no one knew that we had ever been gone. It was a harsh, painful conflict that America very quickly wanted to place well behind it. I knew then and understand now why Korea came to be known as "The Forgotten War."

If you visit the Korean War Memorial at the end of the Mall here in Washington, you will see the patrolling squad of 19 weary soldiers frozen in motion, their rustled ponchos and obstacles beneath them a testament to the harsh conditions and terrain that were endured each day of ground combat. On the adjacent granite wall, one will see the faint etchings of 2,400 unnamed faces of the men and women who contributed in the effort in so many different ways. Clearly displayed beyond these images is the message that so profoundly reminds us, "Freedom is Not Free."

Mr. President, the joint resolution that I introduce today marks the passage of these 50 years since the Korean War and recognizes its extraordinary significance in our history. Most importantly, it thanks and honors the brave men and women who fought so hard to defeat the spread of Communism and preserve our freedom and democracy. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution to recognize our nation's Korean War veterans and mark this historic anniversary.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 39

Whereas on June 25, 1950, Communist North Korea invaded South Korea with approximately 135,000 troops, thereby initiating the Korean War;

Whereas on June 27, 1950, President Harry S. Truman ordered military intervention in Korea;

Whereas approximately 5,720,000 members of the Armed Forces served during the Korean War to defeat the spread of communism in Korea and throughout the world;

Whereas casualties of the United States during the Korean War included 54,260 dead (of whom 33,665 were battle deaths), 92,134 wounded, and 8,176 listed as missing in action or prisoners of war; and

Whereas service by members of the Armed Forces in the Korean War should never be forgotten: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the historic significance of the 50th anniversary of the Korean War;

(2) expresses the gratitude of the people of the United States to the members of the Armed Forces who served in the Korean War;

(3) honors the memory of service members who paid the ultimate price for the cause of freedom, including those who remain unaccounted for; and

(4) calls upon the President to issue a proclamation—

(A) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the sacrifices of the members of the Armed Forces who served and fought in Korea to defeat the spread of communism; and

(B) calling upon the people of the United States to observe such anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 12

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 12, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the marriage penalty by providing that income tax rate bracket amounts, and the amount of the standard deduction, for joint returns shall be twice the amounts applicable to unmarried individuals.

S. 56

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers.

S. 116

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to establish a training voucher system, and for other purposes.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) 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.

S. 463

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 463, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the designation of renewal communities, to provide tax incentives relating to such communities, and for other purposes.

S. 469

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 469, a bill to encourage the timely development of a more cost effective United States commercial space transportation industry, and for other purposes.

S. 741

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 741, a bill to provide for pension reform, and for other purposes.

S. 1028

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to simplify and expedite access to the Federal courts for injured parties whose rights and privileges, secured by the United States Constitution, have been deprived by final actions of Federal agencies, or other government officials or entities acting under color of State law, and for other purposes.

S. 1128

At the request of Mr. KYL, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1128, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers, to provide for a carryover basis at death, and to establish a partial capital gains exclusion for inherited assets.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1196, a bill to improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes.

S. 1446

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1446, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an additional advance refunding of bonds originally issued to finance governmental facilities used for essential governmental functions.

S. 1795

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1795, a bill to require that before issuing an order, the President shall cite the authority for the order, conduct a cost benefit analysis, provide for public comment, and for other purposes.

S. 1921

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1921, a bill to authorize the placement within the site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial of a plaque to honor Vietnam veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam war, but as a direct result of that service.

S. 1941

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1941, a bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide assistance to fire departments and fire prevention organizations for the purpose of protecting the public and firefighting personnel against fire and fire-related hazards.

S. 1992

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. L. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1992, a bill to provide States with loans to enable State entities or local governments within the States to make interest payments on qualified school construction bonds issued by the State entities or local governments, and for other purposes.