

agencies are already required to maintain and update a baseline inventory of activities that could be performed by the private sector. S. 314 would largely codify current administrative policy.●

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT OF 1998

● Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I wish to engage my colleague, Senator DEWINE, in a colloquy.

I thank Senator JEFFORDS, and the other members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources for your collective efforts in passing H.R. 1385, the Workforce Investment Act of 1998. This bill promises to improve and revitalize our country's workforce system and will enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of our federal job training programs.

As you know, Texas has been in the forefront of the remaking its state and local workforce delivery system. Beginning in 1993, Texas created a system very similar to one embodied in HR 1385. As with this federal legislation, the new Texas system is based on the principles of local control, customer service, and consolidation.

In this regard, I commend you for recognizing in the bill the uniqueness and foresight of the Texas workforce system by providing flexibility in the bill for our state to fully implement its new laws.

Specifically, I understand that HR 1385 provides that Texas will be able to maintain use of its Human Resource Investment Council (known as the Texas Council for Workforce and Economic Competitiveness) as defined in Texas statute and regulation to fulfill the State Board requirements under Section 111. In addition, Section 117(I) provides that Texas will be able to maintain the Local Workforce Development Boards as defined in Texas statute and regulation to fulfill the Local Board requirements under Section 117. Section 189(I)(2) provides that Texas may maintain the current local workforce board areas as defined in Texas statute and regulation to fulfill the requirements under section 116, and that no other language in HR 1385 may be construed to force Texas to change the configuration of its 28 local workforce areas. Section 189(I)(3) provides that Texas may maintain its sanctioning process for local boards. Section 194(a)(1)(A) provides that Texas may maintain its current process and formulas for allocating funds under sections 127 and 132 to its local workforce boards and that Texas may maintain its current procedures for disbursing money that is allocated to local workforce boards. Section 194(a)(1)(B) provides that local workforce boards in Texas may maintain their disbursement processes and procedures for monies provided under sections 127 and 132. Section 194(a)(2) provides that Texas may maintain the procedure as defined in Texas statute and regulation through which fiscal agents are des-

ignated by local boards for monies provided under sections 127 or 132. Section 194(a)(3) provides that Texas may maintain its process by which local boards designate or select one-stop partners and one-stop operators, notwithstanding any requirements set forth in section 121. Section 194(a)(4) provides that Texas may maintain its requirements that service providers shall not be permitted to perform both intake and training services. Section 194(a)(5) provides that Texas may maintain the roles and functions of its state board (otherwise known as the Texas Council for Workforce and Economic Competitiveness) and that no requirements for elements of state plans shall be construed to force a role or function upon Texas' State Board that is inconsistent with Texas statute or regulation. Section 194(a)(6) provides that Texas may maintain the roles and functions of its Local Boards and that no requirements for elements of state or local plans shall be construed to force a role or function upon Texas' local board that is inconsistent with Texas statute or regulation.

Mr. DEWINE. The Senator is correct, and I, too, share your commitment to preserving the leading edge reforms Texas is implementing.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Senator. There is, however, one final item on which I request clarification. It is my understanding that the intent of Section 194(a)(4) is to allow Texas to limit providers to provide either intake or training services as defined under section 134.

Mr. DEWINE. The Senator is correct. It was the intent of the Conference Committee to allow Texas this specific flexibility with regard to intake and training providers.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Senator for his leadership and his assistance and cooperation in ensuring that the intent of this important bill is allowed to be carried-out according to specific state needs and laws.●

STATUS OF THE HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL

● Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, as we continue to celebrate the International Year of the Ocean, I would like to inform members of the status and efforts to save the endangered Hawaiian monk seal, the only seal endemic to the Hawaiian islands.

As you may know, the Hawaiian monk seal is one of three species of monk seal known in the world. The other two are the Caribbean and Mediterranean monk seal. The last Caribbean monk seal was sighted in 1952 and is thought to be extinct; the Mediterranean monk seal still survives, but barely, with a population of only 500-1,000 individuals. The rarity of the monk seal makes efforts to save the Hawaiian variety all the more urgent.

Monk seals belong to an order known as pinnipedia, which in Latin means feathery or flipper footed. This order in-

cludes seals, sea lions, and walruses. Walruses are not found in Hawaii because the weather is not cold enough for them to survive; sea lions are also not natural to the area. The only pinniped found in Hawaiian waters is a seal—the Hawaiian monk seal. Although, Hawaiian monk seals predominantly inhabit the Northwestern Hawaiian islands, including Kure Atoll, French Frigate Shoals, Laysan Island, Lisianski Island, Pearl and Hermes Reef, they are occasionally found in the main Hawaiian islands. In fact, the Hawaiian monk seal is one of only two mammals that are endemic to the Hawaiian islands, the other being the Hoary bat.

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) estimates that there is a population of approximately 1,200-1,400 Hawaiian monk seals. This is half of what the population was in the 1950s. Factors threatening this species include entanglement and consumption of marine debris, disturbance by humans and animals on pupping and haul out beaches, mobbing of females by males, and shark predation.

The NMFS is leading the effort to save the Hawaiian monk seal from further endangerment and ultimate extinction. Under federal law, the agency protects Hawaiian monk seals through education, research, and recovery programs. For example, NMFS has appointed a Hawaiian Monk Seal Recovery team to help with research programs, data analysis, population assessment, and addressing specific problems such as mobbing, human disturbance, and fishing line/net entanglement. The recovery team's mission is to eliminate the causes leading to the declining monk seal population and recommend how further efforts should be managed to stabilize and impede endangerment of this species.

Throughout the years, NMFS has monitored activity on primary breeding locations and taken appropriate actions to aid young monk seal pups and their mothers to a full and healthy life. In order to do this, NMFS has initiated recovery plans to protect females and their offspring from vicious male mobbing which occurs when adult male monk seals attack pups, juveniles, and sub-adult females, probably mistaking them for breeding females. Some of the efforts that NMFS has launched include removing weaned pups from the beach and placing them in enclosed pens until they are strong enough to be released on their own, relocating monk seal males from areas where they greatly outnumber females, and rehabilitating small abandoned pups until they can be released back into the wild.

NMFS also strives to decrease indirect and direct human activities that result in harmful occurrences, like a seal swallowing marine debris or entangling itself in fishing lines or nets. In order to accomplish the task of cleaning up beaches and ridding the