SENATE—*Tuesday, July 11, 1989*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 3, 1989)

The Senate met at 8:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable CHARLES S. ROBB, a Senator from the State of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

* * * *God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all.*—1 John 1:5.

Eternal God, perfect in truth, justice, holiness and love—whose "life is the light of men"—let the light of Your infinite perfection penetrate our hearts and pervade our environment. Let it illuminate our petty frauds and foibles, exposing false motives, pride, selfishness, greed, lust, envy. Help us to see ourselves as Thou dost see us in our trivial charades and facades. Purge us of all that is contrary to Your perfection. Let the light of Your truth condemn our lies—the light of justice condemn our inequities—the light of holiness our evil thoughts and words and ways. Liberate us from the tiny tyrannies which immobilize our desire and determination to fulfill our mandate as leaders and which deprive the people of the best our political process promises.

In His name who is the Light of the world. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 11, 1989.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES S. ROBB, a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ROBB thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order, the majority leader is recognized.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the time for the two leaders, there be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 9 o'clock, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess today from 12 noon to 2:15 p.m. to accommodate the party conferences.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, when morning business closes at 9 o'clock this morning, the Senate will go into the nomination of former Senator Chic Hecht to be Ambassador to The Bahamas. The vote will occur not later than 7 p.m. today.

Once the Senate completes its debate on the Hecht nomination, it is my intention to proceed to Calendar No. 130—that is S. 358, the legal immigration bill—and upon disposition of that matter, to proceed to Calendar No. 134, S. 1248, the refugee assistance authorization bill.

RESERVATION OF LEADERS' TIME

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my leader time, and I also reserve the leader time for the distinguished Republican leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now conduct morning business.

Mr. SANFORD addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD].

DO WE NEED ANOTHER ECONOMIC COMMISSION?

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. President, earlier this year the report of the National Economic Commission to the President and Congress was released without fanfare. The National Economic Commission was authorized by Congress, appointed by the President and congressional leaders in the House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans, and paid for by the taxpayers. The expectation was that these leaders would rise above partisan politics, and give the Nation an honest solution. They did not.

I was disappointed that a real solution was not proposed. A lot of us were disappointed, including members of the National Economic Commission. There was a very good minority report filed, but the majority report was a flop.

I was especially disappointed that after 11 months of deliberation, 11 months of carefully examining our current fiscal situation, that this Commission believes that Gramm-Rudman-Hollings is working. I am disturbed that this report called the Gamm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction targets "appropriate goals for budget policy over the next several years." That is nonsense, and everybody in Congress knows that it is.

The report continues to say: "These goals, if realized, * * * should result in a Federal deficit that continues to decline significantly." Anyone who has studied the budget 2 hours, let alone 11 months, knows this is a blatantly false and misleading statement. In short, this report of the majority is a copout. We should be disappointed that these distinguished leaders have shown not the least bit of political courage. They crumpled when challenged to lead. Even under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings calculations, our deficits are increasing.

Mr. President, we are not on the right track with Gramm-Rudman as the report of the National Economic Commission suggests. Our annual increases in the debt continue to climb. And furthermore, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings suggests that we are home free once we eliminate annual deficits.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

That procedure, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, is not eliminating annual deficits; it is simply covering them up. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings does not even recognize the constantly climbing national debt.

Last month I voted for the fiscal year 1990 budget resolution that was approved by the House and Senate. I felt it was important to support new Budget Committee chairmen in both the House and Senate. I thought it was important to support the new leadership in the Senate. I thought it was important to support a new President in the White House in his first effort to produce a budget. And finally, I thought it was important to support the bipartisan spirit and early participation of the President that developed this year in trying to resolve our problems, and besides, we had to have a budget, even one that covered up the deficit and debt, just to keep the Government going.

But the fact is, we are not better off with this budget resolution. We are not making any progress toward eliminating our annual deficits and reducing the Federal debt to a more manageable level. And we continue to use, some feel abuse, the Social Security Program in the process. Under this resolution we will increase our Federal debt by at least $264 billion. That is the unvarnished deficit—$264 billion. My guess is that our bottom line figure—our real deficit, the increase in the Federal debt—will exceed $264 billion in fiscal year 1990. We cannot afford to continue this deceit.

Do we need yet another economic commission to solve our problems, or can we manage this through budget reform and future budget resolutions? I would hope we could manage with the latter, and I think before summer's end we should have a better idea.

Mr. President, it is my hope that we can solve our problems through budget reform and budget debate in the House and Senate, working with the President. However, if we cannot, the new commission suggested by Mr. Zuckerman certainly deserves consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from U.S. News & World Report be printed in the RECORD.

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

DIVIDED WE FAIL

(By Mortimer B. Zuckerman)

The chief executive fiddles with the figures, in connivance with the auditors, to make 2 and 2 equal 5. He ignores a money-losing operation, concealing its losses until after the annual meeting, then siphoning money to this ailing division and hiding the transaction in financial terms by handling it off the budget. He assumes outlandish sales, then sells off capital assets to produce the revenue as if this were the equivalent of earned income. And worst of all, he risks the future of the company and the welfare of its employees by refusing to make the necessary investment in plant, equipment, R&D and worker training to be competitive in the marketplace.

Is there actually a business so craven and shortsighted? There is. It's called the United States government, and it is up to its neck in precisely these kinds of shenanigans in its mismanagement of the nation's fiscal policies—most recently illustrated by the agreement between Congress and the President on the federal budget.

Both sides proclaim that the 1990 budget meets the Gramm-Rudman deficit target of $100 billion. It does, if you believe in gremlins. The financial tricks are staggering, even by Washington standards. Some $2.2 billion is removed from the deficit by moving the Post Office subsidy off budget, as if spending the money in a different account is not the same as spending the money. Nearly $1 billion of farm subsidies for next year is put forward by one day, slipping it into fiscal 1989 in order to make fiscal 1990 look better. The budget projects selling $6 billion of federal assets and raising over $5 billion in taxes, but nobody has a clue as to which taxes. Underlying it all is a fault of seismic proportion—the simultaneous assumptions that the economy will grow faster than anyone thinks and, paradoxically, that interest rates will drop by 40 percent despite the high level of economic growth.

When the smoke finally clears, the Bush budget will break the Gramm-Rudman ceiling by at least $23 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office, and by at least twice that amount based on most Wall Street calculations. Once again, the folks who ritually condemn deficits—and in the 1980s, the list includes leaders of both parties—will have avoided making any of the hard choices about either spending or taxes. They know that federal deficits have absorbed roughly three quarters of the net savings of Americans through the 1980s, depriving the economy of the capital necessary to make the investment we need to compete in a tougher world. And they know we cannot grow our way out of this fiscal crisis. Why do they fail to act?

Because they also understand contemporary American politics. For most of the last 35 years, with the Republicans in the White House and the Democrats in control of at least the House of Representatives, the two parties have fought each other in the interests of their partisan goals. Far too often, the result has been gridlock.

In critical times, we need to find a way to get around the paralysis of political competition. The independent commission of distinguished leaders is one possible answer. Yes, the independent commission is something of a cop-out. But so what, if it achieves results? By definition, such commissions are controlled by people who do not face the voters and who thus provide political cover to those who do. Many European nations use multiparty commissions to deal with the major issues, and we in America are going to have to develop similar institutions to make coalition government work.

The National Economic Commission was set up to deal with the fiscal crisis, but it ran afoul of the 1988 presidential politics. Still, the fundamental idea is sensible, providing leaders of both parties pledged to support the commission's recommendations. Who might serve? Well, for a start, let's try Paul Volcker, former chairman of the Federal Reserve, and Howard Baker, former chief of staff to President Reagan, as co-chairs. Add Alice Rivlin, the former head of the Congressional Budget Office, Lane Kirkland, president of the AFL-CIO, Bob Dole and George Mitchell from the Senate and Tom Foley and Bob Michel from the House.

Commission building is a game anyone can play. Deficit deception is a game in which only the American people are the losers.

FLAG BURNING

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. President, I would like to address the President of the United States. Mr. President, I hope you will decide not to ask the Congress to amend the Constitution to stop flag burning, because that means we will have to amend the Bill of Rights. For more than 200 years we have never tinkered with the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, we love you, we love America, we love the flag, but we love the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights is the foremost document of freedom in the world. It is the shining light that keeps alive the dreams of the oppressed people of the world.

In this moment of justified anger about flag burning, we must not seek an answer by doing something we have never before done. We must not change the Bill of Rights.

There is no document like it in the world. It has become a sacred trust for all the world. We must not change the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, please seek another solution. We must not change the Bill of Rights.

I ask unanimous consent that certain editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Raleigh News and Observer, July 2, 1989]

NO REASON EXISTS TO TINKER WITH CONSTITUTION

(By Claude Sitton)

On Tuesday we celebrate the declaration that led to American independence, and that's as it should be. But we also should celebrate those rights that enabled us to keep that independence once it had been won. That is so because the most precious of those rights—that which keeps government from gagging those who would speak out against its abuses—is being tampered with, and for no good reason.

We have lived with the First Amendment as it was written for more than 200 years. Now, because one scruffy demonstrator burned a flag in a fit of protest and the Supreme Court held its nose and ruled the act within the bounds of law if not those of good taste and patriotism, these two centuries of testimony to the amendment's worth no longer suffice.

How can this be? One answer lies in the plight of a Republican president cursed by an Iran-contra scandal that will not down,

shamed by the exposure of wholesale influence peddling in the administration of which he was a part and plagued by the tyrannical acts of a Chinese runt who won't return the presidential phone call. What better way to divert the public from his predicament than to shout that Old Glory is under threat?

Old dogs don't learn new tricks. They just find new ways to play the old ones. And since the phony flap over the Pledge of Allegiance gave the Bush campaign such a good run up the gutter last year, why not conjure up another romp through the fevered swamps of jingoism?

Then there's the Democratic Congress, embarrassed by the ethical transgressions of some members, beset by factional strife and scared stiff of the ultra-conservative ayatollah among its membership. The dispute over the Supreme Court's decision give both Democratic and Republican members an irresistible opportunity to shore up their right flank with a cheap shot at the justices. And few senators and congressmen have the courage to pass it up.

No question, disrespect for the flag is deplorable. However, that which I see comes from residents who subject it to the vagaries of the weather and forget to lower it at sundown, men who flaunt it in their buttonholes and juveniles who wear it on their backsides.

I've never burned a flag and don't intend to. The closest I've come to seeing that occur happened when a Japanese Zero raked the mast of my LST with tracer fire while the ship was landing troops on a Leyte beach in the Philippines in World War II. In my book, flag-burners deserve about the same respect as pandering politicians who wave it to whip up the emotions of the mob for partisan purposes.

Nevertheless, given the "kinder, gentler" mood with which George Bush has blessed this country, these demagogues may well succeed in passing a constitutional amendment for ratification by state legislatures. Our ayatollahs no doubt are panting over the prospect this offers for posturing as defenders of the flag and portraying opponents as traitors. This, don't forget, is a time and place when Richard Nixon can serve as a money-magnet for a Tar Heel GOP fund-raiser, which raises the question of why the Republicans didn't just pass up the old Watergate coverup artist and raffle off a few HUD contracts?

Other than the politicians, about the only groups that can hope to profit from flag frenzy are the world exporters of junk and their American middlemen. No doubt Tokyo's entrepreneurs will dream of the old days. It was their factories that once supplied us with miniature flags and other patriotic trinkets instead of the Nissans and Toyotas that have put Detroit iron out to rust.

This dispute in no way pits right against left. After all, the Supreme Court's Scalia and Kennedy, the Senate's Humphrey and columnist Kilpatrick are hardly liberal pussycats and to a man they say the court's decision is constitutional. Instead, it arrays defenders of the Constitution against those who would let one demonstrator's insult to the Republican Party and his flag deceive us into carving up one of our highest statements of democratic principle.

That principle is embraced in the First Amendment, which provides that: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievance."

True patriotism, then, calls on us not only to celebrate the declaration of our independence next Tuesday and the rights that enabled us to keep it secure but also to consider what is needed now to protect those rights from the flag-wavers who would do them harm.

[From the Charlotte Observer, June 23, 1989]

FLAG-BURNING AND EXECUTIONS

EVENTS IN CHINA HELP PUT COURT DECISION IN PERSPECTIVE

On Wednesday the government of China carried out the first three death sentences against people involved in the demonstrations for democracy that were brutally crushed in Beijing more than two weeks ago. On the same day, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Constitution protects an American's right to burn the American flag as an expression of protest.

There could hardly be a starker illustration of the most fundamental meaning of freedom under law than the juxtaposition of those two events.

The Chinese executed three workers convicted of torching a train that had plowed through a barricade and killed six of their fellow demonstrators. But in the larger context of events in Beijing in recent weeks, that is hardly more than a technicality. Does anyone doubt that their real crime was their involvement in the protests, or that the government's real purpose in the flood of executions this week is to warn other citizens of the dangers of participating in the demonstrations? And the rush from arrest to execution was so swift that it mocked any meaningful concept of justice.

Meanwhile, a lot of Americans are deeply offended by flag-burning, and they ought to be. The flag represents so much struggle, so much sacrifice, so much hope, and most of all, so much freedom, that we ought to cherish it and be offended by its desecration.

The fact that the high court decision came on a 5-4 vote demonstrated just how emotional an issue it is. The case was not a difficult call intellectually. Part of what makes the flag so dear is that it symbolizes freedom of expression. So, while we are offended by any desecration of the flag, the greater desecration would be if that freedom of expression were denied in the case of flag-burning.

Yet four of the nine justices disagreed. In their dissents they quoted patriotic poetry, and one dissenting justice's voice was described as quaking with emotion as he read. While he was speaking for a court minority, he might well have been speaking for a majority of American citizens.

Perhaps the brutal crushing of demonstrations for democracy in China and the continuing oppression and execution of protesters there will help Americans understand and appreciate the court's controversial decision. It protects everyone's freedom to protest against the government, even by means that many people find offensive. That is perhaps the most meaningful freedom of all. Anything that denies it in the case of one form of expression threatens it in the case of every other form of expression.

[From the Raleigh News and Observer, June 29, 1989]

OTHER FLAMES TO FAN

The last flag-burning most Americans witnessed came over the airwaves in the Vietnam war protests of the 1970s. Even in those turbulent and torn times, it was a despicable act. It accomplished nothing and drew attention not to a cause, but to the shabby individuals involved on its fringes.

The American flag is not a symbol of war. It flies not just over military installations or political conventions, but in front of homes on Main Street, and at places like Arlington National Cemetery, where it represents the nation for which the brave made the ultimate sacrifice.

The flag is not partisan—liberals fly it with the same verve as conservatives, Republicans with the same goose bumps as Democrats.

But President Bush's call for a constitutional amendment that would prohibit desecration of the flag threatens to make Old Glory a purely political issue. It already has prompted much windy rhetoric from Capitol Hill, where members of Congress are stumbling over each other to get to the podiums for some stem-winding oratory on their close personal relationships with the flag.

In the meantime, the nation's business—cleaning the environment, improving education, nuclear arms reduction, dealing with the Soviet Union, responding to the trouble in China—gets stalled as attention wanders to a sure-fire campaign winner, standing up for the Stars and Stripes.

The emotion attached to the flag is pure and strong. Those who fought for this country, were wounded, or lost loved ones in defense of democracy—and for that matter, all Americans—have every right to wave it, defend it and let their anger be known when the symbol is abused. But those who would legislate respect for the flag underestimate it.

A conservative U.S. Supreme Court does not. It ruled that the First Amendment to the Constitution protects the rights of those who would burn the flag, just as it protects the freedoms of those from different cuts of cloth—racial, religious and ethnic—who make up the patchwork that is America.

President Bush can get on to other, tougher chores and accomplish more for the nation than leading the charge up Patriotic Hill. He needn't worry about Old Glory. She can take care of herself. Be it at full mast, half mast, torn, tattered or singed, it is still the flag, stronger and more enduring than any bum who would defile it.

[From the Raleigh News and Observer, July 4, 1989]

FREEDOM'S FOURTH, FOREVER

America marks the 213th anniversary of independence with fried chicken, apple cider, brass bands, family reunions, fireworks and, undoubtedly, a departed and perplexed Betsy Ross wondering what in the world is going on with the red, white and blue descendants of her hand-sewn creation.

The Fourth of July celebrates the Declaration of Independence, this nation's birth certificate. More important to the independence of contemporary Americans are the freedoms embraced by the precious Bill of Rights, which The News and Observer traditionally honors by reprinting on this page.

Tumult around the world shows just how important those rights are—to good govern-

ment, and to the hearts of freedom-lovers everywhere. The Soviet Union wrestles uncomfortably with democracy, with Mikhail Gorbachev finding it a raucous process. China learns the costs of suppression as its image grows tarnished, and the families of those killed in the battles there learn the costs of freedom in a far more devastating way.

Why do they argue, why do they fight—these peoples who were so long complacent with a way of life? Because they have tasted freedom—little freedoms granted them by a begrudging leadership out of fear of revolt or economic collapse. And once there is a taste, nothing else is quite as satisfying.

The uprisings abroad ought to rekindle American patriotism, and shake the cobwebs off rights too often taken for granted. The Soviets and the Chinese want a voice; Americans have had it for over 200 years. Peoples around the world seek the right to vote; Americans have it, but exercise it haphazardly. In other countries, there is little freedom to work for a fair wage and spend the earnings as one wishes; Americans do it every day.

On this grand old day, America finds itself astir over the grand old flag. The Supreme Court has said that flag means freedom—even when that freedom is abused by some to burn Old Glory.

The argument has boiled to the point where President Bush pushes to make burning of the flag unconstitutional, where members of Congress threaten to trample one another en route to the bandwagon. It is a peculiar dispute, for in all the parades today, in all the marches, at all the fireworks displays, few if any flags will burn. And Southerners, in particular, cannot help but note the long-standing practice among some self-appointed patriots of burning another potent symbol—the cross.

Instead of worrying about the red, white and blue, which will endure petty insults, Americans could better spend time thinking about the Chinese and the Soviets and the repressed peoples of the Third World, who think not, dream not, of symbols, but of freedom itself. They yearn to breathe free, just as Americans did before they broke the yoke of a king.

America should share that yearning still, celebrate it, contemplate it and appreciate it. Think of that, then, at today's parade or at the family picnic. Aunt Martha's chicken may have some gristle, Grandma's rice may be sticky, and the cake may be a little dry. But freedom always tastes sweet.

[From the Winston-Salem Journal, June 29, 1989]

AMENDMENT IS WORSE—BURNING FLAG A BAD IDEA

There is a difference, one that appears to be lost on many Americans, between impassioned condemnation of the act of burning the American flag and calling for a constitutional amendment to prohibit that act.

Most Americans would never dream of burning the flag, and bristle at the notion that it is constitutionally condoned. Burning the flag is thumbing your nose at the country. Maybe it isn't flawless, but what better place is there on the face of the earth than the good, old United States of America? Most Americans would quickly answer, "None!"

But one of the reasons that the United States is so treasured by its citizens—indeed, the primary reason—is that power flows from the governed to the governors and not the other way. The individual is not a servant of the state; the states serve the people. That makes the individual special. That makes you special.

To accommodate this individuality, the United States has devised laws that are broadly tolerant of differences between individuals and permit free expression of those differences. Americans can disagree openly with their government, without fear of reprisal from the state.

It is to be hoped, of course, that such disagreement will be civil, reasoned, even constructive. But faced with My Lai, Watergate and a host of other scandals that seem to deny what most people believe the American flag stands for, it is not inconceivable that a flag burning in protest of what is seen as anti-American behavior in government could be understood as a patriotic act. That doesn't mean it is a patriotic act, but the intention may be.

Would you criticize an American during the Revolution for burning a British flag? How about just before the hostilities were declared?

What is sacred here is an ideal, not a piece of cloth. When we lose sight of the ideal, as it is embedded in the Bill of Rights and the words from the Gettysburg Address about "government of the people, by the people and for the people," the piece of cloth may remind us. But it may also symbolize, for some, the losing sight.

A constitutional amendment prohibiting the burning of the flag is a bad idea. Just because burning the flag is a bad idea doesn't mean there ought to be a constitutional amendment prohibiting it. Such an amendment would diminish the value of the flag as symbol of the American ideal and probably would do little, if anything to protect the flag from occasional burning.

One suspects that among the most vehement supporters of an amendment forbidding flag burning would be members of the Ku Klux Klan. Most of them would miss the irony in the comparison between a burning flag and a burning cross.

Mr. SANFORD. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND].

MICHAEL ALAN WOODS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant and a very good friend, Michael Alan Woods. His loss is one which his family and friends feel most deeply. In addition, all of us who have followed his career in public service recognize that this country has lost an outstanding public servant who had the potential to contribute so much more to his nation and to less fortunate people throughout the world, whom he was dedicated to serving.

Most recently, Alan has served as Administrator of the Agency for International Development. At the age of 43 he had already established a long record of public service.

Alan grew up in Mexico, MO, where he graduated from Mexico High School. It was there I got to know Alan as we played tennis together and talked.

As I recall, Alan did not have a great deal of natural tennis ability but he had the desire. As he told my distinguished senior colleague, Senator DANFORTH, he believed that playing tennis would give him an opportunity to see the world; our town tennis team traveled to places like Moberly, Marshall, Columbia, and Jefferson City, MO. But as Senator DANFORTH said at the memorial service for Alan, his horizons soon expanded beyond central Missouri.

When he went on to higher education at Park College near Kansas City, MO, his hard work enabled him to play No. 3 on the college tennis team. Before he graduated from college, his interest in and commitment to public service led him to take a position with Congressman Bob Ellsworth, of Kansas. His horizons continued to broaden and he moved to Washington, where he graduated from American University.

In 1968 he served as press aide to Richard Nixon during the 1968 Presidential campaign and was appointed by President Nixon as Assistant Press Secretary.

In 1970 he came home to Missouri to run my successful campaign for State Auditor and then returned to Washington to serve as vice president of Bradley Woods and Co., a political and economic research firm.

After the 1972 election, he came back to Missouri once again to serve as my chief of staff in the Governor's office in 1973 and 1974. In 1974 he went back to Washington to serve as Deputy Director of the Personnel Office in the White House of President Ford. In 1975 he moved to the Pentagon to serve as civilian chief of staff and senior adviser to the Secretary and was confirmed in 1976 as Assistant Secretary of Defense.

With the change of administration in 1977, he again entered the private sector as Vice President of DJA International, where he was responsible for defense and civilian aerospace activities. He was also briefly vice president for technology at Sears World Trade, where he took the highly unusual step of recommending that the company abolish his particular division and thereby his job. He served thereafter as President of International Services Corp., a consulting and international marketing firm. In the fall of 1985, he was nominated by President Reagan and confirmed by the Senate as Deputy U.S. Trade Representative where he was responsible for sectoral trade negotiations affecting manufacturing, agriculture and service industries. At the USTR he was the lead negotiator with Canada on lumber and also on United States market access to Portugal and Spain.

In the fall of 1987 he was nominated by President Reagan and confirmed for the position of Administrator at AID where he promoted market-ori-

ented economic policies, believing they and free and open trade held the key to progress in developing countries.

In June of last year when he returned from a trip abroad he learned that he had contracted cancer of the colon which had spread to the liver, but despite the physical pain and trauma of his illness, he remained committed to his mission of improving U.S. foreign aid programs. In November of 1988, President-elect George Bush asked him to continue in his position at AID.

Earlier this year, under his direction, AID released a report, "Development in the National Interests: U.S. Economic Assistance into the 21st Century." That report argued that what can be accomplished with foreign aid is limited when recipient countries pursue inappropriate economic policies. Despite the progress of the disease he continued to urge concentrating U.S. aid assistance on sustainable development, making that appeal in one of his last appearances at Park College, where he served on the board of trustees and was awarded an honorary doctor of law degree. He argued that aid should be a temporary bridge to private support and self-sustained growth.

Throughout his distinguished career, Alan remained devoted to his hometown of Mexico which this January gave him the Mexico Area Chamber of Commerce Ambassador Award, for the Mexican who brought great statewide and national credit to the Mexico area.

During the times I talked with him in his last year, he rarely mentioned his illness but talked about the challenges of helping and serving others.

When it appeared that the treatments being provided him at NIH were not succeeding in countering his illness, he pursued a nontraditional treatment with a doctor in New York in whom he had great trust. It is typical in my view of Alan that this spring he was expressing his greatest enthusiasm and excitement that his doctor had discovered a new and better means of treating AIDS. He was greatly encouraged by the hope that the suffering of others could be alleviated by this breakthrough.

Alan loved people and was a devoted and loyal friend. During the course of his final illness, he and his family received great comfort from the many friends from all walks of life who showed their friendship and support.

President Bush called Alan "a personal and professional friend who served his country with compassion and distinction. Alan was committed to focusing AID's work on promoting growth in developing countries. He cared deeply for those people around the world who needed our help."

That statement clearly captures the essence of Alan Woods' life and service.

A former colleague, good friend, and now nationally syndicated columnist Ken Adelman wrote:

> In an age of scandal mongering, with Washington awash with slurs of skullduggery, Alan stands as a shining symbol of what is right about those who serve.

Adelman stated that the story of Alan Woods shows that America is great since those who serve are generally good. He closed his tribute to Alan with a quote from elegy for a man:

> Leave nothing to repent, richly did he live, prodigal of life he spent all that life could give.

Also as a tribute to Alan, Carol Adelman succeeded in dedicating the July 2 meeting of the Philippines Consultative Group in Tokyo to the ideas and ideals for which Alan gave the last full measure of his devotion. She summed up Alan's life with two quotes:

> "Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm," wrote Ralph Waldo Emerson. Though short, Alan's life was filled with enthusiasm, as he lived for ideas. "Ideas," said John Stuart Mill, "are one of the chief elements of social power since what men think determines how they act."

His hometown newspaper, the Mexico Ledger, said:

> Few individuals feel the call to public service as strongly as Alan Woods did. Fewer still are capable of sustaining Mr. Woods' high level of service to their country.
>
> That is one of the many tragedies surrounding Mr. Woods' death Thursday after a long battle with cancer. * * *
>
> Alan Woods accomplished so much in his 43 years. His future was full of promise for still more contributions to his Nation.
>
> The measure of a man's life is sometimes taken by the sense of loss at his passing.
>
> Alan Woods loss is felt so deeply because he had made his life so meaningful.

In his honor his many friends in Mexico have established the Alan Woods Memorial Scholarship for International Affairs. It is our hope that the scholarship fund will encourage students who come from Alan's hometown to show the same concern and commitment for a world community which Alan exhibited. Also, his beloved Park College is establishing a new Alan Woods International Business Management Program. This program will focus on foreign languages and an understanding and appreciation of the cultures in other countries. I can think of no finer tribute than to honor his memory by providing opportunity for future generations of students who study and learn the area of service to which Alan was so dedicated.

Our sorrow over his passing and tremendous loss his young family has experienced cannot be lessened. Our hearts, our prayers, and our friendship go out to his lovely wife, Cameron Derby Woods, who served this body in the Sergeant of Arms office, and to his young daughters, Alexandra and Caroline, and to his parents, Darlene and Donald "Smokey" Woods, of Mexico, MO.

For all of Alan's many friends, his example of friendship and service will live in our hearts forever. As a friend he was always there when we needed him and he was always ready to put his own self-interest second to the needs of others. He believed passionately in the goals of public service he pursued and he never let his travail interfere with his pursuit of noble objectives.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD tributes of Alan Woods.

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

A TRIBUTE TO ALAN WOODS

(By Carol Adelman, Philippines Consultative Group Meeting, Tokyo, July 2, 1989)

Before we begin the formal sessions of this Consultative Group Meeting, I would like to say a few words about my good friend, Alan Woods.

Alan died last Thursday. He had battled cancer ferociously but he died peacefully.

He was born and raised in Mexico, Missouri—a very small town in America's Midwest. Who knows what took him to the East Coast to enter the fast track of politics, government, and business. His mother told me last week that when he left, she knew Alan was on his way to a different life for good.

He had an amazing varied career: politics, public relations, business, defense, trade, foreign aid. He did a lot of things well. But it was to government and public policy that Alan gave his most time and attention.

In contrast to his predecessors, Alan worked to change systems. James Baldwin said, "The world is before you, and you need not take it or leave it as it was when you came in." And this he did with his dedication and work to overhaul the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. He worked to reorient foreign aid to support sustainable development through broad-based economic growth. His report, "Development and the National Interest," lays down a marker for the international donor community to look carefully, as he did, at the experience of those countries that have developed through the right policies and free institutions, not simply large foreign aid transfers.

"Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm," wrote Ralph Waldo Emerson. Though short, Alan's life was filled with enthusiasm, as he lived for ideas. "Ideas," said John Stuart Mill, "are one of the chief elements of social power since what men think determines how they act."

As all of you know, Alan was committed to those same ideas we have been discussing together here in our partnership for development and democracy in the Philippines. I hope you will join with me in dedicating this Consultative Group Meeting to the ideas and ideals for which Alan gave the last full measure of his devotion.

[From the Washington Times, July 6, 1989]

A SHINING EXAMPLE OF SERVICE

(By Ken Adelman)

The story line is frightfully familiar: A gifted youth leaves small-town America to

serve his country, only to be struck down in his prime.

Still, the story of M. Alan Woods—head of our huge overseas development program, who died last Thursday of cancer—shows again how America is great since those who serve are generally good.

In an age of scandal-mongering, with Washington awash with slurs of skulduggery, Alan stands as a shining symbol of what's right about those who serve.

For above all, Alan Woods was a good person. He had to be, hailing from the minitown of Mexico, Mo., and reared on old-fashioned values. As a colleague wrote upon his death, "Alan Woods loved America. He loved to watch the Color Guard of the U.S. Armed Forces present arms and to hear the Marine Band play."

After completing a few years at Park College, Alan headed for Washington, D.C. He told the hometown folks he was off for one semester at The American University. But his father knew better.

Alan took to Washington like a duck takes to water. He took his first dip in politics, after graduating from The American University, as press aide to Richard M. Nixon during his 1968 campaign. Funds were scarce at first, so Alan slept nights in the bathtub of the candidate's New York apartment.

Hardship turned into glory as Alan entered the White House press office to handle press for foreign presidential trips.

As Alan moved up, he never puffed up. He stayed the Man from Mexico, Mo., through key posts, one as the youngest assistant secretary of defense in history. That's when he and I first worked together, under remarkably capable, though hard-driving Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld.

And that's when I observed Alan's keen judgment, incredible integrity and can-do spirit. His cheerfulness was infectious, his competence staggering for a 30-year-old. Alan's ego never got in the way of solving any problem pitched his way.

After returning to Missouri to run two successful compaigns and the governor's office for now-Sen. "Kit" Bond, Alan headed back to Washington. President Ronald Reagan wisely chose him as deputy U.S. trade negotiator and then administrator of the Agency for International Development.

President George Bush wisely asked Mr. Woods to stay in charge of the $6 billion foreign aid program, to which he gave the last full measure of his devotion.

He again remained the Man from Missouri with its "show me" approach. He searched to learn and then to teach, not what made poverty but made prosperity.

The result was his historic contribution, the Woods Report, laden with facts and figures to distinguish development from welfare. As Mr. Woods explained, the United States "needs to concentrate our scarce foreign aid resources on sustainable development—not just the giving of aid. Government-to-government aid should be a transitory bridge to private flows and self-sustained growth."

Typically Woodsian, he did not rest on the laurels of that widely acclaimed report. Ideas have consequences. Path-breaking intellectual work beckons action. So Alan embarked on a rewrite of the aid legislation, which has grown topsy-turvy over the years to become a themeless pudding.

No greater legacy could be bestowed than to have the Woods Act implement the Woods Report. This Alan could not achieve since he then took on a tougher challenge.

One day I visited Alan when he was hospitalized for colon problems. He was cheerful as ever. As I began to leave, he mentioned that tests he just received showed some signs of cancer.

I was bowled over. Alan wasn't. It was another thing to fix, another battle to wage, another job to do. Grit, not remorse, filled his face.

Strangely, Alan's life seems complete, even though he was only 43 when he left. For he lived two years for every one he was given. "Be life long or short, its completeness depends on what it was lived for," Longfellow wrote.

For us, the pain of losing a friend who had a vibrant wife and two little girls, a toddler and a 2-year-old, stings. But Alan still lives on Earth in the acts of goodness he performed and in the hearts of those who cherish his memory.

In short, Alan still lives on Earth in ways that really count. As his hometown paper, the Mexico (Missouri) Ledger, editorialized, "Alan Woods' loss is felt so deeply because he had made his life so meaningful."

There's no better way to leave Alan than to quote "Elegy For a Man":

Leave nothing to repent
Richly did he live.
Prodigal of life, he spent
All that life could give.

[From the Mexico (MO) Ledger, June 30, 1989]

ALAN WOODS DID MUCH IN HIS 43 YEARS

Few individuals feel the call to public service as strongly as Alan Woods did. Fewer still are capable of sustaining Mr. Woods' high level of service to their country.

That is one of the many tragedies surrounding Mr. Woods' death Thursday after a long battle with cancer.

His resume was impressive: a congressional assistant, assistant press secretary to President Nixon, chief of staff to then-Gov. Christopher Bond, assistant secretary of defense, vice president for technology of Sears World Trade, deputy U.S. trade representatives and director of the Agency for International Development (AID).

But more impressive than his resume was the consistent quality of contributions he made at each level he served.

In Missouri government, he was a key figure in implementation of the state's reorganization efforts. As vice president of Sears, he had the courage to recommend the elimination of his own job. As deputy U.S. trade representative, he was a strong advocate of open trade policies. As administrator of AID, he was pressing Congress to revamp the law governing foreign assistance, urging that U.S. aid be considered a "temporary bridge" toward self-sustainable growth in recipient nations.

Along the way, at every post, Mr. Woods expressed pride in his hometown, Mexico, Mo. And behind the scenes he played a quite, but important, role in assuring his hometown would continue to grow and prosper.

He had many special skills; however, one was his hallmark. He was a dedicated Republican, but master of the art of bipartisanship. As one of his associates said, he had a "very likeable way of disagreeing without being disagreeable."

Alan Woods accomplished so much in his 43 years. His future was full of promise for still more contributions to his nation.

The measure of a man's life is sometimes taken by the sense of loss at his passing.

Alan Woods' loss is felt so deeply because he had made his life so meaningful.

Mr. BOND. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KOHL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. HARKIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1282 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

RURAL HEALTH CARE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to share with the Senate several articles that appeared recently in the Salt Lake Tribune. These articles provide a summary of the challenges that are facing rural hospitals and care givers. There are also examples of innovation and dedicated service.

I hope placing these articles into the RECORD will generate a heightened awareness of the challenges that are facing health care delivery services in rural areas. There is a real threat facing those who live in rural areas, predominately the elderly and disadvantaged residents.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

LIFEFLIGHT PLANE HELPS S. UTAH

(By Anne Palmer)

ST. GEORGE.—The sound of a helicopter flying low overhead signals a bad accident on the Wasatch Front, and the racket is sometimes a nuisance.

But consider living in Pioche, Nev., or having an accident on Lake Powell, where residents haven't had the luxury of that nuisance. Until this month, when a fixed-wing air ambulance was acquired by Dixie Medical Center, a bad accident in southern regions meant a long ambulance ride over rough highways to St. George.

Officials at Dixie Medical Center expect that situation to be remedied with the dedication of a Cessna 441 Conquest II capable of landing on short, hot runways, at high elevations. A flight team will be available at all hours.

The ambulance's first flight was May 3, and since then, nine emergency transports have been made. Hospital officials expect three or four emergency flights each week. They estimate that half those transports will be bringing patients from outlying areas to Dixie and half will be taking patients from Dixie to Northern Utah facilities for

neurological, neonatal or specialized cardiac care.

"This is a new thing for rural care, and with all the bad things that have been snowballing in rural medicine, this is incredible," said Lifeflight coordinator Kim Jensen.

Dr. Steven Van Norman, director of emergency services, maintains the new capabilities will dramatically improve pre-hospital trauma care, speeding transport to Dixie and reducing by half the time it takes to get a critically injured patient to a tertiary care center. Lifeflight will serve communities in southern Utah, eastern Nevada and northern Arizona in a 2,000-mile region.

The service will be integrated with the expert Lifeflight network based at LDS Hospital. Both are Intermountain Health Care facilities.

Need for the service is obvious, said Dr. Van Norman.

"A CT scan costs $1 million, and at that price there's a limit on how much of that technology you can provide. One way to give people better health care is instead of taking technology to them, to have a way of bringing patients to the technology in their time of need. That's why having a fixed-wing air ambulance service is so important to a place like St. George," he said.

"When somebody is involved in a car accident and has a head injury, we'll be able to get him to a scanner while we can still do something about it."

With Lake Powell, Zion National Park, and other popular recreation areas nearby, bad accidents are not uncommon.

Before Lifeflight, communities were without emergency service while crews traveled long distances to outlying areas. "One rural problem is you don't have a lot of highly trained people. If you pull EMTs out for a four- or five-hour road-trip transport, that community is left uncovered. You can still protect it with flights," said Dr. Van Norman.

"We've had real sick people come in from Kanab before, and that's a 1½-hour drive. It's an 18-minute plane ride," said Mr. Jensen.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

RURAL PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT GAINS NATIONAL RECOGNITION

(By Anne Palmer)

BICKNELL, WAYNE COUNTY.—Elmo Taylor, the man who for eight years has provided medical care in a community where no doctor is willing to work, has just been named the rural physician assistant of the year for the United States by the American Academy of Physician Assistants.

Most of the patients who come from nine surrounding communities to see him probably don't know that, because Elmo M. Taylor, P.A., is not one to brag. He doesn't show off or take much credit, he just works all the time and occasionally wonders why he's not out catching trout.

"I'd like to get out with my family more. Sometimes I sit looking at Boulder Mountain and wonder why I'm not up there fishing instead of in here seeing patients," he said, gazing out the window of the Wayne County Medical Clinic just outside of Capitol Reef National Park.

He doesn't get out there much because there has been no one to cover for him if he did. When he can persuade another physician assistant or nurse practitioner to cover long enough to take a real vacation, he takes courses to update his medical skills.

"I'm on call 24 hours a day, seven days a week," said the Loa resident, who out of all the physician assistants in the country—most of whom work in medically underserved areas—was singled out this year for recognition.

I wish we had 50 Elmo Taylors, because we could use them," remarked Jim Przybilla, manpower and marketing specialists for the state bureau of local and rural health systems.

Mr. Taylor staffs one of three federally funded community health centers in rural Utah and is representative of the many physician assistants who are the sole providers in rural Utah communities. Under the Public Health Service Act, community centers were established in areas where populations cannot sustain private medical practices. Because many clients of the clinics are low income, fees for services are established based on patients' ability to pay.

"I guess this is the closest thing to being an old-time country doctor, working out of his bag, kind of thing. There's a lot of job satisfaction working with people here, and that makes the job easier," said Mr. Taylor.

"That's one of the biggest problems in a rural setting—finding coverage. But that goes with the job. A lot is said about burnout. There's been times when you get a little discouraged, but it's never as bad here as in the Army," he acknowledged.

Like many physician assistants, Elmo Taylor's medical education began while he served as a field medic for a year in Vietnam. After his stint in the Army, he enrolled in the University of Utah's physician assistant program.

Physician assistants work under the distant supervision of neighboring physicians who consult on cases, review medical charts and oversee drug prescriptions. Mr. Taylor's preceptor and the Physician Director of the Wayne County Medical Clinic is Richfield physician Randy L. Rogers.

"One of the main things that attracted me to the P.A. program was that it was dedicated to providing health care in rural areas. I wanted to work in a rural area," explained Mr. Taylor, who was raised in St. George, which compared to his 2,100-person community is virtually metropolitan.

"There are times when it's hard living out here. It's frustrating to have to go all the way to Richfield to buy a pair of shoes and not finding what you want. There are a lot of pluses and a lot of concessions that have to be made," he observed.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH MEDICAL SCHOOL GRADUATE LOVES LIFE AS A COUNTRY DOCTOR

(By Anne Palmer)

PAROWAN, IRON COUNTY.—Until she took a job running the Iron County Medical Clinic, Ellen F. Gardner ran race horses.

"I kept getting thrown off on my head. That must have been it because after eight years of training race horses I started missing the neurosciences," she laughed.

The falls don't appear to have hurt her any, and when she's not seeing patients Dr. Gardiner still enjoys equestrian work. But sometime during the course of medical school she concluded that she was best suited to working with people, and she decided to become a family physician in a rural medicine practice.

When she completed her residency training last June, Dr. Gardiner decided to join her sheep-herder husband in Paragonah and reopen the Iron County Medical Clinic. It had been five years since the last doctor left town.

Last August the clinic was established in the cheapest location Dr. Gardner could find—right next door to the Justice of the Peace in the Iron County Courthouse. For the residents of Parowan, Paragonah and Beaver who now count on her for their medical care, it's a good thing Ellen Gardner was hard headed.

In medical school at the University of Utah, she resisted those who tried to discourage her from becoming a family practitioner.

"There's a lot of pressure against going in family medicine in medical school," she noted.

"If you decide to go into family medicine, you're the stupid one because you're not specializing. You're not the smartest one in any field. We took terrible abuse in the obstetrics program although I've heard family practice residents score the highest on their board exams. Still, you always feel like the stupid one," she recalled of her recent education.

Dr. Gardner maintains the educational system also is stacked against students from rural areas, the people who are most likely to become rural doctors.

"Unfortunately, it's so competitive to get into medical school you need straight A's, and farm kids aren't going to have those kind of grades. You can't afford the time it takes to be a bookworm when you have chores to do," said Dr. Gardner, who grew up in any thing but a small town—Dallas, Texas.

She chose to go into a rural practice for the same reason nearly all country doctors do—she likes the people she sees and she likes the lifestyle.

"I love living in a rural area. The people here are so honest. I really like them. They're so unpretentious. And there's a subtle sense of humor. I guess you could find that anywhere, but I think there's a higher percentage of people like that in the country," she smiled.

Dr. Gardner sees between 10 and 20 patients a day, a heavy load by most physicians' standards. Although she is on call 24 hours a day and every day of the week, so far she hasn't minded.

Her patients, for the most part, are older people. "I see a lot of congestive heart failure, chronic high blood pressure and cancer screening. I see losts of skin cancers. And diabetes. I had one man in here this week and I had to get him started with insulin injections. They come in here with their blood sugar sky high and wonder why they don't feel so well," she laughed.

Also, because farming and ranching are the main source of employment in the area, she sees a lot of people who have had farming accidents.

One thing she does not do is deliver babies. Like more and more of the family physicians in rural Utah, she foregoes obstetrical practice because it is guaranteed to impinge on two necessities—money and sleep. She can't afford the costly malpractice insurance or spare the late night and early morning hours obstetricians must be available.

She refers maternity patients and those who require the care of specialists to Valley View Hospital in Cedar City, a facility owned by Intermountain Health Care, the corporation that also pays her salary.

"IHC is helping me get started. They pay my salary and [her assistant] Sandra's. I couldn't have set up a practice after accumulating bills in medical school. Medicare pays almost nothing back, and most of the

people don't have any other insurance," she explained.

Because so many patients who come form surrounding communities have no insurance, and Medicare reimburses physicians in rural areas at a lower rate than urban doctors, her practice is very different from those most of her classmates entered.

"In other programs, they teach you to be heavily reliant on running tests and consulting other doctors. People just can't afford to go down to Cedar and get several hundred tests done and maybe get on some trials for new medications. We just try to do the best we can with what we've got," Dr. Gardner said.

"A lot of students perfer to be in a major center where they see new things all the time and can always get a second opinion. That's the advantage of being at a big center, but I find it frustrating," shrugged the soft-spoken Texan.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

SMALL TOWNS CREATE NURSES BY MAIL

(By Anne Palmer)

The shortage of nurses is severe nationwide, and in the competition to fill vacancies, small-town hospitals are at the greatest disadvantage.

After learning the hard way that students who leave home to attend nursing school on the Wasatch Front rarely return, rural Utah hospitals developed innovative ways of bringing nursing education to their towns.

At Sevier Valley Hospital in Richfield, five licensed practical nurses have just completed a correspondence course to upgrade their degrees and gain skills necessary to become registered nurses. At Dixie Medical Center in St. George, nurses are being taught new skills by working on a hands-on computer system.

The chance to become a registered nurse by mail appealed to some of Sevier Valley's employees because it gave them a chance to learn more complex skills without abandoning their jobs or families. When the correspondence program was proposed, it was the only opportunity in town.

Two of the hospital's practical nurses completed the correspondence program with success years ago, and the hospital concluded it was worthwhile to pay the students' tuition.

"One of the struggles in a rural community is that educational opportunities just aren't available. Our hospital has a tuition reimbursement policy, but so what? It doesn't do any good without educational opportunities," said hospital administrator Ken Armstrong. While hospital officials realized that taking college courses in addition to working full-time and caring for patients and families would be stressful for the nurses, they felt the correspondence course was the most viable option for improving patient care.

"We'd love to hire registered nurses from somewhere else, but they just don't exist. The fact is, we can't recruit them into the area. There is nothing here to attract single women, and it's difficult for spouses to find employment. We can spend all the money in the world on recruiting and not bring any nurses into the area," he lamented.

The nurses who accepted the challenge—Leslie Abraham Marilyn Kasiske, Sharon Taylor, Terri Huddleston, and Joan Anderson, agreed that the course work was the greatest academic challenge of their lives. It required that they study independently for about three hours a day, and meet together for more studying and classes one day a week while each maintained her four, 12-hour shifts each week at the hospital.

"I've had to just tell myself that this is my time to be selfish and that ultimately my family will benefit from this," remarked Ms. Abraham. "It's been difficult, but they understand."

"I don't feel quite so guilty as if I had to go away because I can spend more time with my family than if I went off for weeks at a time," said Ms. Kasiske.

Diplomas by correspondence, a program initiated by the New York Regents, "allows us to take the best of our LPNs, our best employees and help them grow. One real advantage is we're dealing with people we know—people we would want to have as registered nurses in our hospital. There's no inherent risk because you know that person's credibility. That's something you can't establish from an interview or by checking on a prospective employee's credentials," Mr. Armstrong observed.

Doing the course together was the only way it could have been done, the nurses agreed.

"There's been a lot of blood, sweat and tears in it for them. It is not easy to do," said Mr. Armstrong.

Less demanding are the interactive video programs being used in St. George with which nurses are learning new skills. College programs offer nursing course work in the area, but Dixie Medical Center Director of Nurse Training, Michelle Hinton, pushed for a sophisticated computer system, which could provide other learning opportunities.

"We got a grant through Intermountain Health Care to develop ideas to improve patient care. My premise, since nursing education was a high priority here, was that if nurses had the continuing medical education they needed they would be more confident and competent," Ms. Hinton said. She believes computerized programs are superior to classroom instruction because the necessary interaction forces nurses to make critical decisions.

On one program, nurses listen to various heart beats and make assessments based on their knowledge of anatomy and physiology. Another simulates emergency room conditions and asks nurses to make decisions about the care of an accident victim with broken bones and internal injuries.

The first mandatory video course at the hospital was on medication errors.

"Working on the computer, problem-solving, is fun," said Ms. Hinton. "And with the traditional method of learning, classroom instruction, you don't know if the students retain information. With interactive video they can practice without any harm coming to anyone," said Ms. Hinton.

Nurses can work on the machines during breaks at workstations located in three of the hospital's units and in the hospital library. Hospital auxiliary members raised $22,000 to purchase a laser disc, which, in conjunction with a mannequin equipped with sensors, is being used to teach cardiopulmonary resuscitation in the community. It's the new, high tech version of Recussi Annie.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, May 21, 1989]

RURAL HOSPITALS GASP FOR LIFE IN SEA OF RED INK

(By Anne Palmer)

Rural hospitals across the United States are closing, and Utah facilities are not immune.

Only three of Utah's 18 rural hospitals managed to turn profits in 1987, according to figures released this week to legislators by the State Health Department. The hospitals that were in the red each have fewer than 50 beds and suffered a combined net loss of more than $2 million.

Last year more than 40 rural hospitals in the United States went out of business, and since 1980 a total of 206 have shut their doors. Utah has had two hospital closures, Summit County Hospital and Carbon County Hospital.

When county hospitals close, communities also lose physicians and providers of emergency care. Residents must seek care elsewhere, and that generally means traveling 50 miles. In the small towns where Utah's small hospitals exist, hospitals are the second- or third-largest employers. Their demise could be economically devastating.

The majority of rural Utah hospitals are owned and operated by the Salt Lake City-based Intermountain Health Care Corp., which has subsidized losses in rural areas and rationalized outlays through referrals to its larger hospitals. But the company has had to streamline operations, and, with no end in sight to the losses that increase annually, officials openly wonder how long IHC can continue to support faltering facilities.

Hard times have not only befallen hospitals. Rural economies have been undermined in the 80s by downturns in mining, agriculture and manufacturing. As a result, young people are moving away from small towns to pursue better opportunities, while mostly elderly people remain in Utah's remote area.

That sounds like an opportunity on which hospitals could capitalize, but serving the aged has been anything but profitable.

Medicare pays the bills of the elderly, who comprise at least 40 percent of rural hospital patients. Under Medicare's Prospective Payment System, rural hospitals have received payments averaging 40 percent less than urban hospitals. The payment formula, rural representatives contend, was erroneously based on the belief that health care is more economical in remote areas. Payments covered only 60 percent of the costs. That—primarily—is why the million dollar deficits have accumulated.

The nation's rural hospitals banded together in February to file a lawsuit against the Department of Health and Human Services alleging that rural hospitals are forced to be subsidized by more prosperous urban facilities.

Meanwhile, members of the Utah Legislature's Interim Health Committee don't know whether or how to ensure that distant medical facilities thrive. This year the legislature secured funds for Weber State College's nursing outreach program to bring nursing classes to rural areas.

New state proposals include the provision of medical insurance for those without it so hospitals can cut losses from charity care.

Dr. Kim Bateman of Ephraim, San Pete County, suggested that lawmakers consider the effects on rural medical-care providers before imposing fees for medical technician licensing and equipment inspections.

"We need better reimbursement, and the state could help keep us afloat by raising payments for long-term care," argued Dr. Bateman, who noted that many small hospitals responded to dropping occupancy rates by converting acute-care units into long-term nursing facilities.

"In order to keep our patients from going to the big cities, we need better recruitment of family practitioners, and physicians with

various specialties. The state could help by providing grants to low-income areas," he added.

The struggles of rural hospitals are increasingly cited as the major problem confronting rural communities. The issue was prominent in the 1988 presidential campaign, but states have been slow to react.

"This isn't just a rural issue," noted Robert Sherwood, director of the bureau of local and rural health systems for the State Health Department.

"If you have ever traveled to St. George or Monument Valley, if you've ever been to Lake Powell or to one of the state or national parks, you're involved in rural health care. Half the emergency-room patients at rural hospitals are people from outside the primary service areas—tourists," said Mr. Sherwood.

He said that the increasing cost of business and the diminishing ability of patients to pay for care make the closure of rural hospitals in Utah very possible.

TRIBUTE TO THE CHILTON COUNTY PEACH GROWERS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am delighted to rise, today, to congratulate the peach growers of Chilton County for being the No. 1 peach-producing county in Alabama. These fine citizens grow some of the best peaches I have ever tasted and have become a major part of Chilton County's history.

Every year, for the past 42 years, the citizens of Chilton County have held their annual peach festival. This year's festival includes many events that will start July 11 and run through July 15. They will hold a parade, feature a peach queen, and honor the peach growers of Chilton County. In addition, the festival has wonderful food, music, arts and crafts, and a peach auction. The peach auction will sell peaches entered in the "Best Peaches Contest." These peaches taste heavenly, and some of them have sold for as high as $2,000 a basket.

This celebration will also include a Civil War reenactment, a talent contest, and entertainment at the Central Alabama Music Park. These events will be spread out all over the county so every citizen will have a chance to participate in the celebration. The citizens of Chilton County work very hard to make their Peach Festival a grand event. The Clanton Jaycees sponsor the festival and the peach growers and other citizens work together to coordinate the week's events.

I am proud to represent the people of Chilton County in the U.S. Senate. I know they are proud of their Peach Festival because I have been there in past years and it is truly one of the best celebrations I have ever attended. I hope this year's festival will be bigger and better than any festival in past years. The people of Chilton County are fine citizens who take great pride in Alabama and our Nation. I wish them the best of luck.

IMPROVING EDUCATION

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise to bring to the attention of the Senate and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding paper which has been written entitled "Bringing American Education Into the Technological Age."

This paper has been written by Dr. Brandon B. Sparkman of Guntersville, AL. Dr. Sparkman has been an outstanding educator in the South for a number of years. He served as superintendent of schools in Jackson public schools, in Jackson, MS. He served as superintendent of schools of Richland County School District 1 of Columbia, SC. He served as superintendent of schools of Guntersville city schools in Guntersville, AL, as an adjunct professor of education at Auburn University, and has served as a liaison to public school administrators at the University of Alabama's College of Education.

I have known Dr. Sparkman for many years when he served first as a principal in my hometown of Tuscumbia, AL, and then served as assistant superintendent of the Tuscumbia public schools when I was serving on the Tuscumbia City Board of Education. He has written, in may judgment, a very innovative and thoughtful article on bringing American education into the technological age. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

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

BRINGING AMERICAN EDUCATION INTO THE TECHNOLOGICAL AGE

(By Brandon B. Sparkman)

It has been said that no state or nation has ever made significant economic progress without first improving its system of education.

In 1986 the national governors education, chaired by Lamar Alexander, Governor of Tennessee, published a report entitled Time for Results. The report said, "Better schools mean better jobs. To meet stiff competition from workers in the rest of the world, we must educate ourselves and our children as we never have before."

In February of 1987, two prominent natinal political leaders addressed general assemblies of the American Association of School Administrators' National Convention. The first of these speakers was The Honorable George Bush, then Vice-President—a Republican, a conservative. Mr. Bush said "The quality of education that a nation provides for its citizens determines the direction and the future of that nation." The other speaker, The Honorable Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neal, then Speaker of the House—a Democrat, a liberal—said, "Education is the key to maintaining and improving our nation's standard of living in this highly competitive economic world."

The above statements appear to indicate a consensus among governors and national political leaders of the two parties, with varying philosophies, that the economic future of the nation depends upon the quality of education. In other words, the power brokers in government said that they were committed to achieving and maintaining the best education program possible. These kinds of statements, although commendable, are not new. Many political leaders over the past two decades have made similar statements and commitments.

But what has happened to public education?

Has the espoused support been present?

What is the current state of education in America?

An article entitled "U.S. Math Woes, Boring Curricula Creating a Nation of Underachivers," published in most major newspapers of this country, some two years ago, is an example of the criticism that the public schools have received during the last two decades. Another article, "Our Teens Outclassed in Math and Science," appearing on the front page of USA Today, February 1, 1989, again reported research which indicates the decline in quality of American education as compared to that of other nations of the world.

[Graphs and charts not reproducible in RECORD.]

The downward trend in achievement test scores, grades nine through twelve from 1962 through 1983 lends further credibility to the argument relative to the deterioration of American Education. However, scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills for primary grades have been improving continuously during the last three decades; but this trend began prior to the decline in pupil/teacher ratio. Note carefully the rate of decline in achievement shown by figures 1-3. This information will be used as a point of reference later.

Still another factor indicative of the condition of education is a statement found in the October, 1986 issue of Educational Leadership which says that, "Fewer able university students are now considering teaching as a career. Schools of education have had drastic declines in students preparing for teaching and in the quality of students entering their programs." [1] This statement too will be used as a point of reference later.

The dropout rate among public school students is also a serious problem. In figure 4, one can see the lack of improvement in the high school completion rate among white students from 1974-1986. Even though there has been some steady improvement in the completion rate among blacks since 1974, the percentage of those graduating from high school is still woefully low. Then when one examines the completion rate among Hispanics, in view of the educational requirements for workers of the future, as well as the necessity of integrating minorities into the work force, it becomes obvious that real problems exist with the present system of public education.

The critical role of education in sustaining and/or improving the quality of life in America over the next decade is shown by excerpts from a study conducted by the Hudson Institute entitled Workforce 2000.

[1] Alfred Bork, "Let's Test The Power Of Interactive Technology," *Educational Leadership*, March 1986, Pp. 36-7.

According to this report, the workforce will grow slowly, and become older, more female, and more disadvantaged. Also, by the turn of the century, new jobs in service industries will require much higher levels of skill than the jobs of today. The report further states that policy makers must find ways to accelerate productivity in service industries; maintain the dynamism of a work force that is rapidly growing older; reconcile the conflicting needs of women, work, and families; integrate black and Hispanic workers fully into the economy; and improve the education level of all workers. The report continues by stating, "If the economy is to grow rapidly, and American companies are to reassert their world leadership, the educational standards that have been established in the nation's schools must be raised dramatically. From an economic standpoint, higher standards in the schools are the equivalent of competitiveness internationally." [2]

What Has Caused Education To Decline in Quality?

Four major factors seem to have contributed heavily to the current condition of education. The first of these is attributable to Congress, the courts, and society. In order to understand the impact of these forces, one needs only a glimpse of the undue burdens that have been placed upon public education—such factors as the burdens of social transition, the disintegration of families, the excessive use of drugs, demands for individual rights and freedom, legislative and judicial mandates, legal involvement, latchkey problems, erosion of authority, demands for schools to assume non-academic responsibilities, and condemnation by politicians and the general public—these and other problems have played havoc with the schools. As a matter of fact, it may be fitting that public school educators be commended for keeping the schools alive with all of the hardships they have undergone in recent years. Perhaps no other institution could have withstood all of these problems and still survived.

The second factor that has kept education from progressing as it should have is the fact that it is a function of the states. As such, there is no national coordination. There is no singleness of direction. There is great diversity among the states, and even a lot of latitude is given local school districts. In other words, there is no singleness of mind for improving education. Everything is fragmented because of the way that public education is organized in this country.

A third problem for public schools is that education is funded from the public coffers. Anytime people are required to vote to take money from their pockets to fund an agency, the chances aren't very great that that agency will ever be overfunded.

A fourth problem relates to the perceptions which people have about how to improve education. There seems to be general agreement that education can be improved through four basic approaches: (1) community involvement, (2) an abundance of materials, (3) better teachers, and (4) lower pupil/teacher ratios.

Most people will readily agree that community involvement is one of the keys to having better schools. Research is clear that the more closely people are involved with the schools, the more confidence they have in the schools and the more likely they are to vote additional taxes upon themselves for school improvements. When one thinks in terms of the fact that only slightly more than one-fourth of families in this country have children in public schools, it is obvious that there must be greater community involvement; otherwise, people will not vote the necessary monies for improving education.

The necessity of an abundance of materials as a means of improving schools is probably overplayed. Certainly, adequate materials are necessary for doing an outstanding job of teaching. However, the lack of materials is sometimes used as an excuse for doing a poor job; when, in fact, a wealth of materials have been purchased but are seldom or never used.

Obviously, better teachers provide better education. However, as already stated, fewer students with high abilities are preparing to teach. If more capable people are to be attracted into the teaching profession, then significantly higher salaries must be paid teachers—salaries some 50, 75, or even 100 percent higher than is presently paid in most states. Teachers' salaries must be highly competitive with business and industry positions that require a college degree.

The fourth generally accepted approach to improving education—lowering of pupil/teacher ratio—on the surface appears to be a very logical approach. However, research indicates not only that it is an ineffective means of increasing achievement, but that it may even be counterproductive. When there is already a shortage of highly capable people entering the teaching profession, increasing the demand for more teachers through lowering pupil/teacher ratios results in the attraction of larger numbers of people with lesser capabilities into teaching. Instead of improving the quality of teaching, it would likely result in less effective teaching. Also, decreasing the pupil/teacher ratio consumes funds which otherwise could be used for raising salaries, thus attracting better teachers.

If lowering the pupil/teacher ratio would result in increased student achievement, then achievement in American schools would be much higher today than it was in 1955. But such is not the case. Some people might argue that the real causes of lower achievement are factors mentioned previously—the undue burdens placed upon public education—and that pupil/teacher ratios must continue to be reduced in order to overcome the burdens. But those burdens are apt to continue to plague the schools, and further reductions are likely to have the same effect in the future that they have had in the past.

An examination of figure 6, which shows the relationship between achievement and class size, indicates the lack of cost effectiveness of lowering pupil/teacher ratios as a means of improving achievement. The chart projects that to increase achievement by ten percentile points, it is necessary to lower the pupil/teacher ratio from approximately 40 students per teacher to roughly 12.5 students per teacher. To gain 10 additional percentile points in achievement, the pupil/teacher ratio would have to be further reduced to approximately seven students per teacher—an unaffordable level. One can discern from this research that "attracting more able people into teaching" and "lowering the pupil/teacher ratio" are in direct conflict with each other. The approach of lowering the number of students per teacher appears to compound the problem of teacher incompetence and perhaps assures lower student achievement in schools. It also decreases the likelihood of raising salaries significantly: a means of attracting better teachers into the field of education.

What then is the solution?

A major part of the solution lies in greater and more effective use of technology. The word "technology" is not a new term in most fields of endeavor. Many industries use computers, automation, and robots extensively to build better products more efficiently. Because of advances in the field of agriculture, approximately 3 percent of the people feed the rest of the nation and still produce surpluses that cause national problems. Recent advancements in medicine such as organ transplants, microsurgery, artificial organs, life support machines, and the conquering of life-threatening diseases are almost incomprehensible. Genetic research and engineering hold both unbelievable promises and danger. In space research, it is only a matter of time until space labs will be used routinely for scientific, industrial, and military purposes.

A person who has been removed from any of the above fields for a period of 50 years would be completely lost should he try to reenter the same field today. But not so in teaching. A teacher who had been removed from his field for a period of 50 years would hardly miss a beat should he return today. Sure, there have been minor changes. Better facilities, more and better equipment (including computers), different and more attractive materials, and new "jargon" have been added. But nothing has revolutionized education and made it dramatically more effective than in the past.

Can this nation afford to let public education remain in the dark ages forever? The obvious answer is a resounding "No."

Most of the tools for launching education into the technological age are presently available in this country. The knowledge, the hardware, and a small amount of software presently exist. Through careful governmental planning, coordination, allocation of funds, and limited support from certain businesses and industries that would profit from a better system of education, the necessary additional software for catapulting education into the technological age could be developed in a relatively short period of time.

In order to visualize this new approach to teaching, think in terms of the visual clarity of television, the sound qualities of stereo, and the speed and capacity of the computer. By tying these features together, you have what is known as interactive video—a process already in use on a limited scale in the private sector and now is slowy moving into the education arena. The laser videodisc machine, with speed similar to that of the computer in finding information, and with a storage capacity that allows large amounts of information to be placed on a single disk, is a practical vehicle for dispensing information to students.

Imagine American history being taught through this medium. The instructor could be one of the nation's best lecturers with every teaching aid imaginable. The course need not be boring, because short film clips covering almost any phase of American history could be inserted to make the subject come alive. One could see a facsimile of the Pilgrims reaching the eastern seacoast, the first Continental Congress in session, the battle of Gettysburg in progress, or a wagon train moving into virgin western territory.

[2] William B. Johnston, *Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the 21st Century*, Executive Summary, Hudson Institute, 1987.

Think of learning biology or physiology through a medium whereby many interior bodily functions could be observed. For example, a study of the heart could include observations of the human heart as it beats rhythmically, the open heart as a surgeon repairs it, and the veins and arteries that connect to the heart. Time-lapse photography, as well as still pictures and professional laboratory settings could become a part of biology lessons.

Opportunities for exploring the arts through interactive video are limited only by the imagination. Many of the great paintings and other masterpieces of the ages could be viewed and discussed almost as if the patient were actually at the museum where the pieces are located. Art experiences, that are now achieved by few if any, could be achieved by every student in the public schools of this nation.

The initial use of dangerous machinery in vocational education shops could be accomplished, with no exposure to danger, through simulation via interactive video.

Entire classes could view lessons on large monitors, then students could move to their interactive video terminals where they would answer questions about the lesson. Any concept not thoroughly understood could be swiftly reviewed by examining that particular segment of the lesson until proper answers could be given to the questions. Such a program of instruction would cater to students of all abilities—slow, signficant, average. Also, instruction on any given subject could be completely individualized by using this medium.

Advanced courses of almost any kind could be made available even in small schools located in the most remote areas of America.

Computerized systems of instructional management are presently in use in many public schools. Normally, they are used to manage reading and mathematics instruction, but could be expanded to cover other areas of learning. These programs can monitor the learning of individuals, of classes, of schools and of school districts. They can analyze curricular strengths and weaknesses, effectiveness of instructional material, and can match materials and methods to the learning style of individual pupils. Management reports can give administrators quick information needed in order to reallocate funds and to get more appropriate curricular materials. They can indicate mastery and non-mastery. They can assign work, specify materials to use; and they can administer mastery tests, score the tests and record the scores. Additionally these computerized management systems can prepare reports for sending home to parents. Using the approach described, these reports could be far more specific than is possible when done manually.

But aren't teachers needed? Of course they are. Education is not a mechanistic process. Education is very personal, requiring human interaction, explanations, feelings and emotions. But education can be more interesting, more challenging, and more personalized through the use of technology. This process would allow teachers to devote more time to personal interaction with students and to discuss concepts and issues in greater depth than is possible under the present system of teaching. Furthermore, variety in instructional procedure is needed. While the use of interactive video can be stimulating, it could also become deadly boring to some students if used excessively or if only one approach to learning through this medium is available.

The scheme described above calls for the smallest classes at the primary level and progressively larger classes as students mature and advance through the grades. The professional staff could have differentiated job assignments. This redistribution and specialization of staff would not result in loss of jobs, but neither would it require additional staff in the future without a large increase in pupil population.

Staff differentiation could bring about opportunities for stimulation and promotions, thus becoming a motivational and staff retention factor.

What is the state of development of interactive video in education?

A number of corporations have been and are still in the process of producing interactive video software and hardware. Prescription Learning boasts that they were among the first, if not the first, to market interactive video software. Hoffman Educational Systems, as far back as two years ago, was excited about their production of interactive video software. At that time Hoffman had produced programs which taught twenty-four basic reading skills, and the staff anticipated rapid expansion of coverage of materials. ISC Educational Systems more recently has produced an interactive video software package for teaching math skills to young adults, which perhaps could be used at the junior high and high school levels. However, it was designed primarily for adults who have dropped out of school and are enrolled in Adult Basic Education programs.

IBM is certainly one of the leaders in the development of hardware designed for interactive video use. They also market some software packages such as "Writing to Read" for use with kindergarten and first grade students and "Pals", a program for adults. Their touch-screen computer lends itself unusually well to interactive video learning. Other companies are producing excellent hardware and software.

Perhaps the most exciting approach to developing software is the grass roots involvement used by the Texas Learning Technology Group. A brainchild of Dr. Orby Holden, Executive Director of the Texas Association of School Boards, and some of his staff, this program covers physical science for 8th, 9th, and 10th grade students.

While the Texas School Board Association initiated the idea of developing the course software, they worked with the Texas Education Agency, the legislature (to some extent), with twelve school districts, and several private companies. All of their initial design work involved teachers and administrators in the public schools. They presented every design and content idea to veteran educators and got input from them from the very beginning of the project. This involvement has made their program much more successful than many others. It is now a "cutting edge" program in education.

They question might be raised, "Well, if private enterprise is involved in developing solfware and hardware, and have some good programs available; and if the state of Texas is involved (and perhaps over states) in developing software packages, why should the political arena get involved? Why not wait and let them do it?" The present approach is too fragmented. One company may be developing limited materials in reading; another, limited materials in math; another, limited materials in vocational education. Bits and pieces can be purchased, but there is no total program.

Additionally, the process is too slow. At the rate that the Texas project is moving in developing interactive video driven instructional courses, another fifty or one hundred years will be required to provide interactive video programs covering most applicable subjects. There is no way that this nation can prosper if it continues to wait while bits and pieces are put together. There needs to be a comprehensive, planned approach to program development.

A third problem is that programs that are presently available have a single design. In other words, they are designed to be used a specific way with specific hardware. These programs must be used that way in order for a school to participate. The single design causes the majority of school districts to be excluded from participation.

The final noted problem with the present approach is that it is too costly. That is the primary reason that so many school district are being excluded. They cannot afford the single design programs that are available at this time.

PROPOSAL FOR BRINGING AMERICAN EDUCATION INTO THE TECHNOLOGICAL AGE

The proposed approach to developing programs for bringing education into the technological age is a modification of the Texas model. The grass roots involvement aspect needs to be expanded. It is unlikely that any state, working alone, can accomplish the task of providing quality interactive video programs, covering all appropriate subject areas, within an acceptable period of time. A multi-state consortium will be required for this voluminous task. A key ingredient to success of such a project will be a coordinating council or board that works harmoniously in planning, coordinating, and directing the total program, setting one direction and providing one plan with flexibility tolerances.

Secondly, at the federal level, the Department of Education needs to be involved. If the Secretary of Education cannot, or is unwilling to, provide the leadership and the singleness of direction, then certainly the federal government needs to be involved with the multi-state consortium, or at least support it strongly, both in concept and cost.

Thirdly, private enterprise needs to be involved to a much greater extent than in the Texas model. Beyond a doubt, business and industry will participate eagerly. Already, hundreds of millions are being spent by these firms in efforts to improve education. A plan with singleness of purpose that will dramatically improve the quality of education in American public schools will attract much greater participation. Needed also is greater involvement of the public schools in design, development, staff training, and use of the program.

Thinking is terms of the Texas model, modifications should be made to incorporate alternative designs. A single design that excludes most school districts from participation is unacceptable. In reality, there is a difference in the wealth of school districts; therefore, the design must be such that every school district can participate at some level. Multiple designs can be accomplished, using a single video for each course, but varying procedures, and using a variety of branching techniques.

PROPOSED DESIGNS

Having been shown to be an effective teaching tool, one of the designs should be "video only" with level one interaction. Most school districts can afford a laser videodisc player and monitor for many, or all, or its classrooms. The least expensive pro-

gram design will allow even the poorest school districts to participate in quality programs.

The second level of the design could be "video, plus separate computer." Computers are presently found in significant numbers in most school districts. This design would allow the video to be viewed and students then moved to existing computers where they would respond to the video lesson. This low-level interaction between video and computer is effective and comparatively inexpensive, both in terms of development and in acquisition by a school district. Part of the instructional management system, described earlier in this paper, could be incorporated into the design for use by districts that are ready for this component.

A third design could be "video interacting with computer." This approach, similar to the Texes model, would utilize the laser videodisc player tied to the touch screen (or other appropriate) computer. This arrangement allows students to interact directly with the program.

A fourth model could be the same as the previous design, except that districts that have sufficient funds would have "multiple interactive video sets" in the same classroom rather than just a single set. In this setting, sufficient sets would be available to allow a maximum of four students to work at each station.

A fifth design would divide the program into "modules." This arrangement would allow an outstanding teacher who enjoys teaching certain topics to handle those topics independently. Other topics that are more effectively taught through interactive video could be taught using that medium.

A sixth design would include multiple sets of "interactive video plus the management component" described earlier. This design would be expensive, but would be highly effective, and especially so with advanced learners.

The final proposed design would be a "home component." Indescribable now, this segment will be vital in the future and should be included in the overall plan for use of interactive video in teaching and learning.

Will the proposed model be effective?

Research shows that video with level one interaction (without computer) is an effective teaching tool. The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) has been active in supporting the use of laser videodisc interactive programs in schools and in having its effectiveness evaluated. A comprehensive study conducted by Vanderbilt Universtity in four districts in three states concluded that "using laser videodiscs to carry the practices of master teachers into the classroom can pay off in substantially improved student learning." Overall, the videodisc series, "Mastering Fractions" (for grades 5-12) produced 'significantly' higher learning gains than those attained with traditional instruction. . . . 'Average ability' students who recieved the videodisc instruction performed 33 percent better on post-tests than similar students in controlled classes who were taught by traditional methods. 'High ability' students using the videodisc program performed 13 percent better than the control groups. Conclusion of the study was that videodiscs provide educators with the ability to capture high quality interactive instructional sequences that can be easily transported from classroom to classroom without the resultant degradation in the quality of instruction.[3]

There is much evidence that integrated computer learning systems, (without video) which use computer assisted instruction for teaching well defined, sequential programs, are highly effective. For example, in Indian River County School District in Florida, potential dropouts, and dropouts who have been retrieved, are now using the WICAT integrated computer learning system. A teacher in that district stated that she teaches 150 students per day who are potential dropouts or retrievals. These students are the slow learners, the troublemakers, the kids who nobody wants to teach, and those not expected to achieve much regardless of the method of teaching. This teacher insisted that she had not had a single discipline problem in her class since she started using the WICAT system. Further, she stated that the students achieve at an acceptable level and pass the Florida graduation examination and the GED. Seventy-two percent stay in school.

In Escambia County, Florida, where the same program is being used, the superintendent stated that, of the 385 "at-risk" students being taught through this method, as of March 1, only three students had dropped out of school during the 1988-89 school year.

Evaluation of the phsycial science, interactive video program in Texas, indicates a very significant increase in achievement among low achieving students involved in the program. Among average learners, there is a signficant increase in achievement. For high achievers, there is no significant increase. However, with the development of Level 6 and Level 7 designs, one can project that high achieving students will show very significant increases in achievement.

Another indication of the effectiveness of the interactive video technological approach to teaching is that students, during their waking hours when not in school, are generally entertained by technology. In other words, movies, television, video games, stereos, etc. are in constant use. When these same students go into the classroom, teachers are at a tremendous disadvantage in attempting to attract and maintain their attention due to the lack of technology in schools. The traditional methods of teaching, although not bad within themselves, are no longer effective in holding the attention of students to the point that they master the subjects being taught.

The argument of whether technology will ever replace traditional methods of teaching, and the argument of yesteryear of whether the automobile would ever replace the horse and buggy seem comparable. There was nothing wrong with the horse and buggy. But the times had changed. The horse and buggy could no longer meet the damands of society for faster and more efficient transportation. Therefore, it was absolutely essential that the automobile replace the horse and buggy. A similar condition exists today in education. Traditional methods of teaching have been effective in past years, but the times have changed and no longer can traditional methods of teaching meet the demands of society in educating American citizens. This situation does not mean that teachers nor methods are necessarily bad. They have served the nation well. The fact is that traditional methods of teaching cannot meet the requirements of today in this nation.

Teachers, when using traditional methods, are probably about as effective as can be expected. That is not to indicate that every teacher is doing the best job that he or she could possibly do. But looking at the whole picture, maybe one cannot expect greater results from the present teaching force, using present methods, than is being obtained.

One might contend that the Japanese, Koreans, and certain other nations that appear to have superior systems of education, still use traditional methods. It is true that traditional methods of teaching in those nations appear to work rather well, However, the variables that make the difference appears to be family stability, and acceptance of parental responsibility for children's education. These factors are problem areas in America and are unlikely to be reversed in the near future; therefore, methods must be incorporated into teaching which tend to negate the weakness caused by this massive parental abandonment of personal commitment to a solid education for their children.

There appears to be an absolute necessity for taking a vastly different approach to teaching, whereby the latest technology is brought into use in classrooms across the nation as rapidly as possible. Furthermore, there is an urgent need to increase salaries of educational personnel to the point of attracting the finest minds of America into teacher training programs, and those with the greatest capability into teaching. Once these two goals have been accomplished, America can again be a world leader in educating its citizens.

Can The Nation Finance This Program?

Since education is considered a function of state, the cost of its improvement will be borne, in large part by the states. Evidence that states are able to provide a significant amount for financing improvements can be seen by examining a trend that is occurring in states such as Indiana and Alabama, where legislation has been enacted to force significantly lower pupil/teacher ratios. The additional cost of salaries alone for these mandates is staggering. But when one understands that such action also requires additional fringe benefits, classrooms, furniture, equipment, supplies, insurance, utilities, maintenance, and janitorial services, it is evident that states could just as easily provide more cost-effective ways of improving schools, if they had sound direction.

The federal government should involve itself in helping finance this effective approach to teaching. Presently, money is being scattered around in small amounts for program improvement, many of which are doing little to add to the effectiveness of education. If there were a singleness of direction, a significant amount of federal funds that are already being spent for education could be focused on providing interactive video instructional programs.

Local school districts, instead of buying more furniture and equipment for those additional classrooms that are being built to lower pupil-teacher ratios, could purchase hardware and software for use in the new instructional program. Also, if it were evident that a concerted, joint effort would be launched with assurances of dramatic improvement in education, people would vote more taxes upon themselves in order to accomplish this purpose.

[3] George Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, "An Evaluation of the Mastering Fractions Level One Instructional Videodisc Program," June 30, 1986.

Finally, private enterprise, which would benefit so much from a greatly improved system of education, would be willing to invest generously in this project.

Certainly, great efforts to improve education have been made throughout the nation. However, in almost every case the approach has been of the "bandaid" type—helping a little but not curing. The suggestions have been, "fix this little thing", "change this philosophy", "add this course", "give more choices"—not the kinds of action that result in major improvements. The only consistent effort to improve education at the national, state, and local levels has been to criticize. Certainly there is room for criticism of public education. But, if criticism would solve the problems of the schools, America's system of education would now be "head and shoulders" above that of every nation of the world. Obviously, criticism is not the solution. The solution requires new directions, singleness of mind, and cooperative attitudes. A major part of the solution lies in catapulting American education into the technological age.

This achievement will require leadership and statesmanship. It will require placing America's interest ahead of personal interest. The leadership may come from the President, the Secretary of Education, a governor, a group of governors; but selfishness, ulterior motives, and political gain must be forgotten. The question is, who will provide that leadership? Who will step forward?

NEAL R. SONNETT

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I know you, as a Senator from Florida, would join with me in giving praise to an outstanding Florida lawyer, Neal R. Sonnett, who recently received the Florida Bar Foundation's Medal of Honor Award.

I have known Neal Sonnett for a number of years and have always had high regard for his abilities. He is serving now as the president of the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the language of the Florida Bar Foundation's Medal of Honor Award to Neal Sonnett be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with articles from the Florida Bar News pertaining to this award and pertaining to the Florida Bar Foundation.

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

THE FLORIDA BAR FOUNDATION MEDAL OF HONOR AWARD PRESENTED TO NEAL R. SONNETT

For his dedicated service in improving the administration of the criminal justice system and in protecting individual rights precious to our American Constitutional form of government. From his appointment following graduation from law school as an Assistant United States Attorney and then Chief of the Criminal Division for the Southern District of Florida, to a private practice in criminal law, Neal Sonnett has, by his example, brought renewed respect and appreciation for his profession and the crucial role of the lawyer as advocate and protector of rights. In leadership posts at the national, state and local levels, he has given unstintingly of his time and talents in pursuit of excellence within the organized bar. His unimpeachable credentials and sense of fair play have led government leaders to call on him in times of community crisis, confident in his ability and desire to seek justice, fair and impartial, for all segments of society. Sensitive to the plight of the impoverished and unpopular, Sonnett has given thousands of hours in pro bono service to immigrants reaching our shores, steadfast in his resolve that even the least among us is granted the full benefit of our nation's laws. Not afraid of controversy, he successfully led the struggle against those who would label expediency justice, and in doing so, has preserved the rights of us all. Top in his chosen field, civic and charitable leader, family man. Neal Sonnett exemplifies the highest ideals of the legal profession he so loves.

JUNE 1989.

[From the Florida Bar News, Mar. 1, 1989]

BAR FOUNDATION INVITES MEDAL OF HONOR NOMINEES

March 31 is the deadline for submission of nominees for The Florida Bar Foundation's 1989 medal of honor awards, Awards Chairman William O.E. Henry said.

The Foundation has two categories for the medal of honor award. A nominee for the first category must be a member of The Florida Bar who has demonstrated dedication to the objectives of the Bar: "To inculcate in its members the principles of duty and service to the public, to improve the administration of justice, and to advance the science of jurisprudence. . . ."

Nominees for this category also must be Florida residents who are actively engaged in a profession relative to the practice of law including, but not limited to, practicing lawyers, judges or teachers in the legal field. Past recipients in this category are Richard T. Earle, Jr., Tobias Simon, Rubin O.D. Askew, Chesterfield H. Smith, Wm. Reece Smith, Jr., Arthur J. England, Jr., Florida Supreme Court Justice Ben F. Overton, Mark Hulsey, Russell E. Carlisle, Talbot (Sandy) D'Alemberte, and in 1988, James C. Rinaman, Jr.

Nominees are also requested for a second medal of honor award which recognizes the achievement of nonlawyers or lawyers not actively engaged in the practice of law. Nominees must have made an outstanding contribution to the improvement of the administration of justice in Florida through research, writing, or other deeds of such character and quality that, in the judgment of the Foundation, warrant the highest award that can be bestowed by the Foundation.

Nominees in this category also must be Florida residents and may be members of The Florida Bar. Past recipients in this category are Robert A. Rosof for establishing a rehabilitation program for juvenile offenders, William C. Clark for his service on the Judicial Qualifications Commission, Lucy Batchelor for her years of dedicated work in the correctional system, St. Petersburg Times writer Martin A. Dyckman for coverage of legal issues and support for open government, Sylvia Alberdi for leadership as staff director of the Florida Senate's Civil Judiciary Committee, and the Rev. A. Leon Lowry, Sr., who was honored for his leadership in promoting civil rights through constructive change.

In 1988, the nonlawyer award was presented to Sr. Catherine Gorman of the Office of Farmworker Ministry in Apopka, for her work in securing the legal rights of migrant farmworkers.

The medal of honor awards will be presented at the annual dinner of the Foundation during the Bar convention at Marriott's World Center in Orlando on June 15.

Nominations should list the specific achievements which would qualify an individual to receive a medal of honor and should include a brief biographical sketch of the nominee. Nomination forms are available from the Foundation. Nominations should be sent to: The Florida Bar Foundation, Medal of Honor Awards Programs, 880 North Orange Avenue, Suite 102, Orlando, Florida 32801-1023. For more information, call (800) 541-2195 or (407) 843-0045.

[From the Florida Bar Journal, September 1988]

THE FLORIDA BAR FOUNDATION

Although The Florida Bar Foundation is an organization independent of The Florida Bar, much effort and cooperation have been given by Florida Bar leadership in the development of an effective Foundation since its creation in 1956. The ultimate goal is to foster law-related public interest programs throughout the state, such as providing greater legal aid to the poor, funding student loan and scholarship programs, and improving the administration of justice.

The Foundation's most conspicuous activity of late has been its administration of Florida's nationally acclaimed Interest on Trust Accounts (IOTA) program. In less than seven years of operation, IOTA has generated over $14.8 million in public interest grants distributed in the name of Florida's legal profession for legal aid to the poor, law student loans and scholarships and improvements in the administration of justice. The IOTA program—the first of its kind in the United States—has been a model for similar programs now in operation in nearly all the states in this country.

In addition to its educational and charitable activities, The Florida Bar Foundation periodically awards its medal of honor to an attorney and a nonlawyer citizen in recognition of outstanding contributions toward improving the administration of justice in Florida. The medal of honor is the highest award that can be bestowed upon a lawyer or layperson by the legal profession in Florida.

The Florida Bar Foundation presents a unique opportunity for Bar members to broaden their involvement in law-related public service. Membership in the Foundation is automatic via any attorney's involvement in the IOTA program, or by becoming a contributing member or fellow of The Florida Bar Foundation. For further information regarding joining the Foundation and about IOTA grants contact: The Florida Bar Foundation, Inc., Suite 102, 880 North Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida 32801, telephone (305) 843-0045, or (800) 541-2195.

THE 1689 BRITISH REVOLUTION

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, that most exemplary periodical of chroniclers and precise observers, notes that this year, 1989, is not simply the bicentennial of The French Revolution. Of course, the anniversary of the French Revolution is being celebrated this week in Paris, and our

President will attend and have dinner with representatives of the avant-elite.

But, 1989 also marks the tricentennial of a much larger event for our Nation and possibly for the world. This event is the Glorious Revolution of 1689 in which William and Mary came to power in Britain. In this revolution, the rights of British citizens and the division of powers within the government were first established in the world. And, they were established step by step, in a very pragmatic, problem-solving kind of way.

The constitution established in this revolution was not only the predecessor of our own, but of so many societies which found ways to establish stable governments and enduring ones. Michael Barone, author of the piece in U.S. News & World Report on this subject, certainly sees the irony in our being all enthusiastic about a revolution whose regimes lasted an average of 18 months as they inexorably made their way to a military dictatorship 6 years later. Whereas, in Britain in 1689 a system of government was established, the arrangements for which have lasted almost two centuries. In fact, this system of government has remained unchanged in even social and political terms, much less constitutional ones. Of course, the British constitution has endured for three centuries just as ours has done for two.

Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to have the opportunity on the Senate floor to acknowledge the work of Michael Barone, whose Almanac of American Politics is as indispensable to us here as is the Congressional Directory.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From U.S. News & World Report, July 17, 1989]

THE OTHER, FORGOTTEN REVOLUTION

(By Michael Barone)

As we remember the 200th anniversary of a revolution that produced so much bloodshed and became the inspiration for so many tyrannies, the 300th anniversary of the revolution to which we owe many of our liberties and free institutions has passed almost forgotten. This Glorious Revolution that culminated in 1689 happened not in France but in England, it produced not a republic and a reign of terror but a Dutch King who expanded the rights of Englishmen, and it is remembered today most vividly not in the countries whose liberties it did so much to secure—Britain, the United States, and the British Commonwealth nations—but in the one place where its legacy is a tragic one, Northern Ireland.

On its face, the Glorious Revolution does not sound very glorious nor does it seem much of a revolution. It was not the downtrodden masses but the most prominent members of the House of Lords, bishops of the Church of England and merchants of the City of London who wanted to get rid of King James II, a Roman Catholic, after his second wife gave birth to a son who would produce a Catholic dynasty. They called on William of Orange, the Stadholder of the Netherlands and husband of James's daughter Mary; in 1688, William, a lifelong enemy of the Catholic King Louis XIV of France, assembled an army and navy and made the only successful cross-channel invasion between that of William the Conqueror in 1066 and Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1944.

To legitimize what amounted to a military takeover, William called for new parliamentary elections, and in the early months of 1689 he and Parliament agreed on what amounted to a set of political deals that produced some of our greatest freedoms. Parliament passed and William approved a Declaration of Rights limiting royal power, an ancestor of our Bill of Rights. Parliament limited grants of money to the King to a single year, the origin of our annual appropriations process. It required that elections be held every three years, the beginning of today's regular terms of office. It passed a Toleration Act for Dissenting Protestants (but not for Catholics or Jews), an early grant of religious freedom in a Europe torn by religious wars.

Over the next several years, Whigs and Tories vigorously debated issues in Parliament and even criticized the King; at a time when the opponents of many rulers were put to death, the English were coming to accept the idea of the legitimacy of political opposition. Other innovations stemmed from William's reign. As he pursued his wars against Louis XIV, Parliament voted him a standing army but kept careful watch over it each year. He also persuaded Parliament to establish the Bank of England, the first officially sanctioned central bank, which helped finance a vast increase in England's trade and economic growth. And the Glorious Revolution inspired John Locke's theory that government derives its powers from a contract with the people, a theory that informs our Declaration of Independence and Constitution.

If King William is not much remembered today, he was not much loved in his own time, either. He was by all accounts a cold fish—short and skinny, with a curved nose and a "pensive, severe, and solemn aspect," according to his great admirer, the 19th-century historian Thomas Macaulay. Orphaned at 10, held a virtual prisoner by his family's political enemies, very much aware that his grandfather King Charles I of England had been beheaded and that his immediate predecessor as ruler in Holland, Jan de Witt, had been torn limb from limb by a mob, he was not given to trusting many people aside from his wife and a few Dutch cronies (whom he made dukes in England). He would not have been an attractive media candidate in an era when politicians and celebrities are expected to lay bare their personalities.

King William helped to make this a kinder and gentler world, but not without fighting a few battles and breaking the rules of dynastic succession. And he is not a hero to everyone. His victory at the Battle of the Boyne in July, 1690, almost exactly 100 years before the storming of the Bastille, is celebrated lustily to this day by the Protestants of Northern Ireland, while Irish Catholics remember William as the man who established the Protestant Ascendancy. Irish politics is still bedeviled by the 17th-century religious hatreds that William helped to exorcise in Britain and its American colonies.

William and Mary had no children and died young. Not much was named for them in Britain and America, except for the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, VA., and the Orange counties of Virginia, North Carolina and New York. The Glorious Revolution, celebrated by Whig historians like Macaulay as the beginnings of our liberties, came to be forgotten by intellectuals who followed the stars of Marx and other admirers of the French Revolution. Those revolutionaries tried to impose their logic on the world, often with terrible results. William III, scrambling to justify a revolution that was popular but against the rules, sacrificed power to win legitimacy, and succeeded. While the French are celebrating their declarations of rights and tiptoeing around the guillotined corpses of their revolutionaries' victims, it is worthwhile, in a world turning increasingly toward representative government and market capitalism, to celebrate the revolution that, for all its ambiguities and oddities, seems increasingly glorious on its 300th anniversary.

TERRY ANDERSON

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I note once again the captivity in Beirut of our own Terry Anderson.

Today marks the 1,578th day that Terry Anderson has been held in captivity in Beirut.

On March 17, 1987, a report appeared in the Los Angeles Times in which Terry Anderson's colleague and friend, Robert Fisk, commented on Anderson's captivity as such: "I don't think anyone ever dreamed it would last 2 years."

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to inform my colleagues that it is now over 4 years that Terry Anderson has been held hostage.

I ask unanimous consent that the Los Angeles Times report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 17, 1987]

HOSTAGES' MILESTONES PASSING QUIETLY IN BEIRUT

(By Charles P. Wallace)

BEIRUT.—Lebanon is passing two milestones this week, but what with Syrian troops occupying West Beirut, Christian and Muslim politicians wrangling over a political settlement and a sinking economy, the events are going almost unnoticed.

It was on an overcast morning two years ago Monday that Terry A. Anderson, chief Middle East correspondent of the Associated Press, finished a tennis game in West Beirut and was on his way home for a shower when gunmen bundled him into the back of a green Mercedes-Benz and sped off.

And it was eight weeks ago today that Anglican Church envoy Terry Waite disappeared while on his mission to gain the release of foreign hostages in Lebanon.

Anderson, from Ohio and now 39 years old, has become the longest-held foreign hostage in Lebanon, with no prospect in sight for his imminent release.

Waite, the personal envoy of the Archbishop of Canterbury, traveled to Lebanon in January in hope of freeing Anderson and another American, Thomas Sutherland, 55, the dean of agriculture of the American University of Beirut, who was abducted in June 1985.

Waite dropped from sight while on his way to meet with the kidnapers, members of a fundamentalist Shia Muslim band of terrorists calling themselves Islamic Jihad, or Islamic Holy War.

There are reports that during his travels he was taken into custody by another group of Shia extremists known as Hezbollah (Party of God)—which, like Islamic Jihad, is believed to be loyal to Iran. Walid Jumblatt, the Druze warlord who was nominally in charge of Waite's security, was moved to remark later that "God's envoy is being held by God's people."

On Monday, the official Iranian news agency said that the Speaker of the Iranian Parliament, Hashemi Rafsanjani, has promised to help the Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert A. K. Runcie, find Waite. According to the agency, Rafsanjani was responding to a letter in which Runcie pledged to try to locate at least one Iranian believed seized by Christian militiamen in Lebanon.

Those holding Anderson and Sutherland have repeatedly demanded that 17 Arab extremists, jailed in Kuwait for car-bomb attacks in December 1983, be released as the price for freeing their captives.

However, events have shown that the hostages' predicament is also inextricably linked to factors such as the long-running Iran-Iraq War and the possibility of a power struggle in Tehran, the Iranian capital.

President Reagan has acknowledged that his Administration sold arms to Iran in hopes of obtaining the release of all the American hostages in Lebanon, of whom there are now eight.

At one point, Lt. Col. Oliver L. North, the now-dismissed National Security Council aide, traveled to Tehran in the apparent hope of closing a deal for the release, but the purported agreement collapsed after David R. Jacobsen, a hospital administrator at the American University, was released last November.

Anderson had been allowed to send out letters to his family, and he made a poignant videotaped appeal to Reagan last October to step up his efforts on the hostages' behalf.

"To a considerable extent, those of us who live here in Beirut feel helpless to help Terry," said Robert Fisk, Middle East correspondent for the Times of London, who was a close friend of the missing journalist and who has worked to help free him.

Fisk noted that although the State Department recently warned Americans to stay away from Lebanon, Anderson was kidnaped at a time when Beirut was still considered a relatively safe place for journalists.

"I don't think anyone ever dreamed it [Anderson's captivity] would last two years," Fisk said. "I remember when he sent the letter to his family in October, 1985, saying he hoped to be home by Christmas. And now we're in 1987."

Anderson has two children, including a baby daughter who was born while he was in captivity and whom he has seen, according to his statements, only on a special television broadcast.

On Friday, a State Department spokesman in Washington called on the kidnapers to release their hostages, whom he described as "the innocent victims of a cruel and cynical act of terrorism."

On Monday, about 250 friends, colleagues, and relatives of Anderson, Sutherland and the other American hostages gathered in Valley Forge, Pa, for a prayer breakfast sponsored by the American Baptist Church, wire services reported. Among those attending was a former hostage, Father Lawrence M. Jenco.

Most Arab and Western analysts here agree that the fate of Anderson and the other hostages has become mired in the tangled Washington scandal over the clandestine sale of arms to Iran and the diversion of profits to the U.S. backed Nicaraguan guerrillas.

At least two freed hostages—Jacobsen and Jenco—may have been released as a result of U.S. arms shipments to Iran. The arms included anti-tank missiles and spare parts for anti-aircraft missiles.

Having used hostages to obtain American arms in the past, it was argued, Iran may hold out for at least a partial settlement of its other claims against Washington before exerting pressure on its followers in Lebanon to free their remaining hostages. A total of 26 foreigners are believed to be in the hands of various Lebanese terrorist factions.

For the extremist groups involved, the hostages may also be regarded as protection against attacks, which makes it difficult to persuade the captors to surrender all their prisoners.

Three weeks ago, Syria sent more than 7,000 troops into West Beirut, and they cleared battling militia forces from the streets of the predominantly Muslim sector of the city.

However, the Syrians have not moved against the southern suburbs, where Hezbollah is believed to have substantial armed strength.

The suburbs are believed to be the most likely place that foreign hostages are being held by the pro-Iranian Shia groups. Some analysts believe that by continuing to hold hostages there, groups such as Hezbollah will feel safer against a Syrian move, but other diplomats here believe that such considerations will not count for much in Syrian calculations.

The analysts noted that no group has claimed responsibility for kidnaping Waite.

According to one theory, Waite was taken prisoner because of a factional dispute within Hezbollah, with one of the factions seizing him in order to discourage further negotiations over the hostages.

In addition to Sutherland, who is from Fort Collins, Colo., and Anderson, the Americans believed held in Lebanon are Frank H. Reed, 53 of Malden, Mass., director of a private school in West Beirut; Joseph J. Cicippio, 56, of Valley Forge, Pa., acting controller of the American University; Edward A. Tracy, 56, of Rutland, Vt., an illustrator and book salesman; Alann Steen, 48, of Boston, a journalism professor at Beirut University College; Jesse Turner, 39, assistant instructor of mathematics and computer sciences at Beirut University College, and Robert Polhill, 53, assistant professor of business studies at Beirut University College.

SENATOR CHARLES ROBB SPEAKS TO THE AIPAC CONFERENCE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce into the RECORD, a speech made by my distinguished colleague from Virginia, Senator CHARLES ROBB, before the recent AIPAC Policy Conference. As you can tell from his remarks, Senator ROBB remains deeply committed to the cause of peace in the Middle East. He is truly a good friend to Israel and a strong advocate of peace. I hope that each of you will carefully review his timely speech.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR CHARLES S. ROBB, AIPAC POLICY CONFERENCE, MAY 22, 1989

This is the first AIPAC Policy Conference without Sy Kenan. His energy and enthusiasm are sorely missed. But his spirit, his devotion to Israel and his love of America live on in this room.

Largely because of Sy's efforts, this conference has attracted as speakers many of the most distinguished leaders in American political life. It has been the occasion of some inspired and inspiring oratory and some memorable one-liners. I may deviate somewhat from tradition, because I come to you tonight with a serious purpose in mind. I come also as a deeply caring friend of Israel, and as one who is truly committed to the cause of peace and the advancement of freedom, in the Middle East and around the world.

I come, too, with many fond memories of my own visits to Israel: vivid recollections of the strength of character and purpose etched in the face of Golda Meir as we had tea in her Tel Aviv apartment; of the excitement, the vibrancy and the heady atmosphere all Israelis experienced right after Entebbe; of Massada, the ancient world's greatest monument to moral courage and physical bravery; memories, too, of the costs of security that sustain modern Israel—the stark terrain of no man's land on the Golan; and Yad Vashem, which no words can describe.

In May of 1983, when I was serving as Governor of Virginia, I had the honor, of speaking at the first meeting that AIPAC ever held in Virginia. I observed then that in a period of hard times for Israel, AIPAC did an outstanding job of keeping Israel's friends in this country informed of developments in the Middle East and abreast of Israel's policies. In my own state of Virginia, I led a Governor's mission, which set the stage for the Virgina-Israel Commission.

Today the times are no easier for Israel, and your contribution is no less vital. Those of us who are committed to Israel's well-being remain indebted to AIPAC for the keep insight you provide into developments in the region and for the determined manner in which you present Israel's cause to the American people.

Tonight, let me reaffirm my conviction that the state of Israel is not only unique in the history of civilization, but also unique as an ally of the United States of America. Israel means so much to America because in Israel's existence our own experience is reflected. Americans built a democratic society composed of people from many lands, who shared common dreams, who conquered a hostile environment, opened up a wilderness and made the desert bloom. Within the lifetime of most of us here tonight, Israelis have repeated that miracle.

Founded, like America, against unbelievable odds, Israel had to fight, as we did, for

independence. Again and again during her short life Israel has been forced to defend her freedom—and her very survival. 1948, 1956, 1967, 1970 and 1973 are etched in memory as dates when her very existence was in jeopardy. Despite war and threat of war and continual acts of terrorism, Israelis have never ceased to cherish their freedom or lacked the courage to insist on their independence.

We see in Israel much of the richness and diversity that we see in America—from its capital, Jerusalem, the city of lights, to the Eucalyptus groves of the north, to the spirited discussion in the cafes of Tel Aviv, to the individualistic spirit of the kibbutzim. From ancient Jewish teachings grew the moral and ethical foundation of modern civilization. Modern Israel has given much to the world, too: the Israel Philharmonic, Novel Prize winner S. Y. Agnon and the medical miracles of the Weitzman Institute are just a few that come to mind—all this from a country the size of Massachusetts, with a population approximately that of Philadelphia's.

Vision, courage, spirit and diversity—these are the qualities that make America great, and they are the qualities that underlie my affection for Israel.

Yet just as our hearts are joined, so are our destinies. Twice in this century the world has been engulfed by war. From the Second World War, the war against the most insidious and evil engineers ever to figure in the long and dark calculus of planned inhumanity, rose the indomitable spirit of the Jewish people, saying with one voice, "never again." So also did the American people say, "never again." Never again shall we turn our back on those who yearn for freedom; never again shall we fail to fulfill our role as the defender of democracy, or as the champion of those against whom a brutal regime organizes hatred and prejudice into a political program of terror and mass murder.

And so a newly reborn state of Israel and an America roused from isolationist slumber became partners in the cause of peace, our futures intertwined by the common understanding that the fate of the globe lies with those who stand up in defense of freedom.

Partners in the cause of freedom, America and Israel share another purpose, a conviction that the Holocaust, which in horror overwhelms the imagination, must never be permitted to lapse from the civilized consciousness. And the victims who perished in this longest night of barbarism, the millions of innocents whose deaths diminished all life, must remain for all of us precious in memory, vivid in image. In their loss, we and the world are forever impoverished; in them and through them we must know that we are all the children of Auschwitz.

Democracies—and friends—stick together, in good times and bad. So let no man doubt this nation's unwavering resolve to preserve, protect and promote the security, the health and the prosperity of our sister in spirit, our partner in peace and our special friend, Israel.

I frequently describe myself as a Scoop Jackson Democrat. Scoop made a speech at this very conference, in which he said, "In their frustration at the seemingly intractable conflict in the Middle East there are those who are tempted to fashion a piece of paper into a paper peace. To yield to such temptation would be a mistake of historic proportions."

I'd like to talk to you about that temptation—which is just as enticing to some today as it was in 1975—but before I do, I'd like to reflect on that quotation as it applies to the world at large.

From Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points, to Franklin Roosevelt's Four Freedoms, to Harry Truman's creation of the NATO alliance and his recognition of the state of Israel, to John Kennedy's pledge to assure the survival and the success of liberty, this nation has been energetically engaged in the worldwide struggle for peace.

We believe that at the core of peaceful and prosperous societies lies an abiding faith in individual liberty. Our goal, then, is not just peace, but peace with freedom.

The quest for true peace, a climate of good will beyond the silent hostilities of an armed truce, is never easy. Freedom has a price. It requires firm knowledge of region and history, the instinct to follow a true moral compass, steady nerves that sustain a clear vision of the future, and most importantly, the ability to transmit to all, friend and foe alike, our unhesitating resolve to apply the force of the greatest and most powerful nation ever on Earth, to defend and support our principles. Otherwise, the peace we seek may end up being just a piece of paper.

Standing up to threats to democracy is very much a part of our tradition—of the tradition of Scoop Jackson and Hubert Humphrey. America must always draw a bright line between those who fight to enlarge the scope of democracy and freedom and those who seek to shrink it. And we must work with those who share our vision. That's why I support enhanced strategic cooperation with Israel, and that's why we both should move to complete the prepositioning of U.S. equipment and material in Israel for use in a crisis.

Just as Israel must never feel guilty about her strength, the United States must never apologize for her power. America must never shrink from the responsibility of being the leader of the free world.

In the period between the time I left the Governor's office and came to the Senate I had the invaluable experience of traveling, as a private citizen, to every continent and most of the world's trouble spots. In meetings with leaders of countries large and small, I came away with a new appreciation for the challenges and responsibilities the U.S. faces in exercising leadership and promoting peace.

With my assignment to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate and of its Subcommittee on Near Eastern Affairs, I'm having the opportunity to put the lessons of history and the insights gained on those trips to use in the cause of the quest for peace in the Middle East.

In any discussion of peace in the Middle East, however, there are two fundamental points which are often used by Israel's enemies to obscure serious dialogue.

First, in the corridors of the United Nations, in the capitals of some Third World countries and, unfortunately, even in some parlors here at home, there continues to be discussion of Israel's right to exist. That is simply not acceptable.

Israel, the resurrection of a 4,000 year old state, the culmination of the Zionist dream, and the best hope of preventing another Holocaust in the Diaspora, just celebrated its 41st year of independence. It's the 58th oldest state of the United Nations' 159 members. We can never compromise on Israel's right to exist, and could give Israel no better anniversary present than to insist that such Orwellian propaganda is abolished in the councils of the world. That's why last week I voted with the majority of my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee to establish an U.S. policy the withholding of funding from any international organization that rejects Israel's membership or accepts the PLO in membership—with no exceptions.

Second, let's be clear about what we mean when we say, "peace in the Middle East." The phrase has become code, having little to do with true peace in the region. Survey the landscape, and you find little in the way of peace. Virtually every state has been in conflict—in border disputes, subversion or full-scale war.

Iran and Iraq have declared a state of truce following a ten year conflict that claimed a million lives, saw waves of children being sent into combat, and in an ominous new trend, the use of deadly poison gas, both in contravention of every civil and moral convention.

Lebanon, once a thriving country referred to as the Switzerland of the Middle East has become a battleground in a seemingly neverending civil war between Arab factions that has claimed more than 100,000 lives.

In Syria, anywhere from ten to thirty thousand Sunnis—men, women and children—were wiped out in a week by the Assad regime in the ancient town of Hamma. So closed is this society that to this day we don't even know the number of the massacred.

Elsewhere, Islamic fundamentalism threatens to sweep the region and topple moderate Arab states.

The list goes on with melancholy regularity. No part of the region is immune. And what is most striking is that up to this point I have not even mentioned the Arab-Israeli conflict.

But it is clear that if the Arab League were to cease its hostilities and recognize Israel tomorrow—as it should, and if it were to exchange ambassadors and resume trade with Israel next week—as it should, those of us who search for "peace in the Middle East" would still have much to do.

These are difficult times for Israel. They are no less difficult for those of us who are committed to Israel. The almost nightly sight on the news of Israeli troops in the West Bank and Gaza causes real pain for those of us who hope, along with Israel, that peace can be brought to the territories without jeopardizing Israel's future.

But it is painful, too, to know what television does not show. It doesn't show the PLO paying demonstrators. The nightly news doesn't document the stipends paid to those who are imprisoned. Nor does it show the Palestinian moderates assassinated by the PLO because the wanted dialogue with Israel.

The world doesn't see that there is a calcuated campaign to create an atmosphere in which real negotiation is useless, if not impossible. Golda Meir expressed the pain we feel when she said, "We can forgive the Arabs for killing Jews, but we can't forgive Arabs for making Jews kill others."

Prime Minister Shamir's peace initiative and plan for elections in the West Bank and Gaza is a first step for peace, an important, positive step in the right direction. A number of us on the Foreign Relations Committee and other Members have recently met with the Prime Minister, and with King Hussein and President Mubarek as well. To each of them we expressed our feeling that this initiative marks the beginning

of a crucial process that could well pave the way for true progress in the conflict.

Now it's time for Arab Palestinians to reciprocate. Intifada Pamphlets 35 and 39, which called for the use of knives and molotov cocktails against the "Zionist enemies" is not an acceptable response. Nor is Arafat's call for the assassination of Bethlehem mayor Elias Freij, who had proposed a truce in the uprising. And continuing to allow a new generation to be lost to terrorism, as was demonstrated only yesterday by new pamphlets justifying assassination of moderate Palestinians and calling for a step-up in violence, does not advance the cause of peace.

As one more moderate Palestinian has said, "It will be a real tragedy if the Palestinian leadership does not seize this opportunity to launch a clear-cut peace initiative that is as daring and imaginative as the uprising itself."

Arab Palestinians have to start building cooperative links with their Jewish and Jordanian neighbors. I'd like to envision a generation of Arab Palestinians who translate stone throwing into positive political action, a new generation of Palestinians, who don't fear PLO assassins, cynical Arab leaders and exploitative Arab regimes, a new generation that knows that its fate—and the prospects for peace—are no longer in the hands of outsiders, but lie in direct negotiations.

Today, there are outsiders involved. Yassir Arafat and the PLO have injected themselves into the peace process.

None of us in the civilized world can forget the massacre of schoolchildren at Ma'alat, of Olympic athletes at Munich, the hijacking of the Achille Lauro, the cowardly murder of Leon Klinghoffer or the cold-blooded Rome Airport attack.

If Arafat has truly forsworn terrorism as a form of political expression, he's going to have to prove that he can deliver on promises he may make on behalf of the Palestinians.

What can we make of his claim that the PLO recognizes Israel, while at the same time constituent factions of the PLO, not to mention his senior political advisors, call for her destruction.

And peace declared at a press conference does not even carry the value of an unsigned paper peace. It matters not that the chairman of *Al Fatah* announce in Stockholm that the 1964 Palestinian Charter is "superseded" and then dashes off to Paris to say that it is "caduque."

At a minimum Arafat must convene the PNC to declare that Article 19 of its charter is "*larin wa-batil*," null and void in Arabic, and then take that message to his Arab partners in the capitals of the Arab World—in Arabic.

We reserve no place at the peace table for dissemblers, posturers or hypocrites. If Yassir Arafat wants to come to the table, he will have to demonstrate that he can deliver. As of now, he is not even at the threshold.

In the East-West area, our relations with the Soviet Union are warming and it has expressed a desire to play a role in the Middle East. It is tempting to believe that it wants real peace in the region. But despite *glasnost* and its "new thinking," the Soviets have yet to prove they want more than a paper peace.

Mr. Gorbachev can start by reestablishing relations with Israel broken off in 1967. If he truly desires Middle East peace, he should pledge that never again will there be the sight of Cuban troops fighting Israelis in the Golan Heights. The Soviets should stop selling SU-24 aircraft to Libya, as they did only weeks ago. The Soviet Union should withdraw the 4,000 or so advisors it has stationed in Syria, along with the 150 SAM installations that are aimed at Tel Aviv, Jerusalem and Haifa.

The Kremlin should also exercise its leverage over Syria, as well as Libya and Iraq, to see that they forswear chemical and biological weapons, and condemn them if they don't. Equally ominous is Iraq's attempt to yet again develop a nuclear capability. The Soviets could play a role there, too.

To be sure, the Soviet Union has initiated active diplomatic efforts in the region, but activity should never be confused with peacemaking.

Some say that in the missile age, surrounded by a hostile Arab world, Israel can't have secure borders. But I'm reminded here that David Ben-Gurion kept a map on his desk of the Middle East from Morocco to the Persian Gulf—the same map that's found throughout the Arab world today. On it, Israel is identified as "Occupied Palestine." Ben-Gurion looked at this map every day, and whenever he was asked how he could stand it, he declared: "There are only two permanents in politics: history and geography." To which he added, "That gives us a draw."

At times, democracies question themselves, perhaps too harshly. But democracies hold themselves to higher standards. Israel and the United States must never forget that people the world over—not just in China and the Soviet Union—aspire to our political values.

I am confident that Israel and the United States will never yield to the temptations of a paper peace in the Middle East. To us, the flowering of a strong, safe and democratic Israel is sweeter, the goal of true peace in the Middle East is more enticing.

For peace is all that we ask, a peace in which all countries in that troubled part of the world will beat their swords into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks; a peace that will enable the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose. When the wicked cease from troubling and the weary be at rest, then all of us, here, there and everywhere, will be able to say to each other, with faith and confidence, in our coming and in our going, Shalom, Peace; Peace be with you, now and forever.

I hope all of us live to see that day.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT BUSH ANNOUNCES COMPETITIVE ELECTION ACT OF 1989

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, for the first time since 1977, the President of the United States has taken an active interest in the campaign finance reform debate. On June 29, George Bush unveiled a comprehensive reform package designed to curtail the influence of special interests, strengthen political parties, reduce incumbent advantages, increase the level of competition in the congressional races, and put the election process back in the hands of the American people.

REDUCING THE INFLUENCE OF SPECIAL INTERESTS

A lot of Americans are disgusted with a political system that appears to cater to the special interests. President Bush has decided to deal with this issue directly by banning political action committees [PAC's] sponsored by corporations, labor unions and trade associations, and increasing disclosure requirements on so-called soft money contributions and independent expenditures.

For the so-called ideological PAC's that are protected under the first amendment's freedom of association, the President would slash the contribution limits from $5,000 per candidate per election to $2,500 per candidate per election.

In addition to limiting the role of PAC's, President Bush would increase disclosure requirements on all contributions and expenditures that are intended to influence elections but are not controlled by the candidates themselves. Full disclosure of all soft money contributions and expenditures by political parties, labor unions, PAC's and corporations for all Federal elections is a significant part of this package. Increased notice and disclosure requirements on so-called independent expenditures are also important.

The first amendment guarantees each American the right to freedom of speech. The Supreme Court held in the case of Buckley versus Valeo that political expenditures are a form of political speech. But, if we are genuinely concerned about the level of money in the political system, we need to know where the dollars come from and how they are being spent. Under these circumstances, disclosure is the best solution.

Although the primary focus of the President's package is on congressional elections, I am pleased that most of the so-called special interest provisions would also apply to Presidential races.

STRENGTHENING POLITICAL PARTIES

Experts have divergent views on the issue of campaign finance reform, but most academics agree that strengthening political parties would improve the current campaign financing system. Larry Sabato at the University of Virginia, Herbert Alexander at the University of Southern California, and Ross Baker at Rutgers University are prominent examples.

President Bush and a vast majority of my colleagues on this side of the aisle agree with the experts on this issue. We believe that, by giving a candidate a nest egg free of special interest obligations, political parties could enable candidates to spend less time raising money and more time discussing the issues.

DEMOCRATIC REACTION

The Democratic reaction to the President's proposal has been extremely partisan. The distinguished majority leader characterized the Bush proposal as having and I quote:

Little to do with campaign finance reform. * * * It was obviously crafted with one objective—to help Republicans.

Ron Brown, the Democratic Committee chairman, dismissed the President's plan before it was even announced. He said, and I quote:

The President's campaign finance bill ought to be labelled the fat cat protection act of 1989. * * * [George Bush] wants to make it easier to give Republican candidates access to big money contributors.

If the campaign finance reform debate in the 100th Congress taught us anything, it showed us that gut-level partisan reactions will lead to a stalemate in the Senate. I suggest that Ron Brown take some time to read through the President's plan. It does not favor the wealthy; it does not change the $1,000 individual contribution limit; it does not favor the special interests, and it does not rely on the taxpayers to pick up the tab for reform.

In my view, the real fat cats are House and Senate incumbents.

THE REAL FAT CATS

It is no secret that incumbents enjoy a number of advantages over challengers. PAC dollars, free media coverage, professional staff, and a multimillion-dollar franking privilege are obvious examples. The major reason for the dispute over spending limits is that they favor incumbents. It's that simple.

As the majority party in Congress, the Democrats have an interest in protecting incumbency, while Republicans are more concerned about guaranteeing that challengers have access to the political process. I, for one, do not want a permanent Democratic majority running the Congress, nor do I want the American taxpayers picking up the tab for "reform."

President Bush's plan directly addresses a number of the most regregious incumbent advantages. It prevents incumbents from building up a war chest by rolling over excess campaign funds; it prohibits Members of Congress from using excess campaign funds for personal use; and it places limits on unsolicited mass mailings by incumbents prior to an election.

GERRYMANDERING

In my view, redistricting is one of the most important elements in President Bush's plan. This issue must be addressed as part of any meaningful campaign finance reform package.

Politicians should not be allowed to manipulate congressional district boundaries in an effort to maintain a partisan advantage. President Bush agrees. His plan features a nonpartisan Federal standard for congressional districts that would go a long way toward making congressional races fair and competitive.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, over the past 2 years, the Senate found itself locked in a partisan logjam on the issue of campaign finance reform. It will clearly take a bipartisan effort to produce real, fair reform. My hope is that President Bush's proposals will give each Senator an incentive to reevaluate his or her position on this issue.

I look forward to working with the President, the distinguished majority leader, and my colleagues in the House and Senate on both sides of the aisle to produce a meaningful campaign finance reform proposal. One that is fair to Democrats and Republicans, to incumbents and challengers alike.

I ask unanimous consent that a fact-sheet of the major provisions in the President's plan be included in the RECORD immediately following my remarks. It is my understanding that the White House is currently drafting legislative language that should be completed before the Senate takes its August recess.

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

FACT SHEET—PRESIDENT BUSH'S CAMPAIGN FINANCE PROPOSALS

Today the President announced a comprehensive campaign finance proposal designed to lessen the power of special economic interests and restore competition to American Congressional elections. The package reflects the President's strong commitment to increasing the roles of individuals and the political parties in the electoral process. It is also designed to reform the system of campaign finance under which in the 1980s House incumbents have a 97.7 percent reelection rate and Senate incumbents an 85 percent reelection rate. The proposals follow general themes first articulated by the President in his April 12 speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

Eliminating political action committees (PACS) supported by corporations, unions or trade associations, and prohibiting such entities from paying for the overhead or administrative costs of any independent PAC.

Strengthening political parties by increasing the amounts they can spend on behalf of congressional candidates. This source of funds would permit legislators to spend less time fundraising, would ensure that challengers have greater resources with which to challenge incumbents, and would further limit the role of special economic interests in elections.

Addressing the problem of the "permanent Congress" by reforms designed to reduce the unwarranted advantages of incumbency. Specifically, the proposals would prohibit the personal use of excess campaign funds, drastically reduce Congressional mailings under the frank, ban the rollover of campaign funds from one election cycle to the next, and legislate fair neutral criteria for the redistriction of Congressional lines that will follow the 1990 census.

Fully disclosing all soft money spent by the political parties and all labor unions, corporations and trade associations to influence a federal election.

A more detailed description of the President's campaign finance reform package follows:

1. CONTRIBUTION LIMITS

Curtailing Political Action Committees (PAC's)

The proposal calls for the elimination of PAC's sponsored by corporations, unions and trade associations. The bulk of PAC contributions come from these corporate, union or trade association PACs: they accounted for nearly 90% of the approximately $160 million contributed by PAC's in the 1987-1988 election cycle.

Contribution limits for the remaining PAC's, i.e., those not sponsored by corporations, unions or trade associations (the so-called "non-connected" or independent PACs) would be reduced from $5,000 to $2,500 per candidate per election. It appears that freedom of association guarantees under the First Amendment make it impossible to eliminate these independent PACs.

Corporations, unions and trade associations would also be prohibited from using Treasury funds for non-connected PAC administrative or overhead costs, including corporate or union subsidies for payroll deductions to fund a PAC.

PAC contributions to national and state political parties would stay the same ($15,000 per year). The remaining independent PACs would also be able to continue funding such participatory activities as voter registration and get-out-the-vote programs, which would become fully reportable.

The proposal would codify the Beck Supreme Court decision, holding that union members cannot be forced to have mandatory union dues go to political causes or organizations they do not support.

"Leadership PAC's," including those associated with Presidential candidacies, would be curtailed by limiting federal candidates and elected officials to one fundraising committee, and by prohibiting transfers between fundraising committees.

All but political party committees would be prohibited from bundling, the practice where an organization or its officials solicit contributions from its employees or members at a central location, "bundles" them and sends them to a candidate without affecting the organization's contribution limits.

Independent expenditures would be subject to additional notice requirements. Any advertisement or other political communication paid for by independent expenditures would have to include additional disclosure throughout, identifying the person or organization funding it and stating that it is not authorized by any candidate.

Strengthening Political Parties

The proposal increases to $.05 from $.02 times the voting age population the coordinated expenditure limits that parties may spend on behalf of federal candidates (ranges now from $92,000 to about $1.5 million depending on population for a Senate race, about $46,000 for a House race). This would allow a larger percentage of contributions to a candidate to come from political parties.

2. REFORMING UNFAIR ADVANTAGES

Limiting the Use of Excess Campaign Funds

The rollover of excess campaign funds into the next election cycle would be prohibited by requiring that all campaign treasuries be zeroed out by January 31 following the election. All excess campaign funds would have to go to: national or state party committees; the National Debt Retirement Account of the United States Treasury; or

all campaign contributors as pro-rata refunds.

Presidential candidates would also be prohibited from using excess campaign funds from previous races to fund their presidential efforts.

The proposal bans the conversion of excess campaign funds for personal use. With regard to the Congress, this would apply as follows:

House—House members who are grandfathered could no longer convert the funds to personal use.

Senate—Senators would be precluded from supplementing official accounts with their own excess campaign funds.

Limiting the Use of the Frank

The proposal bans the use of the frank for unsolicited mass mailings.

Quarterly filings would be required by all Members of Congress regarding the amounts spent on franked mail. The reports would be due within 30 days of the close of the quarter.

Fairness in Redistricting

The proposal calls for the end of Gerrymandering through the promulgation of criteria for fair redistricting in federal elections. Such criteria will include requiring district lines to adhere to compactness standards and follow established community boundaries.

The legislation will emphasize the need for congressional and state legislative plans to follow the provisions of the Voting Rights Act.

3. SOFT MONEY DISCLOSURE

Full disclosure of all "soft money" contributions and expenditures by political party committees would be required under the proposal.

Labor unions, corporations and trade associations would have to disclose all money spent to influence a federal election, including voter registration and get-out-the-vote activities, as well as any communications which advocate the election or defeat of any federal candidates.

The proposal also calls for the adoption of realistic allocation guidelines to attribute the cost of party activities proportionately to federal candidates. This will assure that "non-federal" dollars are not used to support "federal" candidates.

THE DEATH OF WILLIAM J. GREER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to mark the passing of a fine man and great South Carolinian, Mr. William J. Greer of Greenville, SC. Jack Greer was a prominent and successful businessman who contributed greatly to the State's economy, and he never lost sight of his strong commitment to civic responsibility.

Mr. Greer was born in Honea Path, SC, and later moved to Greenville where he attended Parker High School. He worked hard all of his life, beginning at the age of 14 when he was employed as a part-time mill sweeper. Mr. Greer's hard work ethic paid off, and he went on to become the founder of Texize Chemicals and Intex Products which are now sold under the Dow brands name.

The Texize Co. grew from its inception as a five-man operation with $60,000 in annual sales to a household name all over the country. After World War II, when texitle chemicals were a scarcity, Greer started his company to manufacture the chemicals necessary for textile mills. In 1971, Greer founded another company, Intex Products, to supply specialty chemicals for the industrial, institutional and textile industries.

Jack Greer was the model of the American spirit of entrepreneurship—through hard work and dedication, coupled with an astute business sense, we achieved great success.

Mr. Greer was best known as a business magnate, but he was also a committed civic leader. He was chairman of the board of the Boys Home of the South located in Belton, SC, and also served as chairman of commissioners of the State Ethics Commission. He was a founder of the Strom Thurmond Institute at Clemson University and a member of the Clemson University Board of Visitors. I will always be grateful for the fine work he did in connection with the university.

I would like to extend my most sincere condolences to Mr. Greer's lovely wife, Sylvia Lingo Greer, and the rest of the Greer children: his sons, Richard E. Greer and Tommy D. Greer; his daughters Mrs. Paul Storey, Mrs. John Thurnton and Mrs. Randy Bell; and his stepdaughters, Mrs. David Brisben and Mrs. James Hines. Richard Greer is the able head of the South Carolina State Development Board; in this position, he has continued in the Greer tradition of excellence and I commend him on the fine work that he is doing.

The debt of gratitude that we feel for him as friends, South Carolinians and Americans is abiding and strong. We will remember and appreciate Mr. Greer for many, many years to come.

ACT FOR BETTER CHILD CARE SERVICES

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, the Senate now has considered and approved S. 5, the Act for Better Child Care Services. After carefully reviewing the ABC bill and its potential impact on my home State of South Dakota, I could make no other decision than to vote against the ABC proposal and for the administration's child care tax credit package. The ABC legislation, although amended in various respects during debate, contains serious flaws. This fact did not go unnoticed by hundreds of discerning South Dakota citizens, who contacted me to voice their strong opposition to the ABC proposal.

Our Nation's parents should receive child care assistance, but creating a new and extensive bureaucratic structure to deliver assistance to a relatively small number of families is not the answer. The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee's own report on ABC states that approximately 18 million American children would be eligible for ABC funds if the bill becomes law. However, only 500,000 children actually would receive assistance under ABC's funding level. I fear that residents in the rural areas of South Dakota would lose out in a fierce competition for ABC dollars.

The likely ABC impact on America's church-based child care centers is another reason I opposed the bill. The constitutional questions raised by S. 5 have not been settled, no matter how many times ABC advocates say they have been. Churches that host child care programs will face expensive, time-consuming litigation because of this legislation. I, for one, do not want to see churches forced to use scarce resources on lawsuits, nor parents compelled to choose between placing their little ones in church-run care programs and receiving Federal assistance.

In conclusion, I remain very troubled by the Senate's passage of S. 5. Most assuredly, the Government has a role to play in increasing the affordability and availability of child care in the United States, but ABC will not accomplish these objectives. Instead, parental choice will be reduced, another complicated and expensive bureaucracy will arise, and churches will be mired in a legal mess. American families deserve better than to be served this platter of problems. If S. 5 becomes law, this is exactly what they will get.

SANCTIONS ON COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. HELMS. Through the years I have had differences of opinion with the labor union leaders regarding the question of how to raise the living standards of the American working family, but there has never been the slightest doubt in my mind that either Lane Kirkland or his predecessor, the late George Meany, was unaware of the brutal effects of communism on workers.

Last month, speaking of the bloody repression in Red China, Lane Kirkland said: "These acts of repression confirm the nature of Communist dictatorship as essentially tyrannical and immoral."

Mr. Kirkland is right, mass killings, slave labor, the kind of thought control once called brain washing, spies who turn in their family members to the secret police—this is what keeps communism in power.

How, then, does the leading nation of the free world respond to the latest outrage by the Chinese Communist leadership?

Mr. President, the U.S. Congress should pass sanctions legislation—for several reasons:

First, the United States must demonstrate its revulsion at the brutal oppression imposed on those freedom-loving Chinese students whose aspirations—and in many cases, whose bodies and lives—were crushed in the Communist crackdown on June 3 and 4.

Second, we have an obligation to those who yearn for liberty in China, and in other countries suffering under the tyranny of communism. If we do nothing, we will be aiding their enemies—the unrepentant Stalinists in Cuba, Vietnam, Nicaragua, and Eastern Europe who will conclude that after the killings stop, there will be a short period of complaints from the West, followed by oppressive business-as-usual.

Third, we should be responsive to the surviving democracy leaders and those who aspire for democracy within Red China who plead for our support. The prodemocracy forces in Red China have paid the price of liberty. They have earned, they deserve, they must have our support.

President Bush has made an excellent start. The House has made a significant contribution. But there is much more that we can do and must do in Congress.

Multilateral bank loans should be cut off—the West must not continue to finance Communist dictatorship in China.

If we are going to ask United States businessmen to reduce their activities in Communist China, we must to ensure that businessmen from other free world countries do not take commercial advantage of our sanctions and prohibitions.

We must look very closely at civilian aircraft sales. Questions cry out for answers: Did the Chinese Red Army use civilian airlines to move troops to Beijing in May? Could U.S.-produced aircraft be used in the future to move troops on another mission to suppress prodemocracy demonstrators?

The Chinese students have expressed a well-founded fear that the Chinese KGB will come to the United States disguised as diplomats on an intimidation mission. We must prevent that and deny them visas into this country.

After the invasion of Afghanistan, the free world boycotted Soviet national day. We must have a similar response to events in China. Two major holidays are coming up, Army Day on August 1, and the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Chinese regime on October 1.

Mr. President, I cannot claim that these sanctions, combined with those of the other body, will bring communism in China to its knees. That will be a long, hard struggle.

But the consequences of failing to act are obvious. How will future generations of Americans and Chinese, judge the 101st Congress if we are too timid to support democracy in China? Will it be said that the Congress stood up to be counted when democracy was threatened? It is a matter of honor. It is a matter of principle. We must not default.

KASTEN SPEECH IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last month, our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, Senator KASTEN, visited the Soviet Union. While there, he delivered an insightful and thought-provoking address on American democracy, and the lessons of our democratic experience for the world—including the Soviet Union.

Senator KASTEN's message couldn't have been more timely for his audience of Soviet intellectuals and students. His message is also a timelessly valuable one for all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Senator KASTEN's address be printed in the RECORD, and I commend it to all Senators.

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

ADDRESS: THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SYSTEM: HOW IT WORKS—AND WHY

(By Sen. Robert W. Kasten, Jr.)

Thank you very much. I come before you as a member of the United States Senate, which is one of the two bodies that together make up the Congress, the national legislature of the United States.

I also come before you as an American politican, a member of the Republican Party currently headed by President George Bush.

As a legislator and as a politician, I have had occasion for many years now to reflect on the principles and practices of the American form of government. And I am very grateful for this opportunity to share with an audience of Soviet students and intellectuals both my understanding of the philosophical foundations of our system of government, and my appreciation of how that system works in practice to improve the lives of the American people.

The people of the State of Wisconsin elected me to represent their interests in our national capital of Washington, D.C. In maintaining contact with those I represent, I have frequently addressed groups of young people in these or similar words: "The kind of America we have depends on your efforts. It's up to you to build the America of the future."

In America, these sentiments are so commonplace that they have almost lost their meaning. It's taken for granted that the role of young people is to build up their country in their own image, so that they can spend their adulthood in a society of their own creation.

Here in the Soviet Union, those same words have a dramatically different meaning. To call on the young people of Russia to build their own national future is a challenge fraught with immense promise and immense peril. But that is what is happening now, as a result of the unprecedented reform movement led by President Gorbachev.

The Gorbachev reforms—political glasnost and economic perestroika—have confronted the young people of Russia with fundamental choices about the kind of Russia they want to inherit, and the kind of Russia they want to bequeath to their children.

I think President, Gorbachev discovered the correct path when he called for a Russia reintegrated into Europe, and a Soviet Union reintegrated into the global community of nations.

Many in the Communist Party media will try to scare you about America's intentions in Europe. They will try to convince you that America seeks a hegemony in Europe, and is therefore threatened by a new European Russia. But the truth is the opposite: America welcomes Russia back into its European heritage, because only through rediscovery of that heritage can the liberty and prosperity of the Soviet peoples, and a future of peace and security for all nations, be assured.

Let us work to build President Gorbachev's European House, even as the peoples of Poland and Hungary are building it today—a European House founded on a bedrock of respect for human rights, political and economic pluralism, and the dignity of all men and women.

What the peoples of Poland and Hungary are recovering is the tradition of Western political philosophy, of free and enlightened discussion about the structure of the state, the society, and the government.

This dialogue is almost 2500 years old. It began when the Greek philosopher Plato remarked that men can satisfy their material and spiritual needs much more readily in the context of a unified political organization. Plato said that the division of labor and the unity of the state are the foundations of a successful social order.

The weaknesses of Plato's approach were exposed by his student Aristotle. Aristotle believed that a unitary state founded on a strict class system could not do justice to human nature. He argued against Plato that "the nature of a state is to be a plurality"—and that a state without pluralism would cease to be a state at all. It would, argued Aristotle, degenerate into a society in which free choice, happiness, and virtue were no longer the objects of the social order.

And Aristotle believed that any system that sacrificed the proper goal of man—the happiness that results from active participation in building a society of free people—to a desire for efficiency and social conformity was fundamentally unworthy of man.

Aristotle's contribution—what one might call the "Great Leap Forward" of Western thought—was to recognize that the happiness and freedom of the human person are the goals which all good governments strive to accomplish.

The last 25 centuries of Western history have been a debate on these competing visions of the political order. And I am an active participant in a political system which arose from one particular historic response to this debate.

In the late 18th century, my country, America, was a colony being exploited by an imperialist power, Britain. The exploitation had been under way for over a century and a half, and the colonists were finding it increasingly difficult to reconcile the denial of political and economic rights to the colonists with the traditional system of liberties enjoyed by British subjects.

By 1776, the residents of British America had become very angry at the concentration

of power in the hands of the British Sovereign, King George III. They appealed to the higher authority of those traditional British liberties as a justification for an apparently radical step: outright rebellion against Britain.

The rights they were being denied—among them the rights to life, liberty, and the free pursuit of happiness—were held sacred by British tradition. More than that—they were understood to be part of the human person himself, ordained by nature and nature's God. This philosophical system was the foundation for the successful revolution of the American colonies, as well as for the establishment of the Constitution by which today's American government is organized and controlled.

After the Revolution, America for a brief time was a loose Confederation of states. The weakness of the central government during this period prompted Americans to draft a new system of government organization—a new Constitution.

In 1787, the several states which made up the American Confederation sent delegates to a national convention in Philadelphia. The purpose of this convention was to establish a system of government for the newly-liberated colonies which would avoid the extreme centralization and denial of rights which marred the British administration, while at the same time possessing adequate power to meet the needs of the new nation in a democratic-pluralist way.

As one contemporary commentator, Alexander Hamilton, phrased it, the question the convention had to confront was this: "(Are) societies of men . . . really capable . . . of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or (are they) forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force"?

The answer that emerged from the convention was that men and women are indeed capable of constructing a good government based on reason, and that they could devise a system that took sufficient account of all factions and interests while denying the rights and legitimacy of none.

The 1787 Constitution recognized, in the words of one of its chief architects, James Madison, that "(t)he latent cause of faction are . . . sown in the nature of man; . . . (and that therefore) the causes of faction cannot be removed." The only solution, Madison concluded, was to control the effects of faction.

And indeed, controlling the effects of faction was the chief project—and the most signal accomplishment—of the new Constitution. The Constitution provided for a complex series of limitations on government, each of which was designed to lessen the likelihood that any one faction could arrogate to itself the power to oppress the others.

Some argued that all of these factions would irreparably weaken the government, and that it might be better to limit liberties in order to decrease the factional conflict and thus provide for a stronger government. The new government, after all, had a lot of serious problems to confront; why strangle it in its crib with a lot of unnecessary restrictions?

The crafters of the Constitution, led by Madison, argued against this understanding of the restrictions they were imposing on the new government. They believed that the special genius of the system they had devised was that it transformed faction from a source of weakness into a source of strength.

Instead of curtailing liberties in order to make the government strong, the Constitution divided and limited the power of the government so that no faction could hijack all of the power even if it controlled part of the government. It didn't make the government weaker; it made all of the several factions weaker as they each sought to divert government to their particular economic, regional, or ideological ends.

So the end result of allowing and even encouraging all these different individuals and factions to contend was the strengthening of the new government. This was the intention of the writers of the Constitution two hundred years ago; and—as I can testify as a day-to-day participant in that Constitutional system—this is pretty much how it works in practice today.

I'd like now to describe briefly how that Constitutional system works, my own role in it, and how my role interacts with the roles of others.

At the core of the American democratic system is the separation of powers. Madison observed in the debates over the approval of the Constitution that the absence of this separation is the very definition of tyranny. If the same person or group is entitled to write the laws, enforce the laws, and interpret the laws, the necessary result will be an anti-democratic concentration of power in this person or group, and the consequent erosion of the rights and liberties of other citizens.

The legislative function in the United States is exercised by the Congress, which comprises two popularly-elected branches. The Senate, of which I am a member, has two members from each of the 50 American states. The entire population of a state votes on candidates running for election to the Senate. Senators are elected for six-year terms.

The House of Representatives has 435 members, and these are distributed among the 50 states according to population. For example, my own state of Wisconsin sends 9 members to the House; the largest state, California, sends 45; and the very smallest states send only one each. To win a seat in this body, a candidate must contest and win an election in one of the geographic districts in his state. For example, before being elected to the Senate, I served as member of the House of Representatives for one of the nine geographic districts in Wisconsin. Members of the House are elected for two-year terms.

Because members of these two chambers of the legislature are directly elected by popular vote, they are sometimes controlled by different political parties. For much of this decade, the Senate was controlled by a majority from the Republican Party, while the House has been controlled by a majority from the Democratic Party.

The choice about which party will control the House and the Senate is thus made by individual men and women at the local level all over America, when they go to the ballot box and decide which candidate will best represent their interests and values. And it's not unusual for voters to split their ballots—many citizens in Wisconsin voted for me, a member of the Republican Party, in the election for the Senate, while at the same time voting for a member of the Democratic Party in the elections for the House of Representatives.

That's how the people who write America's laws are chosen.

The executive power in America is vested in the President, who is elected for a four-year term. Presidential elections, while occuring on the same day as elections to the Congress, are independent of them and involve a more complex process. Rather than amassing a numerical majority of voters nationwide, a Presidential candidate must win a majority in each of as many states as all together make up a majority of the American population.

Nonetheless, because no candidate in the last 101 years has been elected without also receiving the most votes from the American people, the Presidential elections are widely perceived as being just as fair and democratic as those for Congress.

Voters can split their ballots here as well—voting for a Republican for President and voting for Democrats to serve in Congress. Today, America has a Republican President, George Bush, and Democratic majorities in both the House and the Senate.

So in trying to represent the people of Wisconsin in the national capital, I have to work with another Senator from Wisconsin (who is currently of the opposite party), a nine-member delegation from Wisconsin to the House of Representatives (of which 4 are of my party and 5 are of the other party) and a President (who is of my party).

Together with all the other Senators and members of the House, these are the people who will decide on the national policies affecting Wisconsin and the other 49 states.

The judicial power in America is also independent. The federal judges charged with interpreting the Constitution and enforcing national laws are appointed by the President, but they must be approved by a majority of the Senate. These judges have life tenure.

As if this weren't enough, there is yet another layer of safeguards to protect the liberty of Americans: the system of federalism. Each of the 50 states has its own popularly elected Governor and legislature and makes its own laws. These state governments, because they are closest to the needs and concerns of their people, have been dynamic innovators in government policy—and much of what is best in our national laws was enacted as a result of its proven success in one or a number of the states.

Constitutional rights and liberties are another essential component of the American political system. That a Congress or a President is elected democratically does not entitle it to infringe on the rights of individuals and minorities. The Constitution's Bill of Rights prohibits the making of any laws that would violate the people's right to freedom of speech, freedom of religion, or any other basic human rights.

Central to the economic rights recognized by our Constitution is the provision which holds that "No person shall . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

This provision ought to make clear just how central the individual is to the American system. Just as the individual, as a human being endowed with basic human rights and dignity, has his civil rights protected, so also the individual, as source of economic innovation and creativity, has his property rights protected.

In each case, what is at stake is the dignity of the human person; and, in each case, the American government has no power to infringe upon it.

The Constitution can be amended by common consent of the legislatures of

three-fourths of the states to a particular amendment, which can be proposed either by a two-thirds vote of both houses of the Congress, or by a Convention called by two-thirds of the state legislatures.

By making the amendment process this complex and difficult, the creators of our Constitution ensured that it would not be amended for frivolous and demeaning purposes, or be turned into a tool for the satisfaction of transient passions. And in fact, there have been only 26 amendments in the last 200 years.

As I have just described it, the American political system sounds as if it might be too complicated to work effectively. Does it in fact work?

It is my belief, based on almost twenty years of experience in American politics, that the system works. The dictum of Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain, to the effect that democracy is the worst possible form of government except all the other forms that have ever been tried, is true.

To those of us trying to work within the system to promote the interests of the voters of our states, the system is often irritating. It is even sometimes infuriating. But in the last analysis, when it comes to meeting the human needs and protecting the human rights of all the American people, the American system works very well.

Just as the crafters of the Constitution intended, the fragmenting of power has proved a source of great strength for our country. Our Constitutional system sometimes fails to prevent bad things from happening, but it usually keeps them from becoming much worse than they already are. In short, the system functions as a self-correcting mechanism—just as its founders had intended.

The environment will provide one example of how our democracy works. Nothing is more important to ensuring high standards of living over the long term than prompt action to keep the world's air and water clean and healthy.

Over the last two decades, numerous organizations of private citizens have been formed in America to publicize the environmental problem and to suggest solutions to it. These citizens are voters—and their needs must be respected by all participants in the political process.

The environment was a major issue in last year's U.S. Presidential election. One of the most effective campaign strategies employed by the winning candidate, George Bush, was to charge his opponent, Michael Dukakis, with having presided over the environmental devastation of Boston Harbor.

The Bush strategy was to ask the American people to decide whether a man who had been inadequately sensitive to the needs of the environment when he was serving as Governor of one of the 50 states could be trusted to help set environmental policy for the nation as a whole.

These issues were debated publicly, and Bush was elected. Last week, the new President was busy touring America to gather support for the environmental policies he is planning to propose to the Congress.

That's the way environmental policy is made in America. In a non-democratic society, however, the formation of pressure groups—like the ones using political activism to help save the American environment—is discouraged. Also, in a centrally-planned state economy, there is a tendency to subordinate everything—including the health of the land and its people—to meeting the short-term targets set by five-year plans.

I suspect that this is the reason Russia's environment is in much greater peril than ours. Soviet biologist Alexei Yablokov says that a full 20 percent of the Soviet population lives in ecological "disaster" zones, and another 35-to-40 percent in what he calls ecologically "unfavorable areas."

Dr. Feordor Morgun, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. State Committee for Nature Conservation, warns that 102 Soviet cities, with a total population of 50 million, frequently have concentrations of air pollution of "ten times the permitted level."

And Marat Khabibullov, a researcher at Kazan State University who is currently a visiting professor at the University in Madison, Wisconsin, tells us that the Arab Sea may dry up by the year 2010; that an estimated 2.5 million acres of cropland are abandoned each year in Soviet Central Asia due to soil erosion; and that infant deaths are on the rise in the Soviet Union.

Please don't misunderstand me. I'm not pointing these things out in order to attack the Soviet Union. I'm just trying to show that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R have similar problems only because of our broad democracy, in which many diverse individuals and groups participate.

And so we return to the problem as old as Western civilization, the problem with which the people of the Soviet Union are grappling today: How can we organize a just society? The framers of the American Constitution—the oldest surviving democratic constitution in the world—expressed the task in the following words: "A good government implies two things: first, fidelity to the object of government, which is the happiness of the people; secondly, a knowledge of the means by which the object can best be attained.

I hope that I have been able to set forward in a helpful way the means which my own country has used over the last two hundred years to promote the happiness of our people. Other democracies have sought the same goal, but with somewhat different means, different structures of government organization.

In Great Britain, for example, the executive power is held by members of the popularly elected legislature. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, as parliamentary leader of the majority Conservative Party, makes the executive decisions that in the United States are made by the President.

The British system thus gives great power to the majority party in the legislature. If a party wins a majority in this unicameral legislature, it has the right to enact its policies into law with very few restrictions. Its actions, of course, will be judged by the public at the next elections.

America's separation of powers makes it much more difficult for any particular party to enact its policies into law. But I think that what America loses by lacking this strong consolidation of power, it more than makes up by giving minority parties and minority interests an opportunity to promote their programs.

The empowering of minority groups can of course be taken to extremes, with the result that the political system is completely fragmented and reduced to impotence. I think the state of Israel is in a situation close of this. In Israel, the balance of power is often held by minority splinter parties and religious parties, which exercise political power far out of proportion to the number of people they represent.

The key to a successful representative government is ensuring the rights of the minority while at the same time providing for the enactment of the will of the minority. I think Israel may lean too far in the first direction, toward the minority, and Britain too far in the second direction, toward the majority.

These structures, then, are important. Democracies do better or worse according to how well their structures provide for the political rights of all their citizens.

But the spirit is the same—the spirit of human rights and of democracy. Where this spirit lives, there is a hope of happiness for the people.

President Gorbachev says that faithfulness to Leninist principles requires the democratization of the Soviet Union, that a true Leninist socialism must be based on the grassroots democratic activism of the local soviets and the work collectives.

But Lenin himself wrote in his seminal work The State and Revolution that when he spoke of democracy, what he meant was "an organization for the systematic use of violence by one class against the other, by one section of the population against another."

That's not what we mean by "democracy" in America. That's not what President Lyndon Johnson meant when, in 1965, he asked the U.S. Congress to pass a law that would finally allow the black men and women of America the right to participate fully in democracy.

For centuries, despite the reverence of the American people for the principles of equality and human rights, the black people in America were denied equal treatment under the laws, and they were denied basic human rights. Before 1863, there was outright slavery; after 1863, there were assertively racist white majorities in a number of American states.

This situation was a standing reproach to the ideals of our country. For many years, many Americans, black and white alike, worked peacefully to assemble an effective majority for black rights. And it was in the name of this majority that President Johnson addressed the Congress on March 15, 1965, in the following words:

"This was the first nation in the history of the world to be founded with a purpose. The great phrases of that purpose still sound in every American heart, North and South: 'All men are created equal'—'government by consent of the governed'—'give me liberty or give me death.' Those are not just clever words. Those are not just empty theories. In their name Americans have fought and died for two centuries, and tonight around the world they stand there as guardians of our liberty, risking their lives.

"Those words are a promise to every citizen that he shall share in the dignity of man. This dignity cannot be found in a man's possessions. It cannot be found in his power or in his position. It really rests on his right to be treated as a man equal in opportunity to all others."

On that day in 1965, President Johnson was speaking to the best part of the spirit of all Americans. He was expressing what Americans in the noblest depth of their heart mean by democracy—not a system of violence, but a system of peaceful change; not a system of retribution against enemies, but a system of cooperation and respect for differences; not a system of class hatred or race hatred, but a system that recognizes the inestimable value of all human beings.

On that same day in 1965, Americans could listen to folk singer Bob Dylan on their radios: "Come, mothers and fathers,

throughout the land,/ And don't criticize what you can't understand./ Your sons and your daughters are beyond your command,/ Your old road is rapidly aging./ Please get out of the new one if you can't lend your hand—/ For the times, they are a-changing."

And, today, the times are changing here in the Soviet Union. What will become of this union of great nations? Can true democracy be built on a Leninist foundation? Can the slumbering giant of the Russian spirit be reawakened for active service to the world community?

The answers to these questions are written in the hearts of the young people of this country, the first adults of the 21st century. And I find in those hearts much cause for optimism—because they are the hearts of brothers and sisters, men and women who know the good that is in man if only he is allowed to be free.

So let me ask, along with the great Russian writer Nikolai Gogol: "Whither art thou soaring away to, then, Russia? Give me thy answer! But Russia gives none. With a wondrous ringing does the jingle bell trill; the air, rent to shreds, thunders and turns to wind; all things on earth fly past and, eyeing it askance, all the other peoples and nations stand aside and give it the right of way."

You have it within your power to make this land a wonder of the world, a marvel for all mankind. This is your challenge, and the hope of lovers of freedom all over the world.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will go into executive session to consider the nomination of Chic Hecht to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

NOMINATION OF CHIC HECHT, OF NEVADA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chic Hecht, of Nevada, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today, we are considering the nomination of former Senator Chic Hecht for the post as Ambassador to The Bahamas. Senator Hecht appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations on May 19 for his confirmation hearing chaired by Senator DODD, chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere and Peace Corps Affairs. On June 8, Senator Hecht was favorably reported by the committee.

In today's world, The Bahamas is much more important to the United States than its small size and its stature in the world may indicate. It is a major transshipment point for significant amounts of cocaine and marijuana entering the United States. It is for this reason that in the past few years, many in the Senate have expressed concern about the nature of the Bahamian Government's policy on narcotics trafficking as well as the charges of official corruption within the Government. The administration has certified that the Government of The Bahamas is fully cooperating with United States' antinarcotics efforts and cited various examples.

During his hearing, Senator Hecht was made well aware of the concerns about the narcotics and corruption issues by the Senators in attendance. Senator Hecht pledged to continue pressing the Government of The Bahamas for genuine cooperation in combating international narcotics trafficking.

I congratulate Senator GRAHAM for underlining the importance of the post of Ambassador to The Bahamas by moving for this floor discussion. It will serve as a reminder to all concerned that we in the United States remain very interested in the type of action that the Government of The Bahamas takes on the narcotics front and expect our representatives in The Bahamas to push for cooperation to its fullest extent.

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. President, Mr. President, at this point, I would like to make some introductory comments about the nomination of Senator Chic Hecht as Ambassador from the United States to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas focusing particularly on the following points.

First, we use the term "war on drugs," but this is a very special type of war. It is a war that will not have Waterloo-type victories or defeats. It is a war in which there will be a series of important skirmishes, and our ability to collectively manage and emerge victorious from those series of skirmishes will determine the end result of this war on drugs.

Second is that one of the most important series of these skirmishes will be those that are waged outside the continental United States. Most of the drugs consumed in this country are produced outside the United States. There are important corridors of transshipment from the source countries to the United States, and dealing effectively with those source and transport countries will be an important part of our strategy for victory in the war on drugs.

Third is that not only will a country like The Bahamas be judged by its action, even more important to us, the United States of America is going to be judged by our collective action. I believe that just as individuals can only fundamentally change themselves that nations can only fundamentally change and set directions for themselves. So the type of actions, the symbolism of our actions, the anticipated response to our actions by our foreign allies and our foreign foes are an important part of our strategy for victory in the war on drugs.

Fourth, The Bahamas is an important component of that international dimension to the war on drugs.

And finally, the United States Ambassador to The Bahamas serves in a unique position because of the combination of the importance of The Bahamas as a transshipment point, the scale of The Bahamas as a nation, the small population and economic base and, therefore, the necessity of close cooperation between the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, a sovereign government, and various United States agencies which are providing a substantial amount of the complement to the Bahamian efforts to have an effective defense against drugs from that very important country.

Those are some of the issues that are at stake today as we debate an ambassadorial appointment which, in previous years, might have been considered to be one of the easiest, least controversial, frankly, least demanding ambassadorial post that the United States could assign one of its citizens to fill.

Mr. President, to return to those introductory points, I do not need to belabor the President or the Members of the Senate or the people of the United States with the high priority which is placed upon the United States success in grappling with and overcoming the scourge of drugs which today besets virtually every community in this Nation. In poll after poll—most recently, a Gallup poll and a Hart poll, the issue of drug rates consistently is the top concern of the citizens of this country. This is not a regional issue; it is not a class issue; it is an issue of deep national concern growing out of our recognition as a people of the consequences of surrender in the war on drugs to the future of our Nation.

It is an issue, Mr. President, in which we, as political figures, have spoken at great length and occasional eloquence. The President, Members of the Senate, Members of the Congress, Governors, other State and local offi-

cials have all spoken out about the importance of victory in the war on drugs. What we are about today, Mr. President, is a question of whether we are prepared to back up our words with definitive action. If you ask the question, will the assignment of an Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas be the critical element in victory or defeat in terms of our war on drugs, the answer is no. But frankly, there is no other single action that would be pivotal in victory or defeat. It is much like asking the question, Would the decision of the assignment of the commanding officer to the North African front during World War II in and of itself have made the difference in the victory of the allies over Adolf Hitler? The answer is probably not, but the fact that we were able to turn the tide in that theater set in motion and reinforced actions elsewhere which cumulatively did lead to allied victory. This is an important decision. I suggest that this decision is almost as important to the war on drugs as to the decision to who we assigned to be our commander in chief in North Africa in World War II.

Mr. President, what we are doing here today is also going to be an important symbol around the world and particularly around this region of the world which has been so important—the Caribbean, Latin America. Let me ask you, Mr. President, to put yourself in the position of a political figure in, let us say, Colombia. Colombia has been a country which for the last decade has been in a very real hot war with the drug cartel. We read within the past few days that the Governor of the State of Medellin was murdered as part of that hot war against drugs in Colombia, murdered because he had been vocal and an effective leader in that nation's effort to turn an enormous tide of drugs which face and threaten the very sovereignty of the nation of Colombia.

If you are a political figure in Colombia looking to the United States for not only fiscal and physical but also spiritual and leadership support in this war on drugs, what kind of signal are we sending in terms of the decisions that we make here, including the decision to confirm the Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas? I suggest that we need to send a consistent set of statements of our seriousness, of our willingness to commit not only resources but the best American citizens that we have in the critical battleground against the war on drugs. To do less is to tell our allies that we are less than fully committed to victory, a statement that I do not believe we can tolerate.

Mr. President, I would like to turn now to the specific issue of the importance of The Bahamas within this region in our war on drugs. The Bahamas have been, for most of this decade, the major drug transport center between Latin America and the United States of America. I believe it would be fair to characterize The Bahamas as the most important country to the United States in terms of our war on drugs, other than those which are the direct source of the drugs themselves. It has been estimated that over the last decade The Bahamas has represented as high as 70 percent—70 percent—of the cocaine into the United States was transported through the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

Mr. President, this is a map of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas. The Commonwealth of The Bahamas consists of approximately 700 islands. They stretch from near the coast of Florida almost to the Island of Hispaniola. They consist of a land mass which is approximately the size of the State of Connecticut plus the State of New Jersey combined. The State of Connecticut and the State of New Jersey combined would represent the land mass of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

The Bahamas has a population of 250,000 people, of which approximately half live on the single island of New Providence, the island of the capital of Nassau; the other 125,000 in the remaining some 700 small islands. The Bahamas is a country which by our standards is relatively poor; buy the region's standards is one of the more prosperous countries in the Caribbean.

The Bahamas has made a significant commitment to the war on drugs. While there may be some differences based on accounting method and cost assignment, the Bahamian Government calculates that approximately 12 to 14 percent of its total national budget has been committed to drug-related activities. The Bahamian Government estimates it spends over 15 percent of its total national budget on drug education and treatment, so its efforts between enforcement and treatment represent well over 25 percent of its national budget.

Mr. President, not only is The Bahamas a significant center for cocaine importation, it has also been a major area for importation of other drugs. In 1988, the Coast Guard seized in Bahamian territorial waters almost 48.2 metric tons of marijuana, and in 1988 a joint United States-Bahamian interdiction effort netted an additional 13.2 tons of marijuana in Bahamian territorial waters. So for a variety of serious law enforcement issues, for a variety of drugs which are causing major problems in the streets of the United States of America, The Bahamas is a significant transport center.

The Bahamas also, Mr. President, has unfortunately become a major source of internal drug addiction.

On June 21, our colleague, Senator MOYNIHAN, submitted for the RECORD a statement on drug addiction in The Bahamas, pointing out that as early as the beginning years of this decade The Bahamas became an early indicator of the consequence to a society of massive use of drugs.

I had the opportunity recently to visit in The Bahamas with Dr. David Allen, who is the head of the Bahamian National Drug Council. Dr. Allen pointed out that one of the first places in the world to identify extensive uses of crack was The Bahamas, and that occurred approximately 5 years ago. And now, 5 years later, The Bahamas is one of the first countries to have a pool of its citizens who have become chronic crack-addicted individuals, with a whole host of very serious physical and emotional and antisocial problems.

In many ways this is an unfortunate harbinger of what we can anticipate in our own country as we reach the milestone of 5 years after large-scale addiction to crack. So we have a concern about The Bahamas because of its enforcement issues, we have a concern because of its high level of addiction and what that means to a friendly, allied nation and the model that that may perceive within our own country.

Mr. President, I cannot underscore the importance of this small commonwealth in terms of our overall national seriousness of commitment to win the war on drugs.

Let me turn next to the special importance of the Ambassador to The Bahamas. Because of the geographic circumstances of large size, many small islands, proximity to the United States, and the demographic factors of relatively small population and the economic limitations of The Bahamas, the reality is that any effective action that is going to take place there must be a cooperative one between the sovereignty of The Bahamas and the resources of the United States of America. In that situation the Ambassador plays more than just the traditional diplomatic role. The Ambassador becomes almost an operational officer, coordinatiing specific drug-related initiatives between the Bahamian Government and various United States agencies.

We currently have a series of United States operational centers throughout The Bahamas with others in planning. I spoke earlier this year with the immediate past Ambassador to The Bahamas, Mrs. Carol Hallett. She told me that 95 percent of her time as Ambassador to The Bahamas was spent in drug-related activities, much of it in the coordination of joint operations.

Mr. President, we need to have in that critical position of Ambassador to The Bahamas not only someone who has the requisite background in diplomacy and foreign policy, but we also need to have someone who can give to

the citizens of this country, to the citizens of The Bahamas, and to the citizens of the world who are looking to the United States for leadership, confidence in his or her ability to lead an effective effort against drugs in this most important country.

Mr. President, we have had such a person in Ambassador Hallett, who has been very well recieved. I understand that when she departed The Bahamas at the conclusion of her service, many citizens without invitation or prompting came to wish her Godspeed as she left, as an expression of their collective and individual appreciation for the efforts that she had made—a very rare demonstration of citizen support for the Ambassador of a foreign country in The Bahamas.

Mrs. Hallett was a strong advocate for this country and for The Bahamas, giving a primacy to the war on drugs. She spoke out frequently and with strength and effectiveness, urging the Bahamian Government to take those actions necessary to pursue effective antidrug efforts. She also was a symbol of the U.S. commitment to being a full partner in that effort. Mrs. Hallett, Mr. President, would be the kind of individual I think we should look to for the continued leadership of the United States in the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

Mr. President, it is difficult to speak in opposition to the confirmation of a former colleague. The nominee is someone that those of us who had an opportunity to serve with him knew and liked. I would strongly place myself in that category. I had the opportunity to spend many pleasant occasions with the nominee. We are in the unique circumstance, Mr. President, with the exception of yourself and a few others who have only recently arrived, to probably be the most informed jury that could be convened on this nomination. There is no group of Americans that knows this nominee better than those of us who have served with him in the Senate, and so we stand in a unique position to evaluate whether he has the requisite qualities of diplomatic and foreign policy experience, and particularly our confidence that he can serve in this operational role in the war on drugs that would warrant our confirming his nomination.

I suggest, Mr. President, that we know him better than the President of the United States, who nominated him, or the Secretary of State, who no doubt recommended his nomination to this position.

Therefore, we cannot escape the responsibility for making this very important judgment for our Nation, and for the people of America.

I regretfully come to the conclusion that this individual does not meet the standards that I believe our Nation should set, that he does not send to the world the statement of our commitment to victory in the war on drugs, and that he does not by his appointment and by his confirmation signal our seriousness of intention. I believe the time has come, has long come and gone, when we cannot continue to wage this war with words alone. We must do it with actions—the action that we have before us today as to whether the United States Senate will confirm this nominee to the position of Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

In my opinion, Mr. President, he does not deserve nor does our Nation deserve to be represented by him in The Bahamas. Therefore, I shall vote no.

Thank you.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for not more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. CONRAD pertaining to the introduction of S. 1283 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, may I ask what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ADAMS). The pending business is an executive session to consider the nomination of Chic Hecht, of Nevada, to be Ambassador to The Bahamas.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, for most Americans the Bahamas conjures up the image of miles of white sandy beaches, gorgeous sunsets, and romantic getaways. However, the Bahamas has also become well known to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration and the U.S. Customs Service for covert airstrips, money laundering, and as an offshore haven for narcotics traffickers.

The Bahamas comprises more than 700 islands and cays, scattered over 100,000 square miles of the Atlantic. According to the State Department's Bureau of International Narcotics matters, there are at least 73 airstrips and 110 small boat marinas in the country. Controlling these facilities is an impossible job for the 1,600 police and 750 members of the defense forces.

Although the Bahamian Government has become increasingly cooperative with U.S. authorities in the war of illegal drugs, the volume of drugs which transit the Bahamas continues to grow. Recent reports estimate that between 50 and 60 percent of the cocaine and marijuana entering the United States either transits Bahamian territory, or is transhipped through the Bahamas. In addition, lingering suspicions remain about the alleged involvement of Bahamian Government officials in the drug trade. A member of the Bahamian Parliament was indicted by the United States on March 29 of this year for laundering illegal drug money. There are also allegations that the Prime Minister of the Bahamas, Lynden Pindling, has ties to drug dealers, and that he has been the recipient of more than $3.5 million in payoffs from traffickers.

Traditionally, many ambassadorships have been reserved for close supporters of the President, or as a political consolation prize to a defeated candidate. However, given the Bahamas role as the single largest transit point on the drug highway into the United States, prudence dictates that the President reevaluate the criteria necessary in selecting an American Ambassador.

Mr. President, I cannot support President Bush's selection of former Senator Chic Hecht to be our Ambassador to the Bahamas. I do not oppose his nomination on partisan or personal grounds. The President certainly has the right to nominate a qualified Republican who was a political supporter. I support that right. I am, however, motivated by a deep concern that this country's representative to the Bahamas must be prepared to take a lead in pressing America's war on drug traffickers; and that he send the right message to the world that it is not going to be business as usual when it comes to drugs.

During interviews prior to hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Hecht was asked why he felt that he was qualified for the post of Ambassador. He replied, "I am sure that I will feel at home in the Bahamas. I've been involved in gambling in Nevada, and I've been involved in banking for 25 years. * * * Also, I understand it is a nice life style. I love golf and they have a lot of nice golf courses and good fishing."

I would hope that Mr. Hecht's statements are not an adequate description of the qualifications for serving as Ambassador to any country. They are especially inadequate as qualifications to assume the job in light of the current situation in the Bahamas. We need an Ambassador willing to serve on the front lines of the drug war, not on the back nine of Paradise Island's golf course. We need an Ambassador capa-

ble of coordinating drug interdiction efforts by the DEA, the Customs Service, and the Bahamian police, not a person familiar with gambling. We need an Ambassador who will help to halt the flow of drugs that is killing America's children and turning our cities into war zones, not someone who looks forward to fishing as part of his job description. In short, Mr. President, this assignment cannot be a vacation trip. It is a front line assignment in this Nation's war on drugs.

President Bush came into office promising to broaden and strengthen America's efforts to halt the flow of drugs into this country. I support him in that effort. However, the President's choice of Mr. Hecht would send the wrong signal to the entire world regarding America's commitment to fighting drugs, and be incompatible with our international efforts to stop the free flow of drugs into America. The region and, indeed, the hemisphere will watch the appointment carefully to determine how serious we really are in stopping the flow of drugs into this country. America, Mr. President, deserves the best nominee our President can find. Unfortunately, Chic Hecht is not that man. For these reasons, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to reject the nomination of Mr. Hecht as Ambassador to The Bahamas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of Senator Hecht's nomination at 5 p.m. today, and that there be 40 minutes for debate under the control of Senator GRAHAM and 20 minutes for debate under the control of Senator DOLE or his designee.

I further ask unanimous consent that the vote on the nomination occur at 6 p.m. today.

I further ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 p.m. today the Senate return to legislative session to begin consideration of S. 358, the legal immigration bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOLE. Reserving the right to object—I am not objecting, but I seek one clarification. As I understand we will stay on the Hecht nomination until noon today or whenever it is, 12:30, whenever we recess?

Mr. MITCHELL. Until noon. We will recess from noon to 2:15 and then go to the legal immigration bill and come back to Hecht at 5 for 1-hour debate until 6 and vote.

Mr. DOLE. So anybody wishing to make statements on former Senator Hecht can do so now?

Mr. MITCHELL. Between now and noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing no objection, it is or ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank my distinguished Republican colleague.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have all just returned from town hall meetings, meeting with constituents, in our home States.

At the town hall meetings I held in Nevada, invariably, at every town hall meeting the question was asked of this Democratic Senator: What do you think of President Bush?

I proceeded to say that I thought that President Bush to this point had done some outstanding things in a way that was nonconfrontational; really not very dramatic but I thought good and effective.

For instance, we have a budget earlier than we have ever had one. The budget is done. It is ready. It has been for several months. And it was done without the confrontational "Congress is a bad guy, the President is a bad guy," clashing; which characterized previous sessions.

In addition to the work on the budget, which was done quietly, we were also pleasantly surprised one day to view the press conference where the Secretary of State announced with congressional leaders that the Contra aid issue had been put to bed. This issue had been dividing the country and the Congress for years. Again, President Bush, through his delegated authorities, worked with the Members of the Congress and quietly, behind the scenes, worked out a compromise on that troublesome issue.

On the savings and loan issue, the President again showed his nonconfrontational leadership. President Bush went to Camp David and called in his staff, experts from around the country, and announced, after much study and debate at Camp David, that he had what he believed was a solution to the savings and loan crisis.

He announced to the Members of Congress: "This is the best I can do. If you can come up with something better, do so."

It was an issue that should have been resolved years ago, but we did not have that leadership, in my opinion, at the executive level to accomplish that. It was done through the efforts of President Bush.

I think that it is important to note that these matters were done in a way that was not divisive, in a way that brought about a feeling of collegiality between the Members of Congress and with the executive branch of Government. I recognize, that there are going to be many things that I will disagree with the President about, but I think we must give credit where credit is due. I think everyone will agree that the work done on the savings and loan bill, the Contra aid issue, and the budget situation certainly point toward expectations that this President can do an admirable job.

The reason I mention this in debate on the nomination before us is that the President has held out his hand to cooperate with the Congress, and on the issues I have mentioned this cooperation has been successful. This spirit of cooperation deserves our support. It is in this spirit that the President has nominated Chic Hecht to be an ambassador and has asked us to confirm that nomination. I believe we should support the President's nomination, and I feel confident that the new ambassador will fulfill the President's high expectations. The nomination of Senator Hecht is something that the President has put forward in a cooperative spirit. And, more importantly, he has given us someone that we should confirm and confirm quickly. I am glad it is before the Senate. I am glad that we are going to be able to have this matter resolved today.

I served with Senator Hecht in the Nevada State Legislature. I served as a member of the assembly and he served as a member of the senate. I later became president of the senate as the Lieutenant Governor of the State of Nevada when he was in the senate. I know Senator Hecht. He served from 1966 to 1974 in the State Senate of Nevada; at that time 1 of only 20 senators in the entire State. As most of my colleagues know, he, served here as a U.S. Senator from the State of Nevada from 1982 to 1988.

Senator Hecht was well known prior to seeking elective office in the State of Nevada. He was a businessman since the early 1950's. I knew Senator Hecht, knew his father, used to go into their establishments. He contributed vitally to Nevada's economy when it was sputtering. He contributed not only in the retail merchandising business but he branched out. He was one of the founders of a Nevada bank, a bank that has since been acquired by an outside banking conglomerate. That is a bank that developed into Nevada's home State bank, and he was one of the moving forces behind that.

We have heard a lot about the drug trafficking situation in The Bahamas. I think it most be stressed that Senator Hecht served as an undercover Army intelligence officer, not only served in the Army intelligence but served behind the Iron Curtain for a period of time, 1951 through 1953. His activities have been recognized to the effect that he was installed in the Army Intelligence Hall of Fame. So here is a man who does have experience in sensitive military matters.

I think it is important that the details of covert operations are something that he is familiar with. His service on the Senate Intelligence Committee could be valuable in this regard.

29-059 O-90-28 (Pt. 10)

We also know the Ambassador does not work alone in his activities as Ambassador; we know that in The Bahamas there is a heavy presence of the Drug Enforcement Administration. They have had a great deal of experience in The Bahamas working on drug trafficking. They will continue to have some of their most experienced officers there.

The second in command under Senator Hecht is someone who has experience, as represented by Secretary of State Baker. The personnel that we have there certainly are well trained and include officers of the Coast Guard, in addition to the Drug Enforcement Administration. I am sure that this team will welcome the addition of Senator Hecht.

There has been a lot said about some of Senator Hecht's statements regarding his appointment as Ambassador to The Bahamas. People have picked up on the fact that he said he likes to play golf and that he has had experience in gambling. Those of us who know Senator Hecht knows that his statement about golfing was in jest. He knew when he was making that statement what his qualifications were. We know what his qualifications are; but certainly here is a man who is familiar with the problems in The Bahamas. It certainly goes without saying that they do have legalized gambling there and certainly is familiarity with that will make him more comfortable with the leaders of that nation.

I do not think that we can set aside and not talk about his experience in banking. Not only did he serve 6 years in the U.S. Senate as a member of the Banking Committee, but he also owned a bank, and we know that one way that the drug traffickers try to avoid the law, try to spend their money, is by laundering money in banks. His experience there will be very important.

But of all the qualifications of Senator Hecht, and I say this as someone who served in the U.S. Senate with him, the greatest qualification he has is not the fact that he served in the U.S. military, in the Intelligence Corps, or his service in the U.S. Senate on the Banking Committee and the Intelligence Committee, or that he served in other elective offices including the State Senate of Nevada, but as far as I am concerned, we must look at this man in the sense that he wants to give his life to public service. He does not need the job to be Ambassador to The Bahamas. Senator Hecht is a wealthy man. He could do, as far as monetary things are concerned, anything he wanted in life, but he has decided to devote his life to public service. That is why he served in the State Senate in Nevada and the U.S. Senate. I think it speaks well of that man that he wants to serve in the ambassadorial corps of this country.

Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to speak on behalf of Senator Chic Hecht, a former Senator from the State of Nevada. I recommend to my colleagues that they vote in the affirmative this evening at 6 o'clock when the name of Chic Hecht is put forward to be the United States Ambassador to The Bahamas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. REID. The Senator yields the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Parliamentary inquiry. How is the time controlled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is not under control at this point. There is a unanimous-consent agreement that we will continue on the Hecht nomination until 12 noon, and following the recess there will be debate from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m., and vote at 6 p.m., and from 2:15 p.m. to 5 p.m. we will be on S. 358.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I rise to speak with respect to the nomination of Chic Hecht to become the Ambassador to The Bahamas. Mr. President, I am proud and pleased that President Bush has chosen this very distinguished American for this important post. The Bahamas are very critical and very important to us because of their strategic location in the Caribbean Basin.

Most of our imports and exports come through the Caribbean. Moreover, The Bahamas has been very important with respect to drugs and drug trafficking. I know of no Senator who would be more qualified to be Ambassador to The Bahamas than Senator Hecht, and I am somewhat astounded to find that some of our colleagues question whether he is qualified for this post or not. Senator Hecht has a magnificent record in the private sector as a successful businessman and an equally impressive record in the Government.

His colleague from Nevada just mentioned that he was one of the founders of the Nevada State Bank. Through his leadership, Chic Hecht turned the Nevada State Bank into one of the bigger, more profitable banks in the State of Nevada.

In discussing with Chic about how you run a bank, he said, "Oftentimes people make things too complicated." He said, "It is very simple, you buy money at one price and sell at another price. If you have a little bit left over in the operation, you make a profit. Otherwise you lose money." I think that speaks very clearly of this distinguished American who has a subtle commonsense way to view problems.

While he served here in the Senate, I remember the Wall Street Journal wrote a very critical article of our colleague. For a newspaper that claims to be a business journal to write such a critical article about Chic Hecht, who was the only Senator on the U.S. Senate Banking Committee that had ever owned and operated a bank, was a complete injustice to the Senator's integrity and hurt that newspaper's journalistic credibility.

Not only did that newspaper fail to mention his banking expertise, they also failed to mention he was the only Senator on the Senate Intelligence Committee who ever served behind the Iron Curtain in East Berlin as an agent for the United States of America during the early fifties. He is the only Member of the Senate to do that and the only Member of the Senate, to my knowledge, who is in the Intelligence Hall of Fame. I did write a letter to that newspaper on that issue.

There is another thing about Senator Hecht that many of my colleagues may not know. In the spring of 1985 I had the opportunity to visit Israel. While I attended a meeting at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, my guide from the Foreign Service said, "Senator SYMMS, this synagogue is the Hecht synagogue." He said, "Senator Hecht, and his father and brother made it possible for us to have this synagogue. He paid for it." Senator Hecht is a man very generous, very unselfish, but very unassuming. Some people come to the Senate and become show horses and some people come here and become work horses. I think Chic Hecht has been and will always be a work horse. He did the best he could for the State of Nevada and for America as a U.S. Senator, and I was very proud to have served with him in the Senate and very proud to have him as a friend. I strongly urge Members to support his nomination.

Mr. President, a few points about Senator Hecht that I think should be part of the record. He was involved, as I mentioned, in banking and a variety of other businesses in Nevada before he came to the Senate. He was in the clothing business. He had the Chic Hecht Clothing Store. He was a partner in the Holiday Inn in Lake Havasu, AZ. He was a member of the Nevada State Senate from 1966 to 1974.

As I mentioned, he was trained as an intelligence agent and served undercover in East Berlin from 1951 to 1953. For his work in Army intelligence, he was inducted into the Army Intelligence Hall of Fame, and for 4 years he served on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. He received a B.S. from St. Louis University in 1949, and his broad experience in both government and business qualifies him to be an excellent candidate for the United States Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

Mr. President, I am pleased that finally the holds have been released against Senator Hecht. In my opinion, he should have been approved on a moment's notice when the President sent his name over here. There was no reason why he should not have been, other than any Senator's right, of course, and I would impugn no Senator's right to hold up a nomination, but I think it is somewhat unusual that for this important post the nomination of this very good and capable, honest man, with great integrity and great common sense, has taken this long to get to the floor for approval so the President can have an Ambassador he wants. I think Senator Hecht is certainly capable and qualified and will acquit himself with great distinction as the United States Ambassador to The Bahamas.

I look forward to the opportunity to cast my vote in the affirmative for Senator Hecht. I hope that all of my colleagues will vote for him so that he will go to that post knowing that he has the support of his former colleagues to carry out the wishes of the President of the United States, whose responsibility it is to conduct the foreign policy of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is on the floor. So I yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has yielded the floor.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for recognizing me.

Is the Senator from North Carolina correct in his understanding that the pending business is the nomination of Ambassador Hecht?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senate is in executive session considering the nomination of former Senator Hecht as Ambassador to The Bahamas.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Am I further correct in my understanding that the previous arrangement as to the debate on this nomination has been changed so that it runs until 12?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present order of the Chair is that the debate on the nomination of the former Senator from Nevada will continue from now until 12 noon. Then at 5 p.m. this afternoon the Senate will go into executive session again. Forty minutes of time is allocated to the Senator from Florida, and 20 minutes to the majority leader and minority leader, or their designees, on the nomination. During the period of time from 2:15 until 5 o'clock the Senate will return to legislative business, and will be considering the immigration bill, S. 358.

Mr. HELMS. The Chair is most gracious. I appreciate his making that clear for the record.

Mr. President, it is a distinct pleasure to stand here this morning and endorse and support the nomination of Chic Hecht to be Ambassador to The Bahamas.

Chic is a remarkable man. He is probably one of the brightest men to serve in this Senate. He also has had to run the traps with the news media and its misrepresentation and distortion. But he was a good Senator. He is a good American. And he is an able American. He is uniquely qualified to bring honor to this country as the President's representative to an important neighbor, specifically The Bahamas.

I agree with the comments that have been made here this morning that The Bahamas has a unique importance not only to the United States, but also to the entire region. It is for that reason that President Bush is to be commended for recommending and nominating Chic Hecht to represent this country in The Bahamas.

Chic has the kind of experience in foreign affairs which is seldom seen. He has a distinguished military record which focused on intelligence work behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe. So he knows the machinations of communism and how the Communists operate. Anybody who cares at all about what happens in Central America is bound to be wondering what happened to the Monroe Doctrine when one considers the inroads made by the Communists by deceit and otherwise during the past decade or longer.

Chic Hecht chose to serve on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence during his tenure in the Senate. I think the record is clear that he rendered invaluable service. Chic Hecht was recently inducted into the Army Intelligence Hall of Frame.

So here we have a distinguished former Senator who ought to have been on the job in The Bahamas a long time ago. I thank the Lord that finally we are getting around to confirming this great American and sending him on his way to do the job to which President Bush nominated him.

But what about Chic Hecht's career otherwise? He has had extensive experience in banking, in business, and this makes him uniquely qualified to serve in The Bahamas.

As Senators have heard on this floor many times, money laundering in the banks in The Bahamas has played a significant role in facilitating the international narcotics trade. So what do we have in terms of the Ambassador nominated by George Bush? You have a man who understands communism, and a man who understands that the Communists are exploiting drug trafficking internationally. You have a man who has a distinguished career in intelligence work. You have a man who has been a total success in banking and in business in general. It is small wonder that George Bush, our friend, chose former Senator Chic Hecht to represent this country as Ambassador to The Bahamas.

While he was in the Senate, Chic served on the Banking Committee. He served there with distinction. Former Senator Hecht has noted that the lifestyle of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas is similar to the lifestyle of his home town of Las Vegas, NV. The press twisted that around. They made fun of it. But they did not persuade anybody who knows Chic Hecht. Both The Bahamas and Las Vegas have developed an extensive economy based on attracting thousands of tourists to spend a period of relaxation and entertainment in their respective attractions, The Bahamas and Las Vegas. Both The Bahamas and Las Vegas have parlayed their climates and their leisure communities and their famous golf courses, their hotels, and yes, their casinos, into multimillion-dollar tourist industries. That was what Chic Hecht was talking about. Frankly he was correct. This was not something to be twisted and misrepresented, and hee-hawed by callous representatives of the news media.

But around this place, if you are a conservative, you learn to endure that sort of thing, and in the latter stages you see the humor of certain journalistic pygmies taking potshots at decent, respectable, honorable people. Chic Hecht is a good choice for this job. As a businessman and as a banker in Nevada, he is intimately familiar with so many problems facing The Bahamas. He has been involved both in retailing and the resort business and in banking and department stores. His experience in the hotel industry alone makes him uniquely qualified to appreciate the challenges and opportunities and the needs of the Bahamian economy.

If anybody gets the idea that I strongly favor the nomination of Chic Hecht, that is correct. He is my friend. He served well in the Senate, and he will relate effectively to the needs and the relationship between the United States and The Bahamas. He will carry to The Bahamas the policies of the United States, because he understands the policies and principles of the United States.

My prediction is, Mr. President, that Ambassador Hecht will provide invaluable assistance to American businesses in their operations and investments in The Bahamas, and they are considerable.

Chic Hecht served the Senate from 1983 through 1988. During that time he gained the respect and admiration and friendship of his colleagues. But

the most important trait, as far as I am concerned, is that Chic Hecht has courage to stand by his convictions. He worked hard to serve his constituents in Nevada.

I recall, shortly after his coming to the Senate, Chic and I were on this floor during one of our Saturday sessions, and there was much grumbling by Senators that we were being imposed upon to come here and do a little work on Saturday. Chic turned to me and said, "Jesse, what is going on? I do not know what all this griping is all about. I never had a Saturday off before I came to the U.S. Senate." He meant it.

So, Mr. President, Ambassador Chic Hecht—and I like the ring of that—will have the courage of his convictions. He will take his convictions and his penchant for hard work to The Bahamas, and this is fortunate both for the United States and for The Bahamas. I predict that time will prove that we have rarely seen the equal of Chic Hecht in the diplomatic field.

Of course, as has been mentioned here time and time again, The Bahamas is a critical post at this point, and that is why it is a great prospect to have Chic Hecht in that job. The State Department has estimated that more than half of all of the marijuana and cocaine coming into the United States transits Bahamian territory, or is transshipped in The Bahamas. As I mentioned previously, a great deal of the money laundering necessary for this drug trafficking is taking place in and at banks in The Bahamas.

Unfortunately, the role of The Bahamas in drug trafficking is a significant one. A variety of high level Bahamian Government officials, including the Prime Minister of The Bahamas, have been associated with drug traffickers or implicated in drug trafficking. Two of the Prime Minister's closest associates were indicted in the United States during the past year for drug trafficking.

The growing flow of narcotics into the United States poses one of the greatest threats to our young people and to our society. I thank the Lord that the United States will have an ambassador on the job shortly in The Bahamas who will have the courage to make it clear to that government the seriousness with which the United States views that government's role in drug trafficking.

During his confirmation hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am privileged to serve as ranking member, Senator Hecht was asked about his votes to decertify The Bahamas for not cooperating fully in suppressing drug trafficking, and thereby cut its United States foreign aid.

Chic Hecht, with his customary, typical candor, responded that as Ambassador, he would welcome votes by the Senate to decertify The Bahamas. Such votes, he told the committee, would make his job easier, because such votes would underscore the depth of concern in the United States by the United States, regarding the role played by The Bahamas in drug trafficking.

Mr. President, it is this kind of attitude which assures that America's interests are best served in our dealings with foreign countries. If it were more prevalent down at Foggy Bottom, I venture to say, our Nation's interests overseas would be advanced to a far greater extent than they are today. I add, parenthetically, that the distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Baker, is fully in accord with that. Thus far, he has cooperated and coordinated efforts to achieve that sort of thing.

Mr. President, as Ambassador to The Bahamas, Chic Hecht will serve our country and our President and our people well. As I hope I have made clear in these remarks, I am enthusiastic in my support of Chic Hecht's confirmation, and I wish him and his dear wife well as they proceed.

DESECRATION OF MONUMENTS IN GREENSBORO, NC

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on July 4, the most famous symbol of the city of Greensboro, NC, the 74-year-old equestrian memorial to Gen. Nathaniel Greene at Guilford Courthouse National Military Park, was wantonly and maliciously vandalized. Five other monuments in the park were likewise desecrated. This happened on, of all days, Independence Day.

Shortly after the park closed on Independence Day, the Nathaniel Greene monument, which by the way is the largest bronze statue in my State, was attacked. Some mindless thug, or maybe there were more than one, took a pickax to the granite base of the Nathaniel Greene memorial. When park rangers arrived the next day they found thousands of granite chips strewn around that lovely park. The hooligans had also sprayed paint on the monument and removed many of the bronze letters from the stone tablets.

The National Park Service estimates that repairs to the Gen. Nathaniel Greene statue may cost as much as $250,000.

Guilford Courthouse National Military Park is not merely a special place for North Carolinians. It is a lasting memorial to all Americans who sacrificed everything they had in the struggle for this country's independence and for the freedom of our people. It is a simple, but impressive tribute, to the men whose efforts started Lord Charles Cornwallis' army on its long death march toward Yorktown.

Historically, it is worthy to mention that in October 1780, George Washington appointed one of his most trusted subordinates, Nathaniel Greene, to take command of the American army in the South. Prior to General Greene's assumption of command, Colonial troops had suffered setback after setback at the hands of King George's redcoats.

Upon reaching North Carolina General Greene quickly reorganized the army and restored its flagging morale. Even though he faced a much larger British force, General Greene daringly divided his troops, sending half of his army to strike the British at Cowpens, SC, in January 1781, and there the Americans won a stunning victory over the Redcoats. The British commander, Lord Cornwallis, sought to avenge this defeat by following the Americans to the North, but that was a bad decision on the part of the overconfident General because he did not realize that General Greene, was, in fact, luring the British into the North Carolina wilderness. That was the undoing of the Redcoats.

So on March 15, 1781, General Greene and his forces attacked Cornwallis at Guilford Courthouse. Both sides suffered heavy losses. Tactically, Cornwallis' regulars held the field while the Americans withdrew, but it was a meaningless victory for the Redcoats and for General Cornwallis, because the battles in the two Carolinas had cost Cornwallis more than one-fourth of his men, cost him the flower of the British Army in the South, and they were sorely missed as Lord Charles Cornwallis moved toward his last battle at Yorktown a few months later.

Mr. President, the battle at Guilford Courthouse marked the beginning of the end of British rule in the Colonies. The celebration of American freedom is why the restoration of the Guilford Courthouse Battlefield Park is imperative.

There is something heartwarming about the aftermath of the tragedy in Greensboro on July 4, because North Carolinians in their typical fashion have responded to the emergency facing the battlefield. Civic leaders and radio and television stations, private citizens and young people, are collecting thousands of dollars to return these monuments and this part to their former glory.

It is difficult for me to try to describe the feeling of pride that I am experiencing as I review the actions of so many of my fellow North Carolinians who have taken such pride in their community and their country.

In the days following the Supreme Court's blow to American patriotism, the fact is that countless men and women in my State have expressed their deep feeling about their Nation and the principles for which America stands.

I am proud of my State, and I am proud of my people and their response to this crisis.

Mr. President, it remains to be seen whether an emergency appropriation will be needed to repair the park's monuments. I am ready to offer my help. However, I am proud to say the people of North Carolina are already winning this latest battle at Guilford Courthouse.

My message to them, if I may use a colloqualism, is hang in there.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, there is in a sense nothing more difficult for a Member of this body than to oppose the nomination of a former colleague to some other position, whether it is ambassador or any other official position.

I do not take this task lightly. I rise because I believe there is a much broader issue involved here, an issue which I think was addressed most eloquently by the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] earlier in the debate. He spoke of the importance of The Bahamas to America's interests; the very difficult and complicated problems that were involved in our relationship with The Bahamas; and in light of that the necessity to send the very best person we can find to be our representative on the scene, dealing with those complex issues.

Obviously, the most important of them is the drug issue. We have talked about mounting a war against drugs. Well, in order to do such a thing, we must undertake a whole host of actions, not the least of which is to make very clear how serious we are about that fight.

Unfortunately, the administration, not only in this instance but in other instances with which I am acquainted as well, is treating these ambassadorships simply as political throwaways. It has been argued that there is a time-tested tradition of treating the posts in this manner. Perhaps that is true. But the extent to which this practice is now being carried, it seems to me, ought to lead Members of this body to now say, "Stop. We have had enough. We must approach this from the point of view of the national interest. We think that the question of who serves as ambassador is important in terms of advancing our Nation's interests, and ambassadorships can no longer be simply treated as political rewards."

We have had nominees before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who were being nominated, obviously, only because they have been very large and significant contributors to political campaigns. I am not making the argument that all ambassadors ought to come out of the career foreign service, although I do believe a larger percentage of our ambassadors should be chosen from the career service than has recently been the case. Currently almost 40 percent of our ambassadors are political appointees, a significant increase in the percentage from the past.

Moreover, I would add that on occasion we have had ambassadors chosen from outside of the career service who have been distinguished and able ambassadors. Arthur Burns went to West Germany; former majority leader Mansfield went to Japan; David Bruce went to London. All of them carried out their responsibilities with great skill and distinction.

The real question before us is whether we are going to be serious about these posts. I submit to you that our interests are such and the difficulty of advancing them are such that we must begin treating these ambassadorial positions in a more responsible and careful manner.

In this regard, I want to commend the able Senator from Florida for raising this issue with respect to the nomination that is now before us. We have very important interests in The Bahamas. It is not simply a vacation resort which does not have serious matters connected with it. The question of drug smuggling has been of grave concern to the Congress, to the executive branch, and certainly to the American people.

In recent years, we have been called upon in this body to determine whether The Bahamian Government's efforts with respect to narcotics interdiction and eradication are sufficient to allow the continuation of United States foreign aid. There is a provision now in the law that ties portions of a nation's foreign aid package to its efforts to stem the drug trade. More specifically, the issue that was debated on the Senate floor was whether the certification submitted by the President to us stating that a country's efforts were sufficient was in fact, justified. That question has been put to a vote in successive Congresses here. Clearly, this is a matter of prime importance in our dealings with The Bahamas.

A recent editorial in the Miami Herald on this nomination pointed out this fact and discussed in detail this very issue of the smuggling of drugs through The Bahamas into the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[See exhibit 1.]

Mr. SARBANES. In terms of our combined efforts to halt drug trafficking, the ambassadorial post can be an extremely critical one. The development of modern communications does not render the Ambassador irrelevant. Having a qualified, competent ambassador on the scene, particularly when we are encouraging a nation to become more vigorous in its drug fighting efforts, can be extremely important.

Second, of course, we have an important trade relationship with The Bahamas. Seventy percent of Bahamian imports come from the United States and 62 percent of their exports go to the United States. Their participation in the Caribbean Basin Initiative is a central issue in bilateral ties and we clearly have strong economic interests there.

Finally, there is the broader issue of U.S. policy in the Caribbean. It is a critical, but often neglected, component of our relationship with Latin America as a whole. Because the stability and economic vitality of our allies in that area are at issue, we need to place a greater premium, a higher value, on these relationships.

I regret to say that this nomination is only one in a pattern of appointments about which legitimate questions may be raised. We have, for example, nominees pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to assume important posts in Spain, Australia, and New Zealand. Looking through their résumés, it is clear that the only reason they have been nominated is because they have been large political contributors or fundraisers. In fact, in the certificate of demonstrated competence which the State Department is supposed to submit with the nomination papers, cited as a reason for making the nomination is that the person had made large political contributions. This, in fact, is in direct conflict with the Foreign Service Act of 1980 which provides that political contributions are not to be a factor in making nominations. Despite this clear statutory requirement, the certificate of demonstrated competence filed for one of the nominees now pending before the committee includes detailed information about the nominee's political contributions and activities. This gives some sense of the degree to which this process has deteriorated.

As another example, the Foreign Relations Committee sends nominees a questionnaire to fill out. In that questionnaire, following a number of questions about experience and background and so forth, is a question

which reads: "Are there any factors, other than the information provided above, which particularly qualify you for the position to which you have been nominated?"

One nominee, in this case the one to Australia, wrote in response to that question: "I have been known as a coalition builder, able to organize my colleagues and peers to action in support of worthy civic, charitable, and political causes."

Another nominee, in this instance to be Ambassador to Spain, responded to that question as follows: "I am known as a coalition builder. I am able to organize my colleagues and peers to action in support of worthwhile civic, charitable, and political causes."

Mr. President, I did not make a mistake. I did not accidentally read the answer of the previous person a second time. Virtually identical answers were given by two separate, ostensibly independent, nominees for these ambassadorial positions.

One is obviously led to wonder.

The Washington Post, in an editorial on this very point, said, and I quote:

Modular testimony. Pre-fab (by someone else) self-description. It doesn't inspire a whole lot of confidence. Can the would-be ambassadors be trusted to enter into dialogue with their host governments if they, apparently, cannot be trusted to write a few lines on their own qualifications?

At some point, we are going to have to get serious about America's national interests. The challenges confronting us around the world—the shift in relative strengths among our allies with the emergence of other strong economies, the various issues presented in the security field by the emergence of General Secretary Gorbachev in the Soviet Union, the growing pressures in Third World countries—require the United States to say we must start doing better.

There is a tendency when assessing these nominees to say: Well, they will not do any harm as ambassadors. Are issues of any consequence really at stake? If there is anything truly important, it will be taken care of directly by Washington, by the Secretary or the Under Secretary or the Deputy Secretary. Perhaps this person will not make a major, positive impact on relations, but nothing bad will happen.

I submit to you, we are beyond the point of viewing this question in such terms. We need to ask the question about lost opportunities by failing to send highly experienced, fully qualified, first-rate people to these ambassadorial posts. The challenges facing our Nation, the complexity of our interests at stake are such that we can no longer afford to simply treat these positions as a political reward. To say that it does not matter, or that nothing important happens with respect to that country is, of course, not true. With every country there are important issues; with some they are potentially more important or more difficult than with others. And with every country there is the question of how the United States rates their significance, which is reflected, of course, in the choices that we make in terms of ambassadors.

I join the distinguished Senator from Florida not so much out of a personal view about our former colleague, with whom I was pleased to serve, but out of the broader principle at stake. We must move to a higher standard in considering these ambassadorial nominations. Otherwise we will simply hurt our own national interests.

Other nations that are serious about their role in the world do not treat ambassadorial posts in the same way. The Soviet Union does not treat these posts this way. The Western European countries do not treat these posts in this way. Japan does not treat these posts in this way. And we are engaged in significant security and economic competition with some or all of those nations. It is time for the United States to cease treating these posts in such a careless manner as well.

I commend the able Senator from Florida for his efforts. It is never easy to take this type of stand, given the personal contacts which exist here. But I think the broader question, the broader principle is one that needs to be asserted, and I am pleased to join with him in his effort.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

[EXHIBIT 1]

[From the Miami Herald, June 29, 1989]

REJECT "CHIC" HECHT AS AMBASSADOR TO BAHAMAS

Surely the Bahamas deserves better. The job of U.S. ambassador to Florida's closest neighbor shouldn't be a consolation prize for a Republican loyalist ousted by voters. Especially for a Republican loyalist who has demonstrated no ability and experience for the job.

The post is important because of the Bahamas' strategic location in the jet stream of U.S.-bound drugs and illegal aliens. At one point, drug smugglers were so blatant that they controlled one Bahamian resort as a trans-shipment point. Associates of Bahamian Prime Minister Lynden Pindling were implicated as conspirators.

One, Nigel Bowe, has yet to be sent to the United States on a 1985 indictment despite an extradition treaty. He is charged with supervising shipments of cocaine from Colombia and protecting smugglers from the police. Recently, through patient diplomacy, the United States has won more assistance from the Bahamas government for cooperative investigations.

The United States and the Bahamas also have a strong trading partnership. Last year the Bahamas bought $725 million in U.S. goods, 70 percent of its imports, and sent to the United States products valued at $238 million, 62 percent of its exports. The Bahamas participates in the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI), which gives those nations trade preferences to build their economies. Key legislation broadening and extending the CBI is pending.

Into those issues, the Bush Administration proposes thrusting one Jacob "Chic" Hecht. Mr. Hecht, a clothier, won a Senate term in 1982 in Nevada after the Republicans targeted veteran Howard Cannon, tainted by a bribery scandal. But Mr. Hecht was laughed out of the seat after one term. Senate aides picked him as the least-effective senator. His verbal gaffes—among them: Nevada shouldn't be a "nuclear suppository"—were widely reported.

Now he says that he'll be at home in the Bahamas because "I've been involved in gambling in Nevada, and I've been involved in banking for 25 years. . . . I love golf, and they have a lot of nice golf courses."

In another era and another place, a nice guy ambassador conducting a little diplomacy on the golf course would be OK. Not now. Florida's Sen. Bob Graham is urging his colleagues to step beyond senatorial courtesy to an ousted comrade and reject this nomination. And well they should.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the remarks of our colleague from Maryland. I did not hear all that he had to say, but much of what he had to say I think was valid. He made some very good points indeed. However, none of them applies to the nominee whose nomination is now before the Senate, our former colleague, Senator Chic Hecht.

Chic Hecht is hardly a stranger to this body. Ninety of us, 90 of the 100 Senators who serve in this body know Chic Hecht personally. He is not a stranger to us.

We are not talking now about some fat cat contributor. We are not talking about some stranger. We are not talking about some political hack. We are talking about some political hack. We are talking about someone we know on a personal level and someone we have known for as much as 6 years as a colleague in the Senate, in some cases for even longer periods. We are talking about someone we know very well indeed.

Just who is this man we know, Chic Hecht? First of all, he is a gentleman. I think every Member would agree. One of the foremost gentlemen in the Congress, in fact. A real, true gentleman. He is a man of integrity and a man of intelligence and a man of background far beyond politics. He is a man of background, substantial, successful background in business and several phases of business before he came to this body.

So, this is a unique candidate, it seems to me, a unique nominee, and one who is uniquely well qualified in the sense of a business background with special aspects that pertain to the primary industries in The Bahamas, and I will get to that in just a moment. He is a man of business background and political and Government background as well: A well-rounded, well-suited candidate for this post.

The Bahamas, obviously, is a country that is important to the United

States for several reasons which I will go into in some detail. The person who fills our post of Ambassador in that country should be one who is very capable and well respected. Appropriately, President Bush has nominated a former army intelligence officer, a member of the Army Intelligence Hall of Fame, incidentally—and that is a very select group. I think there are perhaps 100 or 200 in the history of the Army who have qualified for the Army Intelligence Hall of Fame. He is an exceptionally successful businessman in several fields of business, a former State Senator and a former U.S. Senator.

The concern, as I understand it, expressed by those few Senators who have some discomfort in this matter, is the severe problem of drug interdiction that presents itself to us with respect to The Bahamas. And on that score, let me observe that there is no Member of this body who has been more assiduous in his criticism of the Bahamian drug problem than the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY]. Senator KERRY is, of course, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and he apparently was satisfied with regard to Senator Hecht's commitment and ability in the area of drug cooperation with The Bahamas during the hearings on this nomination before the Foreign Relations Committee.

I will quote from an exchange in the committee between Senator KERRY and Senator Hecht.

Senator KERRY. As you know, we recently had a certification struggle here over the question about the Bahamas, and I know you have probably been asked this somewhat, but I want to make sure I do.

There are some serious issues that have been raised again and again about corruption within the Bahamas. The State Department narcotics control report itself referred to continued corruption problems there. And I just want to make certain or I would like to ask you for your observation on that as you contemplate beginning a tour as ambassador there, which you no doubt will.

Do you think that you are in a position and are you prepared to be able to press those issues that are attached to those questions of corruption?

Senator HECHT. Absolutely, Senator. Absolutely, and that is probably going to be one of the most pressing questions and most pressing objectives I have down there.

Senator KERRY voted to report the nomination favorably to the floor of the Senate as did every member of the Foreign Relations Committee, several of whom extensively questioned Senator Hecht about the drug problem. The committee reported the nomination unanimously.

Senator Hecht, before he began his service as a Member of the Senate, was a banker. One of the most principal industries in The Bahamas is banking. Senator Hecht took over a foundering bank in Nevada, his home State, rebuilt it, and today it is one of the most thriving banks in the Nation. So he knows the banking industry very well on a firsthand basis. Banking is an important industry in The Bahamas.

Tourism is obviously an important industry in The Bahamas. Senator Hecht owned and operated several hotels. He knows something about the tourist industry. He knows a great deal, probably more than any one of us for sure, about the tourist industry. And his background in intelligence will serve him well in that all-important effort to cut the flow of drugs which come through The Bahamas form elsewhere around the world and into the United States. Indeed, Senator Hecht has already been briefed by Drug Enforcement Agency officials on our efforts in that country. It is my understanding that the Drug Enforcement Agency officials most involved with drug interdiction efforts in the Caribbean Basin enthusiastically look forward to the prospect of Senator Hecht's serving in Nassau.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the Foreign Relations Committee hearing on the Hecht nomination be included in this debate in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF HON. CHIC HECHT, AMBASSADOR NOMINEE TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS

Senator HECHT. Senator Dodd, than you very much, and all my former fellow Senators, thank you for those very, very kind words.

First of all, If I may take just a moment and introduce my family who has come in with me. The ambassadorship is somewhat of a family affair, and my wife and I have just finished ambassadorial school. Here is my wife, Gall, Leslie, lori, son-in-law, Darryl, and my cousin Alan.

Senator DODD. Anyone not related to Chic Hecht? [Laughter.]

I might think you were an Irish Catholic with that size family.

Being Irish Catholic I can say that.

Senator HECHT. Orthodox Jews have a lot of kids, too.

Senator DODD. Do I have learned.

Senator HECHT. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply honored to appear before you today as President Reagan's nominee to be the United States Ambassador to the Bahamas.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the President for having nominated me for this position. If confirmed by the Senate, I plan to take up my new responsibilities as quickly as possible.

I believe my varied background of public and private sector experience qualifies me for this assignment. I am privileged to have worked with you as a member of this distinguished body. What better preparation can there be for representing the U.S. government abroad than serving as a member of that government at home?

During my service in the Senate membership on the Select Committee on Intelligence provided a unique vantage point to observe the conduct of U.S. foreign policy abroad. Likewise, of particular advantage to my assignment to the Bahamas will be my experience as a banker and a former member of the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee.

After tourism, the banking and financial sector is the second pillar of the Bahamian economy. My private sector management experience in banking and retail meerchandising as well as past directorship of the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce will serve me in good stead in managing our U.S. embassy in Nassau and working to advance U.S. interests in the Bahamas.

The United States and the Commonwealth of the Bahamas enjoy a good bilateral relationship. Our two nations and governments are bound together by deep and broad ties. Politically we share a commitment to democracy and democratic institutions.

Economically the U.S. is the Bahamas' major trading partner. The Bahamas is a member of the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

The U.S. and the Bahamas also have many cultural and family ties as large numbers of our citizens travel back and forth each year. Of the more than three million visitors to the Bahamas in 1988, 90 percent were American citizens.

In 1992 we will celebrate the quincentennial of Christopher Columbus' first landing in the new world, believed by many scholars to have been in the Bahamas.

Most importantly, our two governments are together engaged in a struggle of vital importance to both our countries.

Drug abuse is a scourge which threatens the very fabric of our societies and the peace and stability of our region. Although the Bahamas is not a drug producing country, its scattered islands and close proximity to the U.S. make it an ideal location for narcotics trafficking. Experts estimate that a significant portion of cocaine and marijuana entering the U.S. transits the Bahamas.

The government of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas is firmly committed to the war on drugs. Through Operation Bahamas and Turks and Caicos otherwise known as OPBAT, Bahamian and American personnel work closely together in daily narcotics interdiction operations.

U.S. and Bahamian law enforcement agencies are conducting joint undercover narcotics investigations. The Bahamian government has established three special courts to prosecute drug cases. The U.S. and Bahamas have signed a bilateral narcotics agreement in accordance with the Chiles amendment.

A U.S.-Bahamas mutual legal assistance treaty is presently awaiting advise and consent of the Senate. Negotiations for a new extradition treaty have been going well.

In recognition of the Bahamian anti-narcotics cooperation, the President certified to the Congress with explanation that the Bahamas was cooperating fully in the war on drugs. We are delighted that the Congress upheld the President's certification.

My assignment to the Bahamas is a challenge and an opportunity. It has been a long time since my wife and I visited the Bahamas. We are eagar to return. I look forward to the opportunity to represent the views of the United States and continue the warm, close relationship which we have long enjoyed with the Bahamian government and its people.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the committee for receiving me today, and I will be happy to respond to your questions.

Senator McConnell, it is nice to see you. Thank you for coming out.

Senator MCCONNELL. Thank you and congratulations on your nomination.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Senator, and again, we congratulate you on this nomination.

I wonder if you might briefly characterize the current state of U.S.-Bahamian relationships, particularly in light of the recent indictment of an associate of the Prime Minister of the Bahamas, Prime Minister Pindling. There have been serious allegations about drug corruption against the Prime Minister, and those allegations have affected U.S.-Bahamian relations.

As you know, Senator Kerry of Massachusetts had offered a resolution of disapproval against the certification that we were achieving full cooperation with the Bahamian government in the area of narcotics interdiction and related problems. That resolution was defeated on the floor of the Senate as you know as well.

But, nonetheless, this has been a constant source of friction, and the allegations in the indictment recently of a very close associate of Mr. Pindling raised additional questions in the minds of many people. In light of that, I wonder if you might just briefly describe how you see U.S.-Bahamian relations as you look forward to the post as U.S. ambassador in that country.

Senator HECHT. Well, in my position representing the President of the United States and Secretary of State, certainly this is going to be one of the main objectives is to get these people that have been implicated in drug trafficking to the courts.

I will be working with the Justice Department and, Senator, there have been two special people who have had close ties with the Prime Minister who are under indictment, and I will work with the Justice Department in every which way to bring them to trial.

Senator DODD. As you know, a State Department report in 1988 claimed that the Bahamian government or characterized it by calling it "almost systematic corruption in the country."

Do you think that characterization in 1989 is accurate or do you think that was overstated?

Senator HECHT. Senator, from the briefings that I have had in the State Department—I have not been down there for several years—the cooperation is better today than it was a year ago. However, in no way will any of us tolerate corruption.

Senator DODD. Do you consider that to be the single most important priority for the United States in its relationship with the Bahamas at this point?

Senator HECHT. Yes, because it has been alleged that 50 percent—50-60 percent of the narcotics entering the United States of America comes by way of the Bahamas. Yes, I think that is one of the major problems I will be facing.

The Bahamian government also has lax banking laws, and something like 350 banks down there, and we have to tighten up our security on drug laundering which all will tie in together.

Senator DODD. In answering the issue of the Caribbean Basin Initiative, which, of course, is an extremely important program, the Bahamas was designated as a beneficiary of the CBI in 1985, as you know.

To what extent has the Bahamas benefitted from the participation in the CBI program and are the Bahamas doing everything it can to take advantage of the Caribbean Basin Initiative, in your opinion?

And, would you further characterize how the Bahamian government views current legislation before the United States Congress to expand and indefinitely extend the CBI in their region?

Senator HECHT. Because of the high per capita income of the Bahamas in relationship to the rest of the country, the Caribbean Basin Initiative, they have not profited as much.

They do not have a great deal of agriculture. Their main industry is tourism. The number two industry is banking. So, they have not been as large a recipient as the other countries.

Senator DODD. Would you anticipate—do you support or does the administration support, are you prepared to say so this morning, the continuation, the indefinite extension of CBI?

Senator HECHT. Yes.

Senator DODD. Senator Lugar.

Senator HECHT. Excuse me, may I say hello to Senator Simon.

Senator SIMON. Good morning.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Hecht, what plans do you have or have you thought through a strategy of enhancing business with the Bahamas; that is, economic opportunities there and more opportunities for Americans through that enhanced trade?

Senator HECHT. For the Bahamas, we are the biggest trading partner, something just under $900 million a year. And certainly I want to continue that and build on that because that is what we are trying to do is build up trade with other countries.

Now, tourism, as I mentioned before, just like banking, tourism is their number one industry. Banking is their number two industry and having been in both tourism for 40 years and banking for 25 years, I feel that I can help build on that.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you very much. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DODD. Senator Sanford and then we will come to Senator Simon.

Senator SANFORD. As I said earlier, I am delighted to see you back in these halls.

Senator HECHT. Thank you, Senator. Thank you very much.

Senator SANFORD. The Bahamas was designated beneficiary of the Caribbean Basin Initiative in 1985. Have you given any thought to what extent the Bahamas benefitted from its participation and whether or not it took full advantage?

Senator HECHT. Senator, because, as I mentioned earlier, the economy and very little agriculture, certainly not much textiles or things like that, because their industry is tourism and banking, they have not taken part as much as the other countries.

Senator SANFORD. Do you have any idea what the Bahamian government thinks about the current legislation to expand indefinitely the CBI?

Senator HECHT. No, sir, I have not been in contact with the Bahamian government.

Senator SANFORD. Do you think that the Bahamas would benefit from the passage of this legislation which essentially just extends CBI?

Senator HECHT. Absolutely, sir.

Senator SANFORD. Now, you made two statements about banking. One, that they have got a tremendous number of banks. Some of them are apparently doing things that impede our efforts to control the drug problem.

And, on the other hand, you speak of it in terms that seem to be very positive, that this is their second largest economic base.

What should our attitude be toward banking as it affects this country both in their activities and, I assume, in the ownership of a great many of the banks, which is apparently related or by United States banks? Should we in any way have a policy toward their banking practices?

Senator HECHT. Senator, thank you. They have adopted a policy that any cash transaction over $100,000 has to be reported.

However, some of the major banks, American, British, have adopted a policy of know your customer. Some customers can come in and $1,000 might be over what they would normally deposit in their account. And they are working with the drug enforcement agencies on that.

Senator SANFORD. Who is "they"? The banks or the government?

Senator HECHT. The banks because they have adopted that policy of know your customer, which is the cardinal rule of banking. Sometimes people deviate, and that is when they get in trouble.

In America we have a $10,000 reporting. Perhaps we should talk to them about that on any cash transaction.

I think we should encourage the major American banks, we should encourage the major foreign banks. But there are, I understand, many banks with only a plaque on the door which was set up just to launder money, and these should be discouraged.

Senator SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Senator DODD. Senator Mack.

Senator MACK. Thank you, Senator Dodd.

Chic, I just want to concentrate on the drug issue in the Bahamas. You mentioned in one of your responses that 50-60 percent of the drugs in this country end up here by traveling through——

Senator HECHT. That has been alleged, and that has been in many of my briefing papers, that different individuals have told me that, Senator.

Senator MACK. Assuming that that is a correct statement, 50-60 percent, that is an incredibly significant number. Those of us from Florida, obviously, are very concerned because of the close proximity. And we just recently had a vote on the floor of the Senate where the Senate voted not to decertify the Bahamas.

I would suggest that there will be continued pressure to decertify the Bahamas, even though we have heard over and over and over again from many sources that the Bahamian government is cooperating with us in every endeavor. Basically anything that we ask them to do that they have been very responsive.

I just wonder how you are going to be able to reconcile the pressure to decertify to make the comments continually that the support that, in fact, we are receiving from the Bahamian government. I would just give you an opportunity to talk about that potential problem and get your thoughts on it.

Senator HECHT. Senator, I would welcome that type of pressure because that type of pressure will allow me, then, to go to the Bahamian government and say the United States Senate in their wisdom is not satisfied with what you have done, and you must do this, this, and that. And so that would give me a tremendous push to go back. If you do not have any opposition, then the job would be tougher.

No, I certainly welcome that.

Senator MACK. In your briefings was it suggested as to what some of the additional actions on the part of—the Bahamian government might take to try to reduce that 50-60 percent?

Senator HECHT. Yes, they have asked for more planes, more personnel from America, and more continued cooperation. As you know, there are hundreds and hundreds of islands there, and it is hard with their limited resources.

Now, we are talking about a country approximately 250,000 people, so they do not have the resources. They have come to America, to the United States of America, and asked the drug enforcement to help them to cooperate.

Now, if we find that this cooperation is not forthcoming, then certainly I can go back and say the United States Senate is not in any way—they do not feel that you have done enough on this.

I welcome this opposition from the United States Senate.

Senator MACK. Thank you.

Senator DODD. Senator Simon.

Senator SIMON. Thank you. It is good to welcome an old colleague here.

Senator HECHT. Thank you, Senator. It is nice to be here. Thank you very much.

Senator SIMON. Let me give you my frank reaction. When I first heard that—Chic Hecht has always been a very likable person who is an outgoing diplomat, has some of the skills in that area.

I would have to say also, candidly, your record in the area of civil rights was not a strong one in the United States Senate. You are going to have to be dealing with a population that is overwhelmingly a black population. Have you reflected on that and how you will be moving in that area?

Senator HECHT. Well, Senator, I do not think my reputation in the United States Senate has been anti-civil rights. I think I have always been pro-civil rights. And being a minority person myself, I do not see a problem at all.

Senator SIMON. I guess I would just urge you—and I am going to be voting for you——

Senator HECHT. Thank you very much.

Senator SIMON. I would just urge you to reflect on what you can be doing to help bridge any problems that my come around. I appreciate your being here.

Senator HECHT. Thank you, and perhaps in the time I am in Washinton, maybe we will get a little time to spend together and I can get your thoughts and reflections. Thank you.

Senator SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DODD. Senator Kerry.

Senator KERRY. Thank you very much. I am also delighted to welcome my friend Senator Hecht back. He and I enjoy a special relationship, and I am glad to see his family here.

Senator HECHT. Senator, you have three of your greatest admirers. There is no one on this earth that admires you like my wife and my two daughters.

Senator Dodd, may I just mention for the benefit of the people in the audience who might not know the story, it was Senator Kerry who absolutely saved my life when I was choking.

Senator DODD. He tells us that all the time. [Laughter.]

Senator HECHT. There is no question. Senator, there was a doctor not too far away and said had I lived another minute, I would not have wanted to be alive. And so from the bottom of my heart and my family's heart, we will forever be grateful and every Christmas, just like last Christmas, you will receive a phone call from me saying thank you very much, Senator Kerry.

Senator KERRY. I am not sure I would not rather receive a check. I am running for reelection this year. But I appreciate it.

Senator HECHT. That is not out of the realm of possibility.

Senator KERRY. Oh, no, now it is. It absolutely is.

Senator HECHT. Okay, it is.

Senator KERRY. But I am thrilled, obviously, and I appreciate your comments.

Let me ask you, if I can, just two quick questions. As you know, we recently had a certification struggle here over the question about the Bahamas, and I know you have probably been asked this somewhat, but I want to make sure I do.

There are some serious issues that have been raised again and again about corruption within the Bahamas. The State Department narcotics control report itself referred to continue corruption problems there. And I just want to make certain or I would like to ask you for your observation on that as you contemplate beginning a tour as ambassador there, which you not doubt will.

Do you think that you are in a position and are you prepared to be able to press those issues that are attached to those questions of corruption?

Senator HECHT. Absolutely, Senator. Absolutely, and that is probably going to be one of the most pressing questions and most pressing objectives I have down there.

You know, I think the world of Senator Helms and when Senator Helms and Senator Kerry join together in a resolution, it means a lot to me.

I think you are absolutely right and, quite frankly, the more pressure you apply, I think the easier my job is going to be because I can to to the Bahamian government and say you have to do this, this, and this. Otherwise, the resolution is going to pass the next time decertifying you.

And, for the record, I agreed with you last year and voted with you.

Senator KERRY. I do know that, and I thank you for that.

And the last question, with respect to the extradition, we have been seeking the extradition of Nigel Bowe for some period of time. And last year the State Department report referred to that as an extradition that has been held up on specious legal grounds. This year the "specious" was left out, but the notations as to the continued holdup was still observed.

And it is my hope, and I merely comment on this, that you will press also with them the urgency of reciprocating with respect to those kinds of requests in order to prove that they are truly cooperating fully.

Senator HECHT. You have my word on that. I agree with you wholeheartedly.

Senator KERRY. I thank you, and I wish you well.

Senator HECHT. Thank you very much.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Senator Kerry. Any additional questions by our colleagues?

Senator, let me just lastly, if I can. As you know, the Office of Government Ethics develops rules and regulations designed to prevent conflicts of interests by officers and employees of all agencies. A copy of your financial disclosure report that you filed with the office was provided to the committee and, for the purpose of the record, do you have any personal financial holdings which might create a potential conflict of interest?

Senator HECHT. Absolutely not, and everything I own is in a blind trust. During the entire time I was a Senator I never bought one stock, one bond, or one piece of property because someone could always say I had information others did not have.

I plan to continue that policy, and certainly anything pertaining to the area which I am—not just the country but the entire area—I will have no financial dealings at all.

Senator DODD. Have you been asked or advised by the White House Counsel or Department of State to divest yourself of any of your financial holdings?

Senator HECHT. The bulk of my financial holdings are in real estate in Nevada and government securities.

Senator DODD. They have not asked you to divest anything?

Senator HECHT. No, absolutely not.

Senator DODD. And do you intend to rescue yourself from any matter in which may have a direct or indirect financial interest?

Senator HECHT. Absolutely, absolutely, but I see no conflict.

Senator DODD. Those are questions that we are required to ask of each of our nominees.

Again, congratulations on your nomination. And you correctly point out these ambassadorial positions are family affairs in the sense with your lovely wife, who no doubt will be accompanying you and the family members going down. The Bahamas is a beautiful country, and we have had a close relationship over the years.

Senator Kerry and others have pointed out the important issue of improving our relationships, particularly with regard to the narcotics question, and that will be a challenge for you in the coming couple of years.

You should know that all of us here are prepared to help in that regard, and we look forward to working with you on that question and relying on your advice as we proceed with matters that will come before this committee relating to the Bahamas and those important questions.

So, on behalf of the committee I thank you for appearing before us today. I wish you and your family very well, and I can only tell you that we will deal with this matter as soon as there is a business meeting. I believe it will be the first week in June when we come back from the Senate recess.

If there are any additional questions, of course, our colleagues can submit them in writing. We would ask you to respond to them prior to the business meeting of this committee.

Senator HECHT. Thank you very much, Senator, and thank all of you for coming out today on a break. Having been in this body, I understand what that means.

And I certainly appreciate this turnout because this hearing came up very fast for me and I was in Nevada last week.

I have asked the State Department to make myself available to each one of you if you have any questions, and I would like to meet with you if possible to pick your expertise and your brains on this because I know a lot of you have spent a tremendous amount of time and are very, very knowledgeable, and I would like to pick your brains.

Thank you very much.

Senator DODD. Thank you.

Our next nominee, Mr. Aaronson, has already been introduced by our two colleagues, Senator Nunn of Georgia, and Senator John McCain.

Mr. Aaronson, we welcome you again to the committee and congratulate you on your nomination, and we would ask if you have any opening statement you care to make at this point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I just do not know where this concern is coming from. I am sure those few Senators who have a concern are sincere, but it seems to me a misplaced concern. This is a very well-rounded candidate. It is not one of those types whom Senator SARBANES rightly criticizes. This is an entirely different kind of nominee, one who is eminently qualified, and I am sure will be confirmed by a very, very substantial vote today.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today I rise in strong support of the nomination of former Senator Chic Hecht to be the Ambassador to the Commonwealth of the Bahamas. Last month, Senator Hecht received a unanimous vote from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for this appointment.

Senator Hecht has extensive experience in Government and business. He ably represented Nevada in the U.S. Senate from 1982 to 1989. In the 98th Congress, he chaired the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Development Subcommittee on Insurance. He also chaired the Subcommittee on Housing in the 99th Congress. While in the Senate, Senator Hecht served on the Select Committee on Intelligence. This experience, together with a background in intelligence, which began while he was a special agent in the U.S. Army Intelligence Corps, has equipped him well for assuming a leadership position and providing guidance in confronting the drug problem emanating in the Bahamas. Because of his experience, dedication and service, Senator Hecht was recently inducted into the Army Intelligence Hall of Fame.

On the State level, Senator Hecht served in the Nevada Senate for 8 years, becoming the first Republican to win a State senate seat in predominantly Democratic Clark County—Las Vegas—in more than 25 years. He was senate minority leader under Gov. Paul Laxalt.

Senator Hecht participated for nearly 30 years in the Nevada business community as a leading merchant and banker.

In closing, Senator Hecht's legislative background and his extensive business experience has equipped him well to ably represent the United States as Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas. He is a man of ability and integrity, and I hope that his nomination will be swiftly approved.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I also advocate the confirmation of former Senator Chic Hecht of the ambassadorship for which he has been nominated.

I have known Chic Hecht here in the Senate. I think he will make a very competent Ambassador and, in my judgment, his nomination should be confirmed by the Senate.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of noon having arrived, under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12 noon, recessed until 2:17 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. DASCHLE].

IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1989

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 358, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 358) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to change the level, and preference system for admission, of immigrants to the United States, and to provide for administrative naturalization, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE I—IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1989

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES IN TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Immigration Act of 1989".

(b) REFERENCES IN ACT.—Except as specifically provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed as an amendment to, or repeal of a provision, the reference shall be deemed to be made to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1989

Sec. 101. Short title; references in title.
Sec. 102. National level of immigration.
Sec. 103. Preference system for admission of immigrants.
Sec. 104. Deterring immigration-related entrepreneurship fraud.
Sec. 105. Miscellaneous conforming and technical changes.
Sec. 106. User fees.
Sec. 107. Commission on Legal Immigration Reform.
Sec. 108. Effective dates and transition.

TITLE II—NATURALIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1989

Sec. 201. Short title; references in title.
Sec. 202. Administrative naturalization.
Sec. 203. Substituting 3 months residence in INS district or State for 6 months residence in a State.
Sec. 204. Public education regarding naturalization benefits.
Sec. 205. Naturalization of natives of the Philippines through active-duty service in the Armed Forces during World War II.
Sec. 206. Conforming amendments.
Sec. 207. Effective dates and savings provisions.

SEC. 102. NATIONAL LEVEL OF IMMIGRATION.

(a) WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF IMMIGRATION.—(1) Section 201 (8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended to read as follows:

"WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF IMMIGRATION

"SEC. 201. (a) IN GENERAL.—Exclusive of aliens described in subsection (b), aliens born in a foreign state or dependent area who may be issued immigrant visas or who may otherwise acquire the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence are limited to—

"(1) family connection immigrants described in section 203(a) (or who are admitted under section 211(a) on the basis of a prior issuance of a visa to their accompanying parent under section 203(a)) in a number not to exceed in any fiscal year the number specified in subsection (c) for that year, and not to exceed in any of the first 3 quarters of any fiscal year 27 percent of the worldwide level under such subsection for all of such fiscal year; and

"(2) independent immigrants described in section 203(b) (or who are admitted under section 211(a) on the basis of a prior issuance of a visa to their accompanying parent under section 203(b)), in a number not to exceed in any fiscal year the number specified in subsection (d) for that year, and not to exceed in any of the first 3 quarters of any fiscal year 27 percent of the worldwide level under such subsection for all of such fiscal year.

"(b) ALIENS NOT SUBJECT TO DIRECT NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—The following aliens are not subject to the worldwide levels or numerical limitations of subsection (a):

"(1)(A) Special immigrants described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 101(a)(27).

"(B) Aliens who are admitted under section 207(c) pursuant to a numerical limitation established under section 207(b).

"(C) Aliens whose status is adjusted to permanent residence under section 210, 210A, or 245A.

"(D) Aliens provided permanent resident status under section 249.

"(2)(A)(i) Aliens who are immediate relatives. For purposes of this clause, the term 'immediate relatives' means the children, spouses, and parents of a citizen of the United States, except that, in the case of parents, such citizens shall be at least 21 years of age.

"(ii) Aliens admitted under section 211(a) on the basis of a prior issuance of a visa to their accompanying parent who is such an immediate relative.

"(B) Aliens born to an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence during a temporary visit abroad.

"(C) Aliens who are admitted under section 207(c) pursuant to a numerical limitation established under section 207(a) and aliens who are granted asylum under section 208.

"(c) WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF FAMILY CONNECTION IMMIGRANTS.—(1) The worldwide level of family connection immigrants under this subsection for a fiscal year is equal to—

"(A) 480,000, minus

"(B) the number computed under paragraph (2), plus

"(C) the number (if any) computed under paragraph (3).

"(2) The number computed under this paragraph for a fiscal year is the sum of the number of aliens described in subparagraph (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(2) who were issued immigrant visas or otherwise acquired the status of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence in the previous fiscal year.

"(3) The number computed under this paragraph for a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 1992) is the difference (if any) between the maximum number of visas which may be issued under subsection (a)(2) (relating to independent immigrants) during the previous fiscal year and the number of visas issued under that subsection during that year.

"(d) WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF INDEPENDENT IMMIGRANTS.—(1) The worldwide level on independent immigrants under this subsection for a fiscal year is equal to—

"(A) 120,000, plus

"(B) the number computed under paragraph (2).

"(2) The number computed under this paragraph for a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 1992) is the difference (if any) between the maximum number of visas which may be issued under subsection (a)(1) (relating to family connection immigrants) during the previous fiscal year and the number of visas issued under that subsection during that year.

"(e) REPORT ON, AND REVISION OF, WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF IMMIGRATION.—(1) In January before the beginning of fiscal year 1994 (and in January before each succeeding fiscal year thereafter), the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, shall prepare and transmit to the President and to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives a report discussing the effect of immigration on the United States. The report shall consider—

"(A) the requirements of citizens of the United States and of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence to be joined in the United States by immediate family members;

"(B) the impact of immigration on labor needs, employment, and other economic and domestic conditions in the United States;

"(C) the impact of immigration with respect to demographic and fertility rates and resources and environmental factors; and

"(D) the impact of immigration on the foreign policy and national security interests of the United States.

The report for fiscal year 1994 (and each third fiscal year thereafter) shall include a discussion, based upon such considerations, of the need (if any) to revise the number specified in subsection (c)(1)(A) or the number specified in subsection (d)(1)(A) for any fiscal year of the 3-fiscal-year period beginning with the first fiscal year following transmittal of the report. The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives shall hold hearings on the findings of the latest such report.

"(2) In March before the beginning of fiscal year 1994 (and of each third fiscal year thereafter), the President shall, after considering the corresponding report transmitted under paragraph (1) and after soliciting the views of members of the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, determine whether or not the number specified in subsection (c)(1)(A) or the number specified in subsection (d)(1)(A) should be changed for any fiscal year of the 3-fiscal-year period beginning with the next following fiscal year, and, if so, which number or numbers should apply instead of the number specified in the respective subsection for the fiscal years of that period. The President shall transmit such determination to the Congress by not later than March 31 before the fiscal year involved and shall deliver such determination to both Houses of Congress on the same day and while each House is in session.

"(3)(A) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (c)(1)(A) and (d)(1)(A), if the number transmitted in a determination of the President with respect to subsection (c)(1)(A) or subsection (d)(1)(A) for a fiscal year or years of a 3-fiscal-year period—

"(i) is not less than 95 percent, nor more than 105 percent, of the number specified in that respective subsection, unless the Congress, by not later than August 31 following the date of the transmittal, enacts a joint resolution the substance of which disapproves the change with respect to the number for that respective subsection for that fiscal year or years, the number so transmitted shall take effect and apply, instead of the number specified in that respective subsection, during that period; or

"(ii) is less than 95 percent, or more than 105 percent, of the number specified in that respective subsection, if the Congress, by not later than August 31 following the date of the transmittal, enacts a joint resolution the substance of which approves the change with respect to the number specified in that respective subsection for that fiscal year or years, the number so transmitted shall take effect and apply, instead of the number specified in that respective subsection, during that period.

"(B) For purposes of this paragraph, a number transmitted by the President under paragraph (2) which takes effect and applies under this paragraph with respect to subsection (c)(1)(A) or (d)(1)(A) with respect to a fiscal year or fiscal years shall be deemed to be the number specified in that same subsection for that period, and that number shall be deemed to be the number specified in that same subsection thereafter unless changed pursuant to this subsection.

"(4) Paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) are enacted—

"(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they are deemed a part of the rules of each respective House, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in the case of joint resolutions described in paragraph (5), and supersede the other rules only to the extent that such paragraphs are inconsistent therewith; and

"(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

"(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'joint resolution', with respect to a change in number transmitted by the President under paragraph (2) for the fiscal years of a three-fiscal-year period, in the case described—

"(A) in paragraph (3)(A)(i), means only a joint resolution of the Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress, pursuant to subsection (e)(3)(A)(i) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, disapproves the change proposed by the President in the number specified under subsection of that section for the fiscal year [or years] transmitted to the Congress by the President on ', the blank spaces therein to be filled appropriately; or

"(B) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii), means only a joint resolution of the Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress, pursuant to subsection (e)(3)(A)(ii) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, approves the change proposed by the President in the number specified under subsection of that section for the fiscal year [or years] transmitted to the Congress by the President on ', the blank spaces therein to be filled appropriately.

"(6)(A) No later than the first day of session following the day on which a determination is transmitted to the House of Representatives and to the Senate under paragraph (2), which determination provides for a change in a number specified in subsection (c)(1)(A) or (d)(1)(A) for a fiscal year, a joint resolution (as defined in paragraph (5)) with respect to each such change shall be introduced (by request) in each House by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of that House, or by a Member or Members of the House designated by such chairman.

"(B)(i) Each joint resolution introduced in a House shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the respective House. The committees shall make their recommendations to the respective House not later than June 15 following the date of introduction.

"(ii) If the Committee has not reported such a joint resolution with respect to a change by such date, it is in order to move to discharge the Committee from further consideration of the joint resolution, except that no motion to discharge shall be in order after the Committee has reported a joint resolution with respect to the same change.

"(iii) A motion to discharge under clause (ii) may be made only by a Member favoring the joint resolution, is privileged, and debate thereon shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution, the time to be divided equally between, and controlled by, in the Senate by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees and in the House of Representatives by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the ranking minority member of such committee or their designees. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(C)(i) When the Committee has reported, or been discharged from consideration of, a joint resolution, a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution shall be highly privileged and is not debatable. The motion shall not be subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the respective House until disposed of.

"(ii) Debate on a joint resolution, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, to be equally divided in the Senate between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees and to be equally divided in the House of Representatives between individuals favoring and individuals opposing the joint resolution. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the resolution is not in order. A motion to reconsider the vote by which a joint resolution is passed or rejected shall not be in order.

"(iii) Immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the appropriate House, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

"(iv) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution shall be decided without debate.

"(D) If, prior to the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House, that House receives a joint resolution with respect to the same change transmitted by the President in a number specified under a subsection for a fiscal year, then—

"(i) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no resolution had been received from the other House; but

"(ii) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.".

(2) The item in the table of contents relating to section 201 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. Worldwide level of immigration.".

(b) PER COUNTRY IMMIGRATION LEVELS.—Section 202 (8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "(a) No person" and inserting "(a)(1) Except as specifically provided in paragraph (2) and in section 101(a)(27), 201(b) (2)(A)(i), and 203, no person",

(B) by striking ", except as specifically" and all that follows through "following fiscal year", and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the total number of immigrant visas made available to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area under subsection (c) of section 201 (relating to family connection immigrants) in any fiscal year may not exceed 7 percent (in the case of a single foreign state) or 2 percent (in the case of a dependent area) of the total number of such visas made available under such subsection in that fiscal year.

"(B) If for fiscal year 1991 or a succeeding fiscal year the number of aliens described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 201(b)(2) (relating to immediate relatives and similar individuals) who are natives of a particular foreign state or dependent area and who are issued immigrant visas or otherwise acquired the status of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence in the fiscal year exceeds the greater of—

"(i) the numerical level computed under subparagraph (A) for that state for that fiscal year, or

"(ii) the level of such immigration of natives of that foreign state in fiscal year 1989 or fiscal year 1990 (whichever is greater),

then the numerical level applicable to that foreign state or dependent area in the following fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall be reduced by the amount of such excess, except that such reduction shall not exceed one-half of the numerical level otherwise provided without regard to this subparagraph.

"(C) If, because of the application of subparagraph (A) with respect to one or more foreign states, the number of visas available under section 201(c) for a calendar quarter exceeds the number of qualified immigrants who otherwise may be issued such a visa, subparagraph (A) shall not apply to visas made available to such states or areas during the remainder of such calendar quarter.

"(3)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the total number of immigrant visas made available to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area under subsection (d) of section 201 (relating to independent immigrants) in any fiscal year may not exceed 7 percent (in the case of a single foreign state) or 2 percent (in the case of a dependent area) of the total number of such visas made available under such subsection in the fiscal year.

"(B) If, because of the application of subparagraph (A) with respect to one or more foreign states or dependent areas, the number of visas available under section 201(d) for a calendar quarter exceeds the number of qualified immigrants who otherwise may be issued such a visa, subparagraph (A) shall not apply to visas made available to such states or areas during the remainder of such calendar quarter.";

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section" each place it appears and inserting "a numerical level established under subsection (a)";

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "other than" and all that follows through "section 201(b)" and inserting "other than a special immigrant, as defined in section 101(a)(27), or an alien described in section 201(b)(2)(A)(i)", and

(B) by striking "section 202(a)" and all that follows through the end and inserting "subsection (a)(1), to the foreign state"; and

(4) Section 202(e) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Whenever the maximum number of visas have been made available under subsection (a)(2) to natives of any single foreign state or to any dependent area, then in the next following fiscal year a number of visas, not to exceed the number specified in subsection (a)(2) for a foreign state or a dependent area, as the case may be, shall be made available and allocated for such state or such area for the same classes of aliens described in, and the same percentages specified in, paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 203(a).".

SEC. 103. PREFERENCE SYSTEM FOR ADMISSION OF IMMIGRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 203 (8 U.S.C. 1153) is amended to read as follows:

"ALLOCATION OF IMMIGRANT VISAS

"SEC. 203. (a) PREFERENCE ALLOCATION FOR FAMILY CONNECTION IMMIGRANTS.—Aliens subject to the worldwide level specified in section 201(c) for family connection immigrants shall be allotted visas as follows:

"(1) UNMARRIED SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF CITIZENS.—Qualified immigrants who are the unmarried sons or daughters of citizens of the United States shall be allocated visas in a number not to exceed 9 percent of such worldwide level, plus any visas not required for the class specified in paragraph (4).

"(2) SPOUSES AND UNMARRIED SONS AND UNMARRIED DAUGHTERS OF PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS.—Qualified immigrants who are—

"(A) the spouses of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or

"(B) the unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if the sons or daughters—

"(i) are under 26 years of age as of the date of the petition for such preference, or

"(ii)(I) as of the date of the enactment of the Immigration Act of 1989, had a petition filed on their behalf for preference status under section 203(a)(2) (as in effect on such date) by reason of such relationship and such petition was subsequently approved, and

"(II) continue to qualify under the terms of section 203(a)(2) of this Act as in effect on the day before such date,

shall be allocated visas in a number not to exceed 57 percent of such worldwide level, plus any visas not required for the class specified in paragraph (1).

"(3) MARRIED SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF CITIZENS.—Qualified immigrants who are the married sons or married daughters of citizens of the United States shall be allocated visas in a number not to exceed 9 percent of such worldwide level, plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) and (2).

"(4) BROTHERS AND SISTERS OF CITIZENS.—Qualified immigrants who are the brothers or sisters of citizens of the United States, if such citizens are at least 21 years of age, shall be allocated visas in a number not to exceed 25 percent of such worldwide level, plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (2) or (3).

"(b) PREFERENCE ALLOCATION FOR INDEPENDENT IMMIGRANTS.—Aliens subject to the worldwide level specified in section 201(d) for independent immigrants in a fiscal year shall be allocated visas as follows:

"(1) SPECIAL IMMIGRANTS.—Visas shall be made available, in a number not to exceed 5 percent of such worldwide level, to qualified special immigrants described in section 101(a)(27) (other than those described in subparagraph (A) or (B) thereof).

"(2) ALIENS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE PROFESSIONS HOLDING ADVANCED DEGREES OR ALIENS OF EXCEPTIONAL ABILITY.—(A) Visas shall be made available next, in a number not to exceed 23 percent of such worldwide level to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are sought by an employer in the United States.

"(B) The Attorney General may, when he deems it to be in the national interest, waive the requirement of subparagraph (A) that an alien's services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business be sought by an employer in the United States.

"(C) In determining under subparagraph (A) whether an immigrant has exceptional ability, the possession of a degree, diploma, certificate, or similar award from a college, university, school, or other institution of learning or a license to practice or certification for a particular profession or occupation shall not by itself be considered sufficient evidence of such exceptional ability.

"(3) SKILLED WORKERS.—(A) Visas shall be made available next, in a number not to

exceed 23 percent of such worldwide level, to the following two classes of aliens:

"(i) Qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least 2 years training or experience), not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

"(ii) Qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and who are members of the professions.

"(B) An immigrant visa may not be issued to an immigrant under subparagraph (A) until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(14).

"(4) EMPLOYMENT CREATION.—Visas shall be made available next, in a number not to exceed 4 percent of such worldwide level, to any qualified immigrant who is seeking to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in a new commercial enterprise which the alien has established and in which such alien has invested or, is actively in the process of investing, capital, in an amount not less than $1,000,000, and which will benefit the United States economy and create full-time employment for not fewer than 10 United States citizens or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence (other than the spouse, sons, or daughters of such immigrant). The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of State, may prescribe regulations increasing the dollar amount of the investment necessary for the issuance of a visa under this paragraph.

"(5) SELECTED IMMIGRANTS.—(A) Visas authorized in any fiscal year under section 201(d), less those required for issuance to the classes specified in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), shall be made available to qualified immigrants who attain a score of not less than 45 points, based on the point assessment system described in subparagraph (B).

"(B) The point assessment system referred to in subparagraph (A) shall accord points based on criteria as follows:

"(i) AGE (10 POINTS).—For an alien who (as of the date of filing a petition) is—

"(I) at least 21 years of age but has not attained 36 years of age, 10 points; or

"(II) at least 36 years of age, but has not attained 45 years of age, 5 points.

"(ii) EDUCATION (25 POINTS).—For an alien who (as of the date of filing a petition)—

"(I) has completed successfully grade school through high school or its educational equivalent (as determined by the Secretary of Education), 10 points;

"(II) has been awarded a bachelors' degree or its equivalent (as determined by the Secretary of Education), 10 additional points; and

"(III) has been awarded a graduate degree, an additional number of points (up to 5 additional points) to be determined by the Secretary of Education based on the level of the degree.

"(iii) OCCUPATIONAL DEMAND (20 POINTS).—For an alien who is in an occupation for which the Secretary of Labor determines (before the fiscal year involved)—

"(I) there will be increased demand in the United States for individuals in the occupation in the fiscal year, 10 points, and

"(II) there is a present or there will be a future shortage of individuals in the United States to meet the need in the occupation in the United States in the fiscal year, 5 or 10 points.

"(iv) OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING AND WORK EXPERIENCE (20 POINTS).—To the extent the alien has additional training, work experience, or both, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, in the occupation described in clause (iv), 10 or 20 points, such points multiplied by the number of points awarded under clause (iv) divided by 20.

"(C) The point assessment system described in subparagraph (B) shall be established by regulation by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Education.

"(c) TREATMENT OF FAMILY MEMBERS.—A spouse or child as defined in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of section 101(b)(1) shall, if not otherwise entitled to an immigrant status and the immediate issuance of a visa under subsection (a) or (b) (except for subsection (b)(5)) be entitled to the same status, and the same order of consideration provided in the respective subsection, if accompanying or following to join, his spouse or parent.

"(d) ORDER OF CONSIDERATION.—(1) Immigrant visas made available under subsection (a) or (b) (other than paragraph (5)) or under section 201(a)(3) shall be issued to eligible immigrants in the order in which a petition in behalf of each such immigrant is filed with the Attorney General (or in the case of special immigrants under section 101(a)(27)(D), with the Secretary of State) as provided in section 204(a).

"(2) Of the immigrant visa numbers made available under subsection (b)(5) (relating to selected immigrants) in a fiscal year—

"(A) 20 percent of such numbers shall be issued to eligible qualified immigrants who attain a score of at least 65 points on the assessment system described in subsection (b)(5)(B) with respect to petitions filed for the fiscal year involved, to be chosen in the random order described in clause (B); and

"(B) 80 percent of such numbers shall be issued to eligible qualified immigrants with a qualifying score on such system strictly in a random order established by the Secretary of State for the fiscal year involved.

"(3) Waiting lists of applicants for visas under this section shall be maintained in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State.

"(e) PRESUMPTION.—Every immigrant shall be presumed not to be described in subsection (a) or (b) of this section, section 101(a)(27), or section 201(b)(2), until the immigrant establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer and the immigration officer that the immigrant is so described. In the case of any alien claiming in his application for an immigrant visa to be described in section 201(b)(1) or in subsection (a) or (b) of this subsection, the consular officer shall not grant such status until he has been authorized to do so as provided by section 204.

"(f) LISTS.—For purposes of carrying out his responsibilities in the orderly administration of this section, the Secretary of State may make reasonable estimates of the anticipated numbers of visas to be issued during any quarter of any fiscal year within each of the categories under subsections (a) and (b), and to rely upon such estimates in authorizing the issuance of visas. The Secretary of State shall terminate the registration of any alien who fails to apply for an immigrant visa within one year following notification to him of the availability of such visa, but the Secretary shall reinstate the registration of any such alien who establishes within 2 years following the date of notification of the availability of such visa that such failure to apply was due to circumstances beyond his control.".

(2) Nothing in this subsection may be construed as continuing the availability of visas under section 203(a)(7), as in effect before the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CHANGES IN PETITIONING PROCEDURE.—Section 204(a) (8 U.S.C. 1154(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3), and

(2) by striking "(a)(1)" and all that follows through the end of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

"(a)(1)(A) Any citizen of the United States claiming that an alien is entitled to classification by reason of a relationship described in paragraph (1), (3), or (4) of section 203(a) or to an immediate relative status under section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification.

"(B) Any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that an alien is entitled to a classification by reason of the relationship described in section 203(a)(2) may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification. An alien may be classified as an alien described in paragraphs (2), (3), or (4) of section 203(a) with respect to a specific fiscal year on the basis of a petition filed in a previous fiscal year only if the alien has filed with the Attorney General a notice of continuing intent to be admitted to the United States as an immigrant under such section within the 2 fiscal years immediately previous to the specific fiscal year involved.

"(C)(i) Any alien (other than a special immigrant under section 101(a)(27)(D)) desiring to be classified under section 203(b)(1) (or any person on behalf of such an alien) (relating to special immigrants) may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification.

"(ii) Aliens claiming status as a special immigrant under section 101(a)(27)(D) may file a petition only with the Secretary of State and only after notification by the Secretary that such status has been recommended and approved pursuant to such section.

"(D) Any alien desiring to be classified under section 203(b)(2) (or any person on behalf of such an alien) (relating to professionals) may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification.

"(E) Any person desiring and intending to employ within the United States an alien entitled to classification under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 203(b) (relating to professionals and skilled workers) may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification.

"(F) Any alien desiring to be classified under section 203(b)(4) (relating to employment creation) may file a petition with the Secretary of State for such classification.

"(G)(i) Any alien desiring to be provided an immigrant visa under section 203(b)(5) (relating to selected immigrants) may file a petition at the place and time determined by the Secretary of State by regulation. While the place of filing may be designated inside the United States, the petitioner shall be physically outside the United States when submitting the petition. Only one such petition may be filed by an alien with respect to any petitioning period established. If more than one petition is submitted all such petitions submitted for such period by the alien shall be voided.

"(ii)(I) The Secretary of State may designate a period for the filing of petitions with respect to visas which may be issued under section 203(b)(5) during either of the next

two fiscal years beginning after the close of such period.

"(II) Aliens who qualify, through random selection, for a visa under section 203(b)(5) shall remain eligible to receive such visa only through the end of the specific fiscal year for which they were selected.

"(III) The Secretary of State shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this clause.

"(iii) A petition or registration under this subparagraph shall be in such form as the Secretary of State may by regulation prescribe and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Secretary of State may require.

"(iv) The petition under this subparagraph shall include a certification in writing at the time of filing a petition that all information contained within the petition is true and correct to the best of the petitioner's knowledge, and any willful misrepresentation of the facts or statements included in the petition shall be deemed a violation of section 212(a)(19).

"(2) On or after October 1, 1990, an alien who—

"(A) previous to being admitted as, or otherwise provided the status of, an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence was married to an individual, and

"(B) is so admitted, or provided such status, as a child or as the unmarried son or unmarried daughter of a citizen of the United States or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence,

may not file a petition under this section on behalf of any alien to whom the alien was married previous to being so admitted or provided such status.".

(c) REVISION OF LABOR CERTIFICATION.—(1) Paragraph (14) of section 212(a) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(14) Aliens seeking to enter the United States to perform skilled labor unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General that (A) there are not sufficient qualified workers (or equally qualified workers in the case of aliens who are members of the teaching profession or who have exceptional ability in the sciences or arts) available in the United States in the positions in which the aliens will be employed; and (B) the employment of aliens in such positions will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States. The Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion, substitute for the determination and certification described in clause (A) of the preceding sentence a determination and certification that there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified (or equally qualified in the case of aliens who are members of the teaching profession or who have exceptional ability in the sciences or the arts), and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform such skilled labor. In making either determination under this paragraph, the Secretary of Labor may use labor market information without regard to the specific job opportunity for which certification is requested, but if such determination is adverse, the Secretary of Labor shall make a certification with regard to the specific job opportunity if the employer submits evidence that such specific certification would result in a different determination. An alien on behalf of whom a certification is sought must have an offer of employment from an employer in the United States. The exclusion of aliens under this paragraph shall apply to immigrants seeking admission under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 203(b), except that this paragraph shall not apply to any alien for whom a waiver has been granted under section 203(b)(2)(B);".

(2) The Secretary of Labor shall conduct a comprehensive study to determine whether the process of obtaining an immigrant labor certification under section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by this title, has been simplified or otherwise expedited. In conducting this study, the Secretary shall hold public hearings. Not later than March 31, 1993, the Secretary of Labor shall prepare and transmit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report containing the findings of such study and including any recommendations of other relevant agencies of the Federal Government with respect to such findings.

SEC. 104. DETERRING IMMIGRATION-RELATED ENTREPRENEURSHIP FRAUD.

(a) CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS BASED ON ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISES.—Chapter 2 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR CERTAIN ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS, SPOUSES, AND CHILDREN

"SEC. 218. (a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR STATUS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, an alien entrepreneur (as defined in subsection (f)(1)), spouse, and child (as defined in subsection (f)(2)) shall be considered, at the time of obtaining the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, to have obtained such status on a conditional basis subject to the provisions of this section.

"(2) NOTICE OF REQUIREMENTS.—

"(A) AT TIME OF OBTAINING PERMANENT RESIDENCE.—At the time an alien entrepreneur, spouse, or child obtains permanent resident status on a conditional basis under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall provide for notice to such an entrepreneur, spouse, or child respecting the provisions of this section and the requirements of subsection (c)(1) to have the conditional basis of such status removed.

"(B) AT TIME OF REQUIRED PETITION.—In addition, the Attorney General shall attempt to provide notice to such an entrepreneur, spouse, or child, at or about the beginning of the 90-day period described in subsection (d)(2)(A), of the requirements of subsection (c)(1).

"(C) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE.—The failure of the Attorney General to provide a notice under this paragraph shall not affect the enforcement of the provisions of this section with respect to such an entrepreneur, spouse, or child.

"(b) TERMINATION OF STATUS IF FINDING THAT QUALIFYING ENTREPRENEURSHIP IMPROPER.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an alien with permanent resident status on a conditional basis under subsection (a), if the Attorney General determines, before the second anniversary of the alien's obtaining the status of lawful admission for permanent residence, that—

"(A) the establishment of the commercial enterprise was intended solely as a means of evading the immigration laws of the United States,

"(B)(i) a commercial enterprise was not established by the alien;

"(ii) the alien did not invest or was not actively in the process of investing the requisite capital; or

"(iii) the alien was not sustaining the actions described in clause (A) or (B) throughout the period of the alien's residence in the United States, or

"(C) the alien was otherwise not conforming to the requirements of section 203(b)(4), then the Attorney General shall so notify the alien involved and, subject to paragraph (2), shall terminate the permanent resident status of the alien involved as of the date of the determination.

"(2) HEARING IN DEPORTATION PROCEEDING.—Any alien whose permanent resident status is terminated under paragraph (1) may request a review of such determination in a proceeding to deport the alien. In such proceeding, the burden of proof shall be on the Attorney General to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that a condition described in paragraph (1) is met.

"(c) REQUIREMENTS OF TIMELY PETITION AND INTERVIEW FOR REMOVAL OF CONDITION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In order for the conditional basis established under subsection (a) for an alien entrepreneur, spouse, or child to be removed—

"(A) the alien entrepreneur must submit to the Attorney General, during the period described in subsection (d)(2), a petition which requests the removal of such conditional basis and which states, under penalty of perjury, the facts and information described in subsection (d)(1), and

"(B) in accordance with subsection (d)(3), the alien entrepreneur must appear for a personal interview before an officer or employee of the Service respecting the facts and information described in subsection (d)(1).

"(2) TERMINATION OF PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR FAILURE TO FILE PETITION OR HAVE PERSONAL INTERVIEW.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an alien with permanent resident status on a conditional basis under subsection (a), if—

"(i) no petition is filed with respect to the alien in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1)(A), or

"(ii) unless there is good cause shown, the alien entrepreneur fails to appear at the interview described in paragraph (1)(B),

the Attorney General shall terminate the permanent resident status of the alien as of the second anniversary of the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence.

"(B) HEARING IN DEPORTATION PROCEEDING.—In any deportation proceeding with respect to an alien whose permanent resident status is terminated under subparagraph (A), the burden of proof shall be on the alien to establish compliance with the conditions of paragraphs (1)(A) and (1)(B).

"(3) DETERMINATION AFTER PETITION AND INTERVIEW.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If—

"(i) a petition is filed in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1)(A), and

"(ii) the alien entrepreneur appears at the interview described in paragraph (1)(B),

the Attorney General shall make a determination, within 90 days of the date of the interview, as to whether the facts and information described in subsection (d)(1) and alleged in the petition are true with respect to the qualifying commercial enterprise.

"(B) REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS IF FAVORABLE DETERMINATION.—If the Attorney General determines that such facts and information are true, the Attorney General shall so notify the alien involved and shall remove the conditional basis of the alien's

status effective as of the second anniversary of the alien's obtaining the status of lawful admission for permanent residence.

"(C) TERMINATION IF ADVERSE DETERMINATION.—If the Attorney General determines that such facts and information are not true, the Attorney General shall so notify the alien involved and, subject to subparagraph (D), shall terminate the permanent resident status of an alien entrepreneur, spouse, or child as of the date of the determination.

"(D) HEARING IN DEPORTATION PROCEEDING.—Any alien whose permanent resident status is terminated under subparagraph (C) may request a review of such determination in a proceeding to deport the alien. In such proceeding, the burden of proof shall be on the Attorney General to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the facts and information described in subsection (d)(1) and alleged in the petition are not true with respect to the qualifying commercial enterprise.

"(d) DETAILS OF PETITION AND INTERVIEW.—

"(1) CONTENTS OF PETITION.—Each petition under subsection (c)(1)(A) shall contain facts and information demonstrating that—

"(A) a commercial enterprise was established by the alien;

"(B) the alien invested or was actively in the process of investing the requisite capital; and

"(C) the alien sustained the actions described in clauses (A) and (B) throughout the period of the alien's residence in the United States.

"(2) PERIOD FOR FILING PETITION.—

"(A) 90-DAY PERIOD BEFORE SECOND ANNIVERSARY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the petition under subsection (c)(1)(A) must be filed during the 90-day period before the second anniversary of the alien's obtaining the status of lawful admission for permanent residence.

"(B) DATE PETITIONS FOR GOOD CAUSE.—Such a petition may be considered if filed after such date, but only if the alien establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General good cause and extenuating circumstances for failure to file the petition during the period described in subparagraph (A).

"(C) FILING OF PETITIONS DURING DEPORTATION.—In the case of an alien who is the subject of deportation hearings as a result of failure to file a petition on a timely basis in accordance with subparagraph (A), the Attorney General may stay such deportation proceedings against an alien pending the filing of the petition under subparagraph (B).

"(3) PERSONAL INTERVIEW.—The interview under subsection (c)(1)(B) shall be conducted within 90 days after the date of submitting a petition under subsection (c)(1)(A) and at a local office of the Service, designated by the Attorney General, which is convenient to the parties involved. The Attorney General, in the Attorney General's discretion, may waive the deadline for such an interview or the requirement for such an interview in such cases as may be appropriate.

"(e) TREATMENT OF PERIOD FOR PURPOSES OF NATURALIZATION.—For purposes of title III, in the case of an alien who is in the United States as a lawful permanent resident on a conditional basis under this section, the alien shall be considered to have been admitted as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence and to be in the United States as an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) The term 'alien entrepreneur' means an alien who obtains the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence (whether on a conditional basis or otherwise) under section 203(b)(4).

"(2) The term 'spouse' and the term 'child' mean an alien who obtains the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence (whether on a conditional basis or otherwise) by virtue of being the spouse or child, respectively, of an alien entrepreneur.".

(b) ADDITIONAL GROUND FOR DEPORTATION.—Section 241(a)(9) (8 U.S.C. 1251(a)(9)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", or (C) is an alien with permanent resident status on a conditional basis under section 218 and has such status terminated under such section".

(c) CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR IMMIGRATION-RELATED ENTREPRENEURSHIP FRAUD.—Section 275 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1325) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Any individual who knowingly establishes a commercial enterprise for the purpose of evading any provision of the immigration laws shall be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or fined not more than $250,000, or both.".

(d) LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—Section 245 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) The Attorney General may not adjust, under subsection (a), the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on a conditional basis under section 218.".

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 217 the following new item:

"Sec. 218. Conditional permanent resident status for certain alien entrepreneurs, spouses, and children.".

SEC. 105. MISCELLANEOUS CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL CHANGES.

(a) Sections 101(b)(1)(F), 202(a), 202(c), 204(b), 204(e), 216(g)(1)(A), 222(a), 244(d), 245(c)(2), and 245(c)(5) (8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(1)(F), 1152(a), 1152(c), 1154(a)(1), 1154(b), 1154(e), 1186a(g)(1)(A), 1202(a), 1254(d), 1255(c)(2), 1255(c)(5)) are each amended by striking "201(b)" each place it appears and inserting "201(b)(2)(A)(i)".

(b) Section 204 (8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking "section 203(a) (3) or (6)" and inserting "section 203(b)(3)",

(B) by striking "section 201(b)" and inserting "section 201(b)(2)(A)(i)",

(C) by striking "a preference status under section 203(a)" and inserting "preference under subsection (a) or (b) of section 203",

(D) by inserting "(and, in the case described in section 203(b)(5), specify the point score on the assessment system)" after "approve the petition", and

(E) by striking "The Secretary of State" and inserting "Subject to section 203(b)(5), the Secretary of State";

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking "preference immigrant under section 203(a)" and inserting "immigrant under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 203", and

(B) by striking "section 201(b)" and inserting "section 201(f)";

(3) by striking subsection (f);

(4) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as (f) and (g), respectively;

(5) in subsection (f)(1), as redesignated by paragraph (4), by inserting "(as in effect before the date of the enactment of the Immigration Act of 1989)" after "203(a)(4)"; and

(6) in subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (4), by striking "preference status" and inserting "status under section 203(a)(2)".

(c) Section 212(a)(32) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(32)) is amended by striking "203(a)(3) and (6) and to nonpreference immigrant aliens described in section 203(a)(7)" and inserting "203(b)(2), (3), and (5)".

(d) Section 244(d) (8 U.S.C. 1254(d)) is amended by striking "201(a) or 202(a)" and inserting "201(c) or 202(a)(2)(A)".

(e) Section 245 (8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking "203(a)" and inserting "203", and

(2) in subsection (c), by redesignating clause (5) as clause (4) and by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", or (5) an alien who is applying for adjustment of status to preference status under section 203(b)(5)".

(f)(1) Section 3304(a)(14)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "section 203(a)(7) or".

(2) Section 1614(a)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking "section 203(a)(7) or".

(g) Section 2(c)(4) of the Virgin Islands Nonimmigrant Alien Adjustment Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-271) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "(as in effect before October 1, 1990) or by reason of the relationship described in section 203(a)(2)(B), 203(a)(3), or 201(b)(2)(A)(i), respectively, of such Act (as in effect on or after such date)".

SEC. 106. USER FEES.

Section 286 (8 U.S.C. 1356) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(q) VISA FEES FOR IMMIGRANTS.—The Secretary of State shall provide for a schedule of fees to be charged for the filing of a petition for any and all immigrant categories under sections 201(a)(3), 201(b)(2)(A)(i), and 203 (a) and (b). The fees established under this subsection shall be sufficient to cover administrative and other expenses incurred in connection with the processing of petitions for any and all immigrant categories filed under sections 201(a)(3), 201(b)(2)(A)(i), and 203 (a) and (b).

"(r) CREDITABLE FEES.—Notwithstanding sections 1 and 2 of the Act of June 4, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 750; 22 U.S.C. 214) or any other provision of law, up to $20,000,000 in fees collected by consular officers for issuance of visas and for execution of applications for visas shall be credited to a Department of State account which shall be available only for the payment of the expenses of research, development, equipment, and automation of visa and passport functions, including related software. Each fiscal year thereafter additional amounts of such consular fees may be credited to such account, except that not more than $20,000,000 of such fees may be available for such purposes in any one fiscal year.".

SEC. 107. COMMISSION ON LEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION.—(1) Effective February 1, 1991, there is established a Commission on Legal Immigration Reform (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Commission") which

shall be composed of 9 members to be appointed as follows:

(A) One member who shall serve as Chairman, to be appointed by the President.

(B) Two members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives who shall select such members from a list of nominees provided by the Chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law of the House of Representatives.

(C) Two members to be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives who shall select such members from a list of nominees provided by the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law of the House of Representatives.

(D) Two members to be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate who shall select such members from a list of nominees provided by the Chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugees Affairs of the Senate.

(E) Two members to be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate who shall select such members from a list of nominees provided by the Chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Affairs of the Senate.

(2) Appointments to the Commission shall be made during the 45-day period beginning on February 1, 1991. A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(3) Members shall be appointed to serve for the life of the Commission.

(b) FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION.—The Commission shall—

(1) review and evaluate the impact of the amendments made by this Act, in accordance with subsection (c); and

(2) transmit to the President and the Congress—

(A) not later than February 1, 1992, a first interim report describing the progress made in carrying out paragraph (1);

(B) not later than February 1, 1993, a second interim report describing the progress made in carrying out paragraph (1) since transmittal of the report described in clause (A); and

(C) not later than February 1, 1994, a final report setting forth the Commission's findings and recommendations, including such recommendations for additional changes that should be made with respect to legal immigration into the United States as the Commission deems appropriate.

(c) PARTICULAR CONSIDERATIONS.—In particular, the Commission shall consider—

(1) the requirements of citizens of the United States and of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence to be joined in the United States by immediate family members and the impact which the establishment of a worldwide ceiling under section 201(c) has upon the availability and priority of family preference visas;

(2) the impact of immigration and the implementation of the independent immigrant category established in section 201(d) on labor needs, employment, and other economic and domestic conditions in the United States;

(3) the impact of immigration with respect to demographic factors and natural resources; and

(4) the impact of immigration on the foreign policy and national security interests of the United States.

(d) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—(1) Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government is entitled to receive, subject to such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts, pay at the minimum annual rate of basic pay in effect for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule. Each member of the Commission who is such an officer or employee shall serve without additional pay.

(2) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence.

(e) MEETINGS, STAFF, AND AUTHORITY OF COMMISSION.—The provisions of subsections (e) through (g) of section 304 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 shall apply to the Commission in the same manner as they apply to the Commission established under such section, except that paragraph (2) of subsection (e) shall not apply.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the authority to make payments, or to enter into contracts, under this section shall be effective only to such extent, or in such amounts, as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

(g) TERMINATION DATE.—The Commission shall terminate on the date on which a final report is required to be transmitted under subsection (b)(2), except that the Commission may continue to function until October 1, 1994, for the purpose of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to standing committees of Congress concerning its final report under this section and disseminating that report.

SEC. 108. EFFECTIVE DATES AND TRANSITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 1990, and shall apply to immigrant visa numbers issued for fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1991; except that the amendments made by section 3(b) (relating to immigrant visa petitioning process) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply to immigrant visa numbers issued for fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1991.

(b) GENERAL TRANSITION.—In the case of a petition filed under section 204(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act before October 1, 1990, for preference status under section 203(a)(3) or section 203(a)(6) of such Act (as in effect before such date), such petition shall be deemed as of October 1, 1990, to be a petition for the status described in section 203(b)(2) or 203(b)(3) of such Act (as amended by this title), as elected by the petitioner, and the priority date for such petition shall remain in effect, except that petitions filed before such date for preference status on the basis of unskilled labor under section 203(a)(6) of such Act (as in effect before such date) shall be deemed as of such date to be petitions for the status described in section 203(b)(3) of such Act (as amended by this title).

(c) ADMISSIBILITY STANDARDS.—When an immigrant, in possession of an unexpired immigrant visa issued before October 1, 1990, makes application for admission, the immigrant's admissibility under paragraphs (20) and (21) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be determined under the provisions of law in effect on the date of the issuance of such visa.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed as affecting the provisions of section 19 of Public Law 97-116, section 2(c)(1) of Public Law 97-271, or section 202(e) of Public Law 99-603.

TITLE II—NATURALIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1989

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES IN TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Naturalization Amendments of 1989".

(b) AMENDMENTS TO IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—Except as otherwise specifically provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 202. ADMINISTRATIVE NATURALIZATION.

Section 310 (8 U.S.C. 1421) is amended to read as follows:

"NATURALIZATION AUTHORITY

"SEC. 310. (a) AUTHORITY IN ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The original authority to naturalize persons as citizens of the United States is conferred solely upon the Attorney General.

"(b) ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS.—An applicant for naturalization may choose to have the oath of allegiance under section 337(a) administered by the Attorney General or by any district court of the United States for any State or by any court of record in any State having a seal, a clerk, and jurisdiction in actions in law or equity, or law and equity, in which the amount in controversy is unlimited. The jurisdiction of all courts specified in this subsection to administer the oath of allegiance shall extend only to persons resident within the respective jurisdiction of such courts.

"(c) APPEAL TO BIA; JUDICIAL REVIEW.—(1) A person whose application for naturalization under this title is denied, after a hearing before an immigration officer under section 336(a), may seek review of such denial before the Board of Immigration Appeals (established by the Attorney General under part 3 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations). The decision of such Board is reviewable by the United States district court for the district in which such person resides. Such review of the district court shall be de novo, and the district court shall make its own findings of fact and conclusions of law and shall, at the request of the petitioner, conduct a hearing de novo on the application.

"(2) The district court shall issue an order authorizing the naturalization of a person in accordance with this title only after determining, upon review of the denial of that person's application for naturalization, that such denial was wrongfully made as a matter of fact or of law.

"(d) SOLE PROCEDURE.—A person may only be naturalized as a citizen of the United States in the manner and under the conditions prescribed in this title and not otherwise.".

SEC. 203. SUBSTITUTING 3 MONTHS RESIDENCE IN INS DISTRICT OR STATE FOR 6 MONTHS RESIDENCE IN A STATE.

Section 316(a)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1427(a)(1)) is amended by striking "and who has resided within the State in which the petitioner filed the petition for at least six months" and inserting "and who has resided within the State or within the district of the Service in the United States in which the applicant

filed the application for at least three months".

SEC. 204. PUBLIC EDUCATION REGARDING NATURALIZATION BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 332 (8 U.S.C. 1443) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) The Attorney General shall broadly disseminate information respecting the benefits which persons may receive under this title and the requirements to obtain such benefits. In carrying out this subsection, the Attorney General shall seek the assistance of appropriate community groups, private voluntary agencies, and other relevant organizations, and the Attorney General is authorized to make grants to, and enter into contracts with, such organizations for such purposes.".

(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—(1) Section 404 (8 U.S.C. 1101, note) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 404 to carry out this Act for a fiscal year, $1,000,000 shall be available only to carry out section 332(h) for such fiscal year.".

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 1989.

SEC. 205. NATURALIZATION OF NATIVES OF THE PHILIPPINES THROUGH ACTIVE-DUTY SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES DURING WORLD WAR II.

Section 329 (8 U.S.C. 1440) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "Any" and inserting "Except as provided in subsection (e), any"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall not apply to the naturalization of any person—

"(1) who was born in the Philippines or who was otherwise a noncitizen national of the United States residing in the Philippines before the service described in paragraph (2);

"(2) who served honorably in an active-duty status in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States at any time during the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946;

"(3) who is otherwise eligible for naturalization under this section; and

"(4) who applies for naturalization not later than one year after the date of enactment of the Naturalization Amendments of 1989.".

SEC. 206. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 310 REVISION.—(1) The item in the table of contents relating to section 310 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 310. Naturalization authority.".

(2) Section 101(a)(36) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(36)) is amended by striking "(except as used in section 310(a) of title III)".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO CHANGE IN RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT.—(1) Section 319 (8 U.S.C. 1430) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "has resided within the State in which he filed his petition for at least six months" and inserting "has resided within the State or the district of the Service in the United States in which the applicant filed his application for at least three months",

(B) in subsections (b) and (d), by striking "within the jurisdiction of the naturalization court" and inserting "within a State or a district of the Service in the United States", and

(C) in subsection (c), is amended by striking "within the jurisdiction of the court" and inserting "district of the Service in the United States".

(2) Section 322(c) (8 U.S.C. 1433(c)) is amended by striking "any State or within the jurisdiction of the naturalization court" and inserting "within a State or a district of the Service in the United States".

(3) Section 324(a)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1435(a)(1)) is amended by inserting "or district of the Service in the United States" after "State".

(4) Section 328 (8 U.S.C. 1439) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by inserting "or district of the Service in the United States" after "State", and

(ii) by striking "for at least six months" and inserting "for at least three months";

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "within the jurisdiction of the court" and inserting "within a State or district of the Service in the United States"; and

(C) in subsection (c), by inserting "or district of the Service in the United States" after "State".

(5) Section 329(b) (8 U.S.C. 1440(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting "or district of the Service in the United States" after "State", and

(ii) by inserting "and" at the end of paragraph (2);

(B) by striking paragraph (3), and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(c) SUBSTITUTION OF APPLICATION FOR NATURALIZATION FOR PETITION FOR NATURALIZATION.—The text of the following provisions is amended by striking "a petition", "petition", "petitions", "a petitioner", "petitioner", "petitioner's", "petitioning", and "petitioned" each place it appears and inserting "an application", "application", "applications" or "applies" (as the case may be), "an applicant", "applicant", "applicant's", "applying", and "applied", respectively:

(1) Section 313(c) (8 U.S.C. 1424(c)).

(2) Section 316 (8 U.S.C. 1427).

(3) Section 317 (8 U.S.C. 1428).

(4) Section 318 (8 U.S.C. 1429).

(5) Section 319 (a) and (c) (8 U.S.C. 1430 (a), (c)).

(6) Section 322(a) (8 U.S.C. 1433).

(7) Section 324 (8 U.S.C. 324(a)).

(8) Section 325 (8 U.S.C. 1436).

(9) Section 326 (8 U.S.C. 1437).

(10) Section 328 (8 U.S.C. 1439).

(11) Section 329 (8 U.S.C. 1440), other than subsection (d).

(12) Section 330(a)(1) (8 U.S.C. 1441(a)(1)).

(13) Section 331 (8 U.S.C. 1442), other than subsection (d).

(14) Section 333(a) (8 U.S.C. 1444(a)).

(15) Section 334 (8 U.S.C. 1445).

(16) Section 335 (8 U.S.C. 1446).

(17) Section 336 (8 U.S.C. 1447).

(18) Section 337 (8 U.S.C. 1448).

(19) Section 338 (8 U.S.C. 1449).

(20) Section 344 (8 U.S.C. 1455).

(21) Section 1429 of title 18, United States Code.

(d) SUBSTITUTING APPROPRIATE ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY FOR NATURALIZATION COURT.—(1) Section 316 (8 U.S.C. 1427) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking "court" each place it appears and inserting "or the Attorney General",

(B) in subsection (b), by striking "date of final hearing" and inserting "date of any hearing under section 336(a)",

(C) in subsection (e), by striking "the court" and inserting "the Attorney General",

(D) in subsection (g)(1), by striking "within the jurisdiction of the court" and inserting "within a particular State or district of the Service in the United States", and

(E) in subsection (g)(2), by amending the first sentence to read as follows: "An applicant for naturalization under this subsection may be administered the oath of allegiance under section 337(a) by any district court of the United States, without regard to the residence of the applicant.".

(2) The second sentence of section 317 (8 U.S.C. 1428) is amended by striking "and the naturalization court".

(3) The third sentence of section 318 (8 U.S.C. 1429) is amended—

(A) by striking "finally heard by a naturalization court" and inserting "considered by the Attorney General", and

(B) by striking "upon the naturalization court" and inserting "upon the Attorney General".

(4) Section 319 (8 U.S.C. 1430) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(3), by striking "naturalization court" and inserting "Attorney General", and

(B) in subsection (c)(5), by striking "naturalization court" and inserting "Attorney General".

(5) Section 322(c)(2)(C) (8 U.S.C. 1433(c)(2)(C)) is amended by striking "naturalization court" the first place it appears and inserting "the Attorney General".

(6) Section 324 (8 U.S.C. 1435) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by inserting "and" at the end of paragraph (1),

(ii) by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting a period, and

(iii) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4);

(B) in subsection (b), by striking "naturalization court" and inserting "Attorney General"; and

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking "the judge or clerk of a naturalization court" and inserting "the Attorney General or the judge or clerk of a court described in section 310(b)", and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking "or naturalization court" each place it appears and inserting "court, or the Attorney General".

(7) Section 327(a) (8 U.S.C. 1438(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking "any naturalization court specified in section 310(a) of this title" and inserting "the Attorney General or before a court described in section 310(b)"; and

(B) by inserting "and by the Attorney General to the Secretary of State" after "Department of Justice".

(8) Section 328(c) (8 U.S.C. 1439(c)) is amended by striking "the final hearing" and inserting "any hearing".

(9) Section 331(b) (8 U.S.C. 1442(b)) is amended by striking "called for a hearing" and all that follows through "to be continued" and inserting "considered or heard except after 90 days' notice to the Attorney General regarding the application, and the Attorney General's objection to such consideration shall cause the application to be continued".

(10) Section 332(a) (8 U.S.C. 1443(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking "for the purpose" and all that follows through "naturalization courts" in the first sentence, and

(B) by striking the second sentence.

(11) Section 333(a) (8 U.S.C. 1444(a)) is amended by striking "clerk of the court" and inserting "Attorney General".

(12) Section 334 (8 U.S.C. 1445) is amended—

(A) by amending the heading to read as follows:

"APPLICATION FOR NATURALIZATION; DECLARATION OF INTENTION";

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking "in the office of the clerk of a naturalization court" and inserting "with the Attorney General",

(ii) by striking "upon the hearing of such petition" and inserting "under this title";

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "(1)",

(ii) by striking "and (2)" and all that follows through "Attorney General", and

(iii) by striking "petition for";

(D) by amending subsections (c) through (e) to read as follows:

"(c) Hearings under section 336(a) on applications for naturalization shall be held at regular intervals, to be fixed by the Attorney General.

"(d) Except as provided in subsection (e), an application for naturalization shall be filed in person in an office of the Attorney General.

"(e) A person may file an application for naturalization other than in an office of the Attorney General, and an oath of allegiance may be administered other than in a public ceremony before the Attorney General or a court, if the Attorney General determines that the person has an illness or other disability which—

"(1) is of a permanent nature and is sufficiently serious to prevent the person's personal appearance, or

"(2) is of a nature which so incapacitates the person as to prevent him from personally appearing."; and

(E) by striking the first sentence of subsection (f) and inserting the following: "An alien who has attained the age of 18 years of age and who is residing in the United States pursuant to a lawful admission for permanent residence may file with the Attorney General a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States. Such a declaration shall be filed in duplicate and in a form prescribed by the Attorney General and shall be accompanied by an application prescribed and approved by the Attorney General.".

(13) Section 335 (8 U.S.C. 1146) is amended—

(A) by amending the heading to read as follows:

"INVESTIGATION OF APPLICANTS; EXAMINATION OF APPLICATIONS";

(B) in subsection (a), by striking "At any time" and all that follows through "336(a)" and inserting "Before a person may be naturalized";

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "preliminary" each place it appears,

(ii) in the first sentence, by striking "to any naturalization court" and all that follows through "to such court",

(iii) by striking "any court exercising naturalization jurisdiction as specified in section 310 of this title" in the second sentence and inserting "any district court of the United States"; and

(iv) by striking "final hearing conducted by a naturalization court designated in section 310 of this title" in the third sentence and inserting "hearing conducted by an immigration officer under section 336(a)";

(D) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking "preliminary" each place it appears, and

(ii) by striking "recommendation" and inserting "determination"; and

(E) by amending subsections (d) through (f) to read as follows:

"(d) The employee designated to conduct any such examination shall submit to the Attorney General a determination as to whether the application be granted, denied, or continued, with reasons therefor.

"(e) After an application for naturalization has been filed with the Attorney General, the applicant shall not be permitted to withdraw his application, except with the consent of the Attorney General. In cases where the Attorney General does not consent to the withdrawal of the application, the application shall be determined on its merits and a final determination made accordingly. In cases where the applicant fails to prosecute his application, the application shall be decided on the merits unless the Attorney General dismisses it for lack of prosecution.

"(f) An applicant for naturalization who moves from the district of the Service in the United States in which the application is pending may, at any time thereafter, request the Service to transfer the application to any district of the Service in the United States which may act on the application. The transfer shall not be made without the consent of the Attorney General. In the case of such a transfer, the proceedings on the application shall continue as though the application had originally been filed in the district of the Service to which the application is transferred.".

(14) Section 336 (8 U.S.C. 1447) is amended—

(A) by amending the heading to read as follows:

"HEARINGS ON DENIALS OF APPLICATIONS FOR NATURALIZATION";

(B) by amending subsections (a) and (b) to read as follows:

"(a) If, after an examination under section 335, an application for naturalization is denied or continued, the applicant may request a hearing before an immigration officer.

"(b) Where there has been a failure to make a determination under section 335 on an application or a failure to have a hearing under subsection (a) on a denial or continuance of an application, the Board of Immigration Appeals (established by the Attorney General under part 3 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations) may, in its discretion, and shall, at the request of the applicant in extraordinary circumstances, require such a determination or hearing.";

(C) in subsection (c), by striking "court" and inserting "immigration officer";

(D) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking "clerk of the court" and all that follows through "naturalization" and inserting "immigration officer shall, if the applicant requests it at the time of filing the request for the hearing",

(ii) by striking "final" each place it appears, and

(iii) by adding at the end the following: "Such subpenas may be enforced in the same manner as subpenas under section 335(b) may be enforced."; and

(E) in subsection (e)—

(i) by striking "naturalization of any person," and inserting "administration by a court of the oath of allegiance under section 337(a)", and

(ii) by striking "included in the petition for naturalization of such persons" and inserting "included in an appropriate petition to the court".

(15) Section 337 (8 U.S.C. 1448) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking "in open court" and inserting "in a public ceremony before the Attorney General or a court with jurisdiction under section 310(b)",

(ii) in the second and fourth sentences, by striking "naturalization court" each place it appears and inserting "Attorney General", and

(iii) in the fourth sentence, by striking "the court" and inserting "the Attorney General";

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "in open court in the court in which the petition for naturalization is made" and inserting "in the same public ceremony in which the oath of allegiance is administered", and

(ii) by striking "in the court" after "recorded";

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking "being in open court" and inserting "attending a public ceremony", and

(ii) by striking "a judge of the court at such place as may be designated by the court" and inserting "at such place as the Attorney General may designate under section 334(e)"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) The Attorney General shall prescribe rules and procedures to ensure that the public ceremonies conducted by the Attorney General for the administration of oaths of allegiance under this section are in keeping with the dignity of the occasion.".

(16) Section 338 (8 U.S.C. 1449) is amended—

(A) by striking "by a naturalization court",

(B) by striking "the clerk of such court" and inserting "the Attorney General",

(C) by striking "title, venue, and location of the naturalization court" and inserting "location of the district office of the Service in which the application was filed and the title, authority, and location of the official or court administering the oath of allegiance",

(D) by striking "the court" and inserting "the Attorney General", and

(E) by striking "of the clerk of the naturalization court; and seal of the court" and inserting "of an immigration officer; and the seal of the Department of Justice".

(17) Section 339 (8 U.S.C. 1450) is amended to read as follows:

"FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF CLERKS AND RECORDS OF DECLARATIONS OF INTENTION AND APPLICATIONS FOR NATURALIZATION

"SEC. 339. (a) The clerk of each court that administers oaths of allegiance under section 337 shall—

"(1) issue to each person to whom such an oath is administered a document evidencing that such an oath was administered,

"(2) forward to the Attorney General information concerning each person to whom such an oath is administered by the court, within 30 days after the close of the month in which the oath was administered,

"(3) make and keep on file evidence for each such document issued, and

"(4) forward to the Attorney General certified copies of such other proceedings and orders instituted in or issued out of the court affecting or relating to the naturalization of persons as may be required from time to time by the Attorney General.

"(b) Each district office of the Service in the United States shall maintain, in chronological order, indexed, and consecutively numbered, as part of its permanent records,

all declarations of intention and applications for naturalization filed with the office.".

(18) Section 340 (8 U.S.C. 1451) is amended in the first sentence of subsection (a), by striking "in any court specified in subsection (a) of section 310 of this title" and inserting "in any district court of the United States",

(19) Section 344 (8 U.S.C. 1455) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking "The clerk of the court" and inserting "The Attorney General",

(ii) in paragraph (1), by striking "final", and

(iii) in paragraph (1), by striking "the naturalization court" and inserting "the Attorney General";

(B) by striking subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f);

(C) in subsection (g)—

(i) by striking ", and all fees paid over to the Attorney General by clerks of courts under the provisions of this title,", and

(ii) by striking "or by the clerks of the courts";

(D) in subsection (h)—

(i) by striking "no clerk of a United States court shall" and inserting "the Attorney General may not",

(ii) by striking ", and no clerk of any State court" and all that follows through "charged or collected", and

(iii) by striking the second sentence;

(E) in subsection (i), by striking "clerk of court", "from the clerk,", "such clerk", and "by the clerk" and inserting "Attorney General", "from the Attorney General,", "the Attorney General", and "by the Attorney General", respectively; and

(F) by redesignating subsections (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(20) Section 348 (8 U.S.C. 1459) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and

(B) by striking "(a)," in subsection (a).

(e) STRIKING MISCELLANEOUS MATERIAL.—Section 316 (8 U.S.C. 1427) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (f); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

(3) Section 331 (8 U.S.C. 1442) is amended by striking the second sentence of subsection (d).

(f) CORRECTIONS OF TABLE OF CONTENTS.—(1) The items in the table of contents relating to sections 334 through 336 are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 334. Application for naturalization; declaration of intention.
"Sec. 335. Investigation of applicants; examination of applications.
"Sec. 336. Hearings on denials of applications for naturalization.".

(2) The item in the table of contents relating to section 339 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 339. Functions and duties of clerks and records of declarations of intention and applications for naturalization.".

SEC. 207. EFFECTIVE DATES AND SAVINGS PROVISIONS.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) NO NEW COURT PETITIONS AFTER EFFECTIVE DATE.—No court shall have jurisdiction, under section 310(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to naturalize a person unless a petition for naturalization with respect to that person has been filed with the court before the effective date (as defined in paragraph (3)).

(2) TREATMENT OF CURRENT COURT PETITIONS.—

(A) CONTINUATION OF CURRENT RULES.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any petition for naturalization which may be pending in a court on the effective date shall be heard and determined in accordance with the requirements of law in effect when the petition was filed.

(B) PERMITTING WITHDRAWAL AND CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION UNDER NEW RULES.—In the case of any petition for naturalization which may be pending in any court on the date of the enactment of this Act, the petitioner may withdraw such petition and have the petitioner's application for naturalization considered under the amendments made by this title.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE DEFINED.—As used in this section, the term "effective date" means the first day of the fourth month beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amendments made by this title are effective as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) INTERIM, FINAL REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations (on an interim, final basis or otherwise) to implement, on a timely basis, the amendments made by this title.

(c) CONTINUING DUTIES.—The amendments to section 339 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (relating to functions and duties of clerks) shall not apply to functions and duties respecting petitions filed before the effective date.

(d) GENERAL SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—(1) Nothing contained in this title, unless otherwise specifically provided, shall be construed to affect the validity of any declaration of intention, petition for naturalization, certificate of naturalization, certification of citizenship, or other document or proceeding which is valid as of the effective date; or to affect any prosecution, suit, action, or proceedings, civil or criminal, brought, or any status, condition, right in process of acquisition, act, thing, liability, obligation, or matter, civil or criminal, done or existing, as of the effective date.

(2) As to all such prosecutions, suits, actions, proceedings, statutes, conditions, rights, acts, things, liabilities, obligations, or matters, the provisions of law repealed by this title are, unless otherwise specifically provided, hereby continued in force and effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCAIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1285 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FOWLER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 3:30 P.M.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 3:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, the Senate will stand in recess until 3:30 p.m.

There being no objection, at 2:43 p.m. the Senate recessed until 3:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. BREAUX].

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business before the Senate is the consideration of the bill S. 358.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the Senate resumes debate today on a bill it has reviewed before—a bill to bring long needed reform to our Nation's immigration laws. And, once again, I am pleased to be joined in this effort with my colleague from Wyoming, Senator SIMPSON, whose longstanding leadership on immigration issues is recognized by everyone in this body.

As we prepare to grapple again with the controversial issue of immigration, I would like to say to our colleagues who may be asking why additional immigration legislation is needed so soon after the major reforms we enacted in 1986.

The answer is that Congress dealt in 1986 with only half the problems, which some call the easier half—the question of illegal immigrants—not the system by which we admit legal immigrants, which has not changed since 1965.

As we all know, the issues surrounding legal immigration stir deep emotions and strong political passions. They touch the heart of what America is, how we all became Americans, and who the future Americans will be.

Over the past several years, Senator SIMPSON and I have worked to fashion a compromise immigration bill that we believe reflects a consensus on what needs to be done to bring some long-overdue reforms to our immigration system.

As reported from the Judiciary Committee, S. 358 the "Immigration Act of 1989," carries forward all of the essential reforms supported by the Senate last year when, by a vote of 88 to 4, it adopted our original immigration bill. Our goal then, and now, is to modify our current immigration system—which has not changed in 28 years—so that it will more faithfully serve the national interest, be more flexible and open to immigrants from nations which are now short-changed by current law.

Mr. President, the provisions of our compromise bill will accomplish these

objectives while also maintaining the priority we have traditionally given to those with family connections in the United States—and will do so without departing from any of the basic goals on fairness established in the 1965 reforms.

Our compromise bill will create two separate immigration visa preference systems: one for close family members, another for independent immigrants. This two-track system was first recommended in 1981 by the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy. At least 54,000 visas will be added to the independent category, and they will be made available to users of the present immigration system and to earlier sources of immigration to the United States. By redressing some of the imbalances in immigration which have inadvertently developed in recent years, we will again open our doors to those who no longer have immediate family ties in the United States. By placing more emphasis on the particular skills and qualities that these independent immigrants possess, we will bring our present immigration laws more in line with our historic immigration policy.

Equally important, however, is that these reforms will be achieved without taking a single number from, or reducing in any way, our traditional priority toward family reunification. The visas currently reserved for family members of recent immigrants, as established in the 1965 reforms, will not be reduced. Our compromise bill will add visas; it does not subtract visas.

By adding over 224,000 additional visas over the next 3 years, our bill doubles the number available for the more immediate, closer relationship of spouses and minor children of permanent residents in the second preference category—a preference which is growing worldwide and is already backlogged. Further, our compromise bill leaves absolutely unchanged the current fifth preference for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

In short, the pending bill not only carries forward and increases the present emphasis on family reunification, it also opens new opportunities for new immigrants with needed skills. It does so by increasing our annual immigration quota by 21 percent. If adopted, we believe this will be a major step forward in implementing the long-term reforms which the Congress has wrestled with for nearly a decade.

Mr. President, to clarify some recent questions and expressions of concern over this legislation, let me review briefly what our bill does, and does not, do.

The bill does the following:

First, it adds a reasonable number of new immigration opportunities—over 100,000 more each year—to open our system to new immigrants with needed skills, as well as to deal with growing backlogs in the close family category of spouses and small children of permanent residents, second preference.

Second, it creates a new national level of immigration which is 20 percent higher than current law, not to reduce the current immigrant flow, but to better manage it and reflect our changing immigration needs; by establishing an annual level, with the statutory requirement that it must be reviewed every 3 years, we will enhance our ability to promote immigration that is in the national interest.

At the outset, Mr. President, I want to stress that one of the important issues which this legislation addresses is in response to the adjustment of the status of the nearly 3 million individuals who, under the immigration bill of 1986, adjusted their status under the amnesty provisions. Now we find out that more and more of those individuals are trying to be reunified with members of their families. Without expanding the second preference, we are going to find that immediate members of their families will be delayed many years—8, 10, 12 years, perhaps even more—depending upon where the new applications come from, and the nature of their relationship.

That is one of the very important and compelling reasons for this legislation if we are going to be true to our historic concern over the reunifications of families.

The second element which I have just mentioned is really the requirement that we as an institution are going to be forced to revisit the issue of legal immigration at least every 3 years. This is something that basically has not been done in the past. There have only been three general immigration bills in the entire history of this country, despite a number of inequities, unfairness, and incidents of discrimination which have plagued our immigration system.

I think one of the very important aspects of this legislation is the requirement that Congress, under expedited procedures, must revisit these issues every 3 years, and will require the Congress to address in a serious way the changing immigration demands that we will likely face in the future.

Third, it creates a new category for independent immigrants to provide visas for those with skills and talents in short supply, and for those from nations who no longer have family ties in this country.

Fourth, it recognizes future U.S. labor needs especially for skilled professionals, as documented in the Department of Labor's study, "Workforce 2000," by adding additional opportunities for immigrants qualifying in these fields.

We also streamline in a very important and significant fashion the way individuals with special skills are going to be gaining entrance. Previously that has involved a long, costly procedure, both for the potential employer as well as for the employee. And we are basically streamlining the labor certification process.

Fifth, Mr. President, it increases business-sponsored visas and separates the current third and sixth preference for professional and skilled workers sought by U.S. employers, and this, I believe, is an important addition. We are considering, particularly in the sixth preference, giving a higher preference for those with skills needed in the United States.

Sixth, it creates a new point system for 54,000 new immigrants, along the lines of the Canadian-Australian system, for those with skills, experience, and education needed to immediately contribute to our Nation's economy, eliminating individual labor certification, but recognizing the national labor market conditions and needs.

Finally, Mr. President, to answer the question of many, this is what our bill does not do:

It does not cut family reunification, since additional numbers are provided to the family category, doubling the visas available for spouses and children of permanent residents, the second preference, and maintaining without change the numbers for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens, the fifth preference. We will hear over the course of the debate whether we should have provided a faster track for those younger brothers or sisters who had not married, to give some advantage to younger children to be reunified with their family. That was an issue that was considered by the Select Commission a number of years ago.

We have had different views expressed on the floor of the U.S. Senate on these questions. In this bill we have come to a compromise to give some greater preference to the small children of permanent residents and move them along in a more rapid way. I think a strong case can be made for that. I think a case can also be made not to alter or change the fifth preference. After a good deal of consideration, we have retained the current fifth preference system. So this legislation does not cut family reunification. And it maintains the current fifth preference.

This legislation does not restrict future growth of immigration through the imposition of a cap. Since procedures are provided to review and adjust the level every 3 years, the President and a specially created, independent commission must review the effects of immigration on our country and recommend changes in the national level of immigration, and Congress may act expeditiously to deal with those changes under special parlia-

mentary procedures established by the statute.

We have attempted in this legislation to do what very few of our committees do, and that is to put in a modified sunset provision, to require the Senate and Congress to revisit this issue. We think that is appropriate, because we have seen immigration patterns change, and it has been a historical fact that this institution, as an institution, has not been willing to come to grips with immigration issues very often. We felt, given our experience in this area over a number of years, that it was important to assure that this institution will more consistently revisit and reexaming immigration problems.

Mr. President, this bill does not reduce the flexibility to meet changing immigration requirements, since no number, no level, no category of immigration will be allowed to become frozen in law and remain unchanged from decade to decade, as has been the case historically. These are the goals we believe our bill accomplishes and which we hope will earn, once again, the support of the Senate.

We must pick up where Congress left off in 1986 and finally address the unfinished agenda of immigration—the reform of our legal immigration system. Our bill preserves the immigration rights of those who have close family connections in this country, while stimulating immigration from the earlier sources of immigration to our country that contributed so much to America in the past.

Mr. President, these reforms are long overdue. I urge the Senate to accept them. I am grateful to Senator SIMPSON for his bipartisan cooperation and support in developing this legislation. From the earliest days of our history, America has been a beacon of hope and opportunity to people in other lands. We are proud of our immigrant heritage, and we must do all that we can to preserve that heritage and to build upon it and to strengthen it for the future.

Mr. President, I hope that with the successful conclusion of this bill's reform of legal immigration, we will have responded to the recommendations of the Select Commission, which was established in 1979, and recognize that we as an institution have not addressed both the illegal and legal immigration issues for far too long. Our bill will also respond to the more immediate crisis which this country is going to face, and that is with the adjustment of status of those that have taken advantage of the amnesty provisions, to expedite the reunification of the families in the second preference. It will also respond to some of the unintended consequences of the 1965 act, where a number of countries around the world who had individuals come to this country, participate in its development and in its evolution, but who are now shutout.

We suppose that if Senator SIMPSON were to fashion a bill, his legislation would be a good deal different from the legislation which we are jointly proposing today. If I were to fashion a bill, mine would be different as well.

What we do recognize is the need to compromise. This bill really represents the best judgment of those who served on the Select Commission a number of years ago, and responds to what our committee has studied, and reviewed in recent years.

I think we have a sound piece of legislation here. It is one which I am honored to cosponsor with the Senator from Wyoming, and with which I have welcomed the opportunity to work with him over a number of years in developing these issues.

I hope that the Senate will again support this bill, and we will welcome the opportunity to respond to any questions from our colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is recognized.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I stand here today on this side of the aisle, as I have done for nearly 10 years now with my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I am very pleased to join with him, as my subcommittee chairman, in again cosponsoring the Immigration Act.

Indeed, as Senator KENNEDY has mentioned, we made a dual promise when we became involved in this together. I chaired this subcommittee with the great assistance of Senator KENNEDY as the ranking member for several years, until power was usurped from us. Then I sank back into the ranking minority position. You can legislate from either level there, but it is more fun as chairman.

Mr. President, I think that few people are aware that Senator KENNEDY has been working on these issues for 27 years.

Senator KENNEDY came to this Chamber the same year my father came to this Chamber and, yet, he and I are the same age. He has worked on this issue in a singular manner, often times without assistance from either side of the aisle, as he has placed upon the books the 1965 amendments to the Immigration Act. Those are the amendments that we are now readdressing and fine tuning. There are some unintended consequences. Some countries were adversely affected, as the phrase is used. But in any event, it was Senator KENNEDY that was involved.

It was Senator KENNEDY that put the Refugee Act of 1980 on the books. It was Senator KENNEDY and myself and Senators MATHIAS and DECONCINI who served on the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy. I was appointed to that Commission by President Carter. I asked him one time why he would do such a thing to a freshman Republican.

He said because, you are a freshman, you are going to have the job. President Carter supported me fully in our work as we created a large body of material which slowly we are placing on the statute books—in the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, and in the proposal we passed last year which I think now has matured even more.

Indeed, there are some things in this bill that are painful to me, and there are some things that perhaps are painful to Senator KENNEDY and, yet, that is what legislating is about. It is about informing yourself, and educating yourself, and compromising an issue without compromising yourself. I have done that and so has Senator KENNEDY.

Senator SIMON is the third member of the subcommittee. It is an interesting subcommittee. There are only three members: Senator KENNEDY, Senator SIMON, and myself. In the process of trying to present to our colleagues a bill which we hope will be accepted, obviously the three of us, with our philosophies and our intentions, had to accommodate each other. I think we have done so in a very civil way.

Senator KENNEDY has told you in great detail what the legislation would do. I would emphasize the three most important goals for me are to see that we set a generous, reasonable, fair, and flexible national level of immigration. That level we set is 22 percent above current immigration levels, even though in every poll we see and in the mail that comes to me the American public's apparent desire is to admit the current number or even less when we talk about legal immigration.

So we have been quite generous to come up with a 22-percent increase above existing levels. This level is to be reviewed and adjusted with relative ease every 3 years by the President and by the Congress. I think that is critically important. It is our job to do this. It is a very tough job. No one wants to address it. There is no issue like it. It is filled with emotion, fear, guilt, and racism and traditions of the Statue of Liberty and traditions of our classic immigration heritage. We are a nation of immigrants. Senator KENNEDY's roots are in Ireland. Mine are in England, Ireland, and Holland. There is not one of us who is not a child of immigrants, a grandchild of immigrants, a great grandchild of immigrants—immigrants, or descendents of immigrants. That is the uniqueness of our country.

I think a national level of immigration is very important for us to predict, our future demographic profile, our future population size, our future

housing and social services needs, and our environmental needs which are very critical. What is the ideal population of the United States? It was interesting in our work on the Select Commission that we had difficulty in funding studies on what the population of the United States might or should be with regard to the carrying capacity of this remarkable land. No one chose to address that. There are a host of other factors that any prudent government should attempt to predict, and I hope that setting a national level of immigration and reviewing it continually, and addressing it on the level of the Presidency and the Congress will force us to do what we should do in that area.

The second thing the bill does is to increase the number and proportion of visas that are awarded to immigrants that have certain skills and abilities that are very much needed in our country. These immigrants would either come to work for specific U.S. employers or they would come here because their skills would contribute to the national economy. I hope our colleagues will listen to this debate and remember that we are not talking about illegal immigration, we are not talking about refugees, we are not talking about extended voluntary departees, we are not talking about humanitarian parolees. We are talking about legal immigrants' immigration.

Only 5 percent of all immigrants coming to this country are now admitted because of their special skills or abilities. This bill would raise that figure to 20 percent while concurrently increasing family-based immigration. We are not reducing it. That is not an appropriate explanation or comment about this bill. We are not reducing family-connection immigration. But we have seen a situation arise where currently 85 percent of all immigrants to our country come from only two regions of the world. I think we should diversify our immigration flows by an appropriate degree, and this bill will do just that.

Finally, I think the bill will open up some remarkable new opportunities to immigrants from countries that do not send us many immigrants today—those countries we describe as being adversely affected. In 1986 we opened a type of lottery system, if you will, for those people and literally millions applied for those very limited visas. But it is not a good way to do business. It is ad hoc legislation. We ought to do our business through changes in the immigration law, Immigration Nationality Act, and not through a piecemeal process of trying to reach the 34 or 36 nations that are adversely affected. Let us do that by legislating and not by some patchwork effort.

Finally, at some course in the debate will come an issue which should not be in any way looked upon as being racist or exclusionary or harsh, and the concerns that are set aside for a point system. Fifty-five thousand numbers out of the overall level of 600,000. This is a category that has been used in Canada and in Australia where points are given for certain abilities and skills, and in Australia and Canada a certain number of points are issued for those who have a proficiency in English.

In the debate in the Judiciary Committee, which is always very spirited, there were several who addressed the issue of points for English. My guest grandparents did not know English when they came and many of us can state that, too, when we discuss our immigrant heritage. But the issue is, and I hope you will keep it in mind when it does come before the body, and it will come in one way or another, that when we are talking about this English proficiency, we are speaking of it in the context of the point system only which has to do with only 9 percent of the numbers in this bill. I want all of our colleagues to know, if an English amendment is offered, that we are talking about an aspect or a qualification which applies only to 9 percent of the immigration under this bill. I just wanted to share that with my colleagues.

Mr. President, the bill, as Senator KENNEDY has observed, follows many of the recommendations of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy. The bill passed the Senate last year by a vote of 88 to 4. It was not taken up by the House. I feel quite assured that it will be this time.

We have new judiciary personnel in the House, both Democrat and Republican. I think they realize the importance of dealing with legal immigration. There is a new chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BRUCE MORRISON, and a new ranking member from Texas, Mr. LAMAR SMITH, and I have visited with both of them.

We have a new judiciary chairman, JACK BROOKS, who knows the issue well, being also from the State of Texas. There is HAMILTON FISH, the ranking member. There is Congressman SCHUMER, who has worked diligently with me and with Senator KENNEDY on issues of illegal immigration, and it was he who characterized what we should be doing in legal immigration as getting back to the classic immigrant definition. I like that phrase—the classic immigrant. The players are all there.

I hope that our colleagues will support the legislation. I encourage our House colleagues to move in this Congress on the important issue of legal immigration reform, the second part of a package started some 8 to 10 years ago, under the Immigration Act of 1986.

I submit it to you with my colleague from Massachusetts. I think this is a measure which is truly in the national interest, and that is what any immigration reform legislation should be about—what is in our national interest, not in the interest of other countries, although we listen to them and try very clearly to be sensitive to what they are saying. It is important to understand that as we consider immigration or refugee policy or any kind of policy in the movement of human beings is that it is not just the fact that people around the world are ready to come, but that we must have a rational system of receiving them. We must do that in a humane and generous manner and we must have order. I think this bill gives us that order and is in our national interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I neglected to comment on the excellent work that has been done on our Subcommittee on Immigration by the Senator from Illinois. He has really mastered the intricacies of this legislation. He has been an extremely active member of the subcommittee, and has had a major impact upon this legislation.

I recognize as we move into the opening presentation on this legislation his very significant, useful, and important assistance in the development of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois, Senator SIMON, is recognized.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts. He exaggerates, I regret to say, when he says I have mastered the intricacies of immigration law, because it is a complicated area.

Perhaps there is no other subcommittee in the U.S. Senate that has only three members, Senator SIMPSON, Senator KENNEDY, and me.

Let me pay tribute to my two senior colleagues who have really worked in an area where there is no political mileage. It is just a very, very difficult area where you have to serve the country.

What has emerged is a compromise. It is not just exactly as I would like to see it. It is not just exactly as Senator KENNEDY would like to see it. It is not just exactly as Senator SIMPSON would like to see it. But it is, I think, a reasonable compromise.

For example, I feel very uneasy in having a cap on immigration numbers. It is the first time in the Nation's history that we have had a cap on actual numbers. But I accepted that as part of the overall compromise and I think a reasonable part of the overall compromise.

Family reunification is more of a priority for me, particularly the fifth preference, than for Senator SIMPSON,

and he somewhat reluctantly accepted that part on my part.

I think overall what we have is a package that is a good package for this country. I think Senator SIMPSON put it well when he said that is the real question. The question is not whether we are serving some other country well; the question is whether we are serving the United States of America well.

This is one of those bills that really has to look internally at this country and say what have we achieved here?

I think it is a reasonable compromise. I will speak in more detail as we have various amendments come up. I hope this measure can pass pretty much as it is without too substantial a change.

Again, I applaud my colleagues and appreciate their leadership on this matter.

Mr. President, if there is no other Member who seeks the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, just for the information of the membership, we will be considering a joint leadership proposal with regard to Chinese students on the floor as a freestanding amendment in a short period of time.

The Senate then goes back at 5 o'clock, as I understand it, under a consent agreement, to consider the nomination of Ambassador Hecht.

It is the intention of both Senator SIMPSON and myself to then consider an amendment to be offered by Senator HELMS, which will be in the nature of a substitute, on which we will offer a time limitation of 1 hour to be evenly divided and to begin that debate this evening and to retain a certain percentage of the time, perhaps a half an hour, which will be evenly divided tomorrow, then hopefully get a vote on that sometime midmorning, and then to move on to consideration of the other amendments.

So we will be looking forward to discussing the other amendments and debating those amendments or responding to questions. We have probably a half dozen different amendments which have been proposed. We are prepared now to work out time agreements with the membership on those amendments.

Given what both leaders have outlined as a very considerable schedule, we hope that we could, with the cooperation of our colleagues, conclude this legislation sometime in the late afternoon or early evening tomorrow. That is basically where we are in terms of the consideration of this legislation and the way that we would like to proceed.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. DECONCINI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DECONCINI pertaining to the introduction of S. 1288 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 239

(Purpose: To adjust to lawful temporary resident status certain nationals of the People's Republic of China)

Mr. MITCHELL. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PELL, Mr. REID, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. KOHL, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. GORE, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mr. HELMS, proposes an amendment numbered 239.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 148, after line 17, add the following new title:

TITLE III—STATUS OF STUDENTS FROM THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989".

SEC. 302. ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIONALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

The Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after section 245A the following new section:

"ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIONALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

"SEC. 245B. (a) WAIVER OF FOREIGN RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT FOR "J" NONIMMIGRANTS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, persons who are nationals of the People's Republic of China may apply for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence or for a change to another nonimmigrant status if such national—

"(1) was admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(J) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(J)), and

"(2) has been continuously resident in the United States since June 5, 1989.

"(b) PRESUMPTION OF CONTINUOUS RESIDENCE FOR CERTAIN PRC NATIONALS.—(1) For purposes of adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) and change of status under section 248 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1228), in the case of any alien who is a national of the People's Republic of China—

"(1) who, as of June 5, 1989, was present in the United States in the lawful status of a nonimmigrant, or

"(2) who was present in the United States before June 5, 1989, but who, as of that date was not present in the United States because of a brief, casual, and innocent trip abroad,

such an alien shall be considered as having continued to maintain lawful status as such a nonimmigrant (and to have maintained continuously a lawful status) for the period described in subsection (e).

"(c) AUTHORIZATION OF TRAVEL ABROAD.—The Attorney General shall, in accordance with existing regulations, permit an alien described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) to return to the United States after such brief and casual trips abroad as reflect an intention on the part of the alien to continue residence in the United States.

"(d) EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION.—Any national of the People's Republic of China who applies for adjustment of status or change of nonimmigrant status under the terms of this section shall be granted authorization to engage in employment in the United States and shall be provided with an employment authorization document or other appropriate work permit.

"(e) DURATION OF STATUS.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), nationals of the People's Republic of China described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) shall have their departure from the United States deferred until June 5, 1992, or until there has been an adjustment or change of status under subsection (a) or (b).

"(2) On or after June 5, 1990, the Attorney General may terminate the status accorded under this subsection 60 days following the date that the President determines and so certifies to the Congress that conditions in the People's Republic of China permit such aliens to return to that country in safety."

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, this amendment is offered by myself and the distinguished Republican leader, and following discussions with him and the managers of the bill, I now ask unanimous consent that the time between now and 5 p.m. be used for debate on this amendment and that at 5 p.m. there be a vote on this amendment.

I further ask unanimous consent that no amendments or motions be in order in relation to the amendment and that the Senate vote on the amendment, without any intervening action, at the conclusion of yielding back of the time.

I further ask unanimous consent that on completion of the vote on this matter, the Senate return to executive session to consider further the nomination of former Senator Chic Hecht to be Ambassador to The Bahamas, and that the time for debate on that matter be as set forth in the existing order.

Mr. President, before the Chair acts on that request, I would like to clarify that under the existing order there is 1 hour of debate on the Hecht nomination, 40 minutes under the designation of Senator GRAHAM, 20 minutes to Senator DOLE or his designee. This means that if all the time were used, a vote would occur at 6:15, as opposed to the 6 p.m. now under the order. It is not certain that all the time will be used, so that the vote will occur now at the latest at 6:15, possibly sooner, if the time is not used and yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I will add to the request and then will withhold for a moment, pending clearance by the distinguished Republican leader.

I further ask unanimous consent that Senator HELMS be recognized to offer a substitute amendment, upon the disposition of the Mitchell-Dole amendment, and that there be an hour for debate, equally divided between Senators HELMS and KENNEDY.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote in relation to the Helms amendment, without any intervening action, at the conclusion of yielding back of time.

I further ask unanimous consent that if the Helms amendment is agreed to, that the committee substitute, as amended, be considered, agreed to as original text for purposes of further amendment.

Mr. President, it is my expectation that the vote on the Helms amendment would come tomorrow morning.

I would hope that debate would commence this evening. It is my intention to have the Senate come in at 10:30 tomorrow and be back on the bill at 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inquire of the majority leader, the request is that immediately after the vote on the Mitchell-Dole amendment, the Senate would consider the nomination of Chic Hecht to be Ambassador to The Bahamas and then pursuant to that, the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] would be in order; is that the request?

Mr. MITCHELL. If I may clarify the request, Mr. President. It is my request that the Senate now consider the Mitchell-Dole amendment, and I will amend the initial request by requesting that it be under a 10-minute time limit equally divided between myself and Senator DOLE; that on the expiration or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the Mitchell-Dole amendment; and that immediately thereafter, the Senate return to executive session to consider the Hecht nomination. Under the previous order, there is 1 hour of debate divided 40 minutes under the control of Senator GRAHAM and 20 minutes under the control of Senator DOLE; following the yielding back of that time, the vote would occur on the Hecht appointment. Immediately thereafter, the Senate would return to legislative session to again consider the pending bill and, at that point, Senator HELMS be recognized to offer a substitute amendment. There is an 1-hour time limit on that equally divided, and I am suggesting that 30 minutes of that debate occur this evening, and that when the Senate returns to this bill at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, the remaining 30 minutes be used and the vote on the Helms amendment occur at 11:30 tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have no objection, I would like to agree with the request, but I am trying to locate one Member who has a problem moving the vote from 6 to 6:15. I wonder if the majority leader might agree we shrink the time proportionately on each side on the Hecht nomination debate. Instead of an hour, maybe reduce that to 40 minutes, 30 on that side and 10 on this side and still have the vote at 6?

Mr. MITCHELL. I am advised that that would be acceptable to Senator GRAHAM. I amend the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request as amended by the majority leader? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, with respect to the amendment now pending offered by myself and Senator DOLE, yesterday I met with a group of Chinese students who expressed their deep concern and their reservations about the deferred departure program which the administration has instituted to assist those Chinese students residing in the United States.

Their chief concern is focused on the fact that the current program presents serious problems for resident Chinese students and scholars in that it requires them to indicate an unwillingness to return to China. According to the students such a statement brands them as traitors in the eyes of their Government and provides a means for Chinese officials to track down and pressure students who do not choose to return to China at this time.

The students were also concerned that if they elect to take advantage of the deferred departure program, they are only protected for 1 year until June 5, 1990. They are fearful that after that period they could be forced to return to China even at a time when the climate there may still be particularly dangerous for students and intellectuals. Under existing law, if they voluntarily or involuntarily return to China, they then must remain there in residence and wait 2 years before they can return to the United States.

Mr. President, there are approximately 40,000 Chinese students now in the United States. Since the massacre in Tiananmen Square thousands of these students have courageously spoken out and demonstrated in support of prodemocracy forces in China. In view of the Chinese Government's widespread persecution of prodemocracy students, these students would be in imminent danger if they were forced to return to China. Because of the existing situation in China the students need legislative action which will waive the 2-year foreign residency requirement, allow them to remain in legal status while they are in the deferred departure program or in the process of requesting a change or adjustment in their residence status.

Mr. President, for over a half-century the world has looked to the United States as the beacon of freedom, the voice of self-government and self-determination, as a refuge for the oppressed and persecuted. I believe we should respond generously to this request by the Chinese students who are living among us and bravely standing up for freedom and democracy in their homeland. Accordingly, we offer this amendment to S. 358, the Immigration Act of 1989, which addresses the important concerns of the students while at the same time taking due consideration of our own immigration laws and procedures. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this action to assist these brave young men and women who are living and studying in our country, learning not only about our technical skills but also about the fundamental democratic principles which make American democracy the symbol that it has been for the past two centuries.

Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the majority leader, and I am pleased to join the majority leader in this leadership amendment.

In my view, this amendment is very much in the spirit of the actions already taken by President Bush. It represents a reaffirmation of the basic policy position he has taken, and which is supported by the vast majority of the American people: that we should not arbitrarily send home to a very uncertain fate the thousands of Chinese students now studying in the United States.

The amendment does take one additional small step, in response to the le-

gitimate concern expressed by many of the Chinese students—that we should not put them in greater jeopardy than they already are, by forcing them into a public expression of their dissent over the actions of their Government, through application for some kind of deferred departure. In effect, it grants them the right to stay in this country for at least 1 more year, even if their visas expire in the interim—without making specific application to do so.

But this legislation also responds to this real need in a responsible way, that will not do violence to very important principles and policies of our immigration law. It does not open the gates to automatic citizenship for anyone.

The amendment will open up no new channels to conversion to permanent resident alien status; that is, to U.S. citizenship. The Chinese students who came here did so as nonimmigrants; they were admitted on the basis of the criteria that apply to nonimmigrants, and to me it makes no real sense to respond to their plight simply by converting them to immigrant status, assuming there is an effective alternative available.

This amendment waives only a single eligibility requirement for applying for immigrant status—the requirement that someone here on a nonimmigrant visa return to their homeland for 2 years, before seeking to change to a PRA status. Clearly, imposing that requirement on Chinese students now would be to put in their path a near-insurmountable obstacle.

In sum, this is a well-crafted amendment. It reflects the best in America's tradition of providing safehaven for those truly in danger. But it does so in a way consistent with our very real foreign policy and immigration policy interests.

I hope all Senators will join in passing this amendment overwhelmingly.

Mr. President, I join my colleagues, and I hope there will be a record vote on this amendment. I believe the amendment is well crafted. I think it does express the concern and does express the hope of most Americans who understand that these Chinese students are truly in danger, but it does so in a way consistent with our very real foreign policy and immigration policy interests.

I hope that all Senators will join in agreeing to this amendment overwhelmingly. We have discussed this amendment with the administration. I think it is fair to say the administration may have some slight reservations, but I think generally they are supportive of the principle because it does, in effect, codify President Bush's previous statements.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts and 40 seconds to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CONRAD). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this builds upon the recommendations of the Attorney General which would have provided a 1-year period of grace marking from June of this year to June of the following year. This adds 2 years.

It also deals with some of the hindrances which do exist in the immigration law for adjusting the status, particularly among the students, and is absolutely essential. We cannot expect students to return to China and then come back here at a delayed time.

So, Mr. President, I commend the leaders for this proposal. We will certainly welcome the opportunity to work with our colleagues in the House and make sure that this becomes a part of the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 40 seconds.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I join in commending the leadership for this amendment.

I have had the privilege of meeting with a number of Chinese students. I think it is absolutely vital that we move in this direction.

I might add I will have an amendment a little later on dealing with the Hong Kong situation which also is pressing to increase the quota there temporarily.

This is clearly moving in a direction to help some people who may very well desperately need that help. I hope it will get a resounding vote here in the Senate.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have 2 minutes and 12 seconds remaining.

I yield 1 minute and 12 seconds to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 1 minute and 12 seconds.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the fine bipartisan work of Senators MITCHELL and DOLE, our leaders, and many other Members, who have provided their help in developing this language. This issue is an important one for these Chinese students.

I visited with several of them just this weekend at the University of Wyoming.

I feel this amendment can be read as being consistent with the Bush administration's policy of ensuring that Chinese nationals who fear their return to China will receive our protection until a safe return is possible.

We want to remember that we have been very generous. The administrations' Deferral of Enforced Departure Program is generous. We will continue to be generous, and we will continue to revisit the situation of students in China regularly. I would hope that we would review this continually, every 3 to 6 months.

We do not want to jeopardize our Student Exchange Program, and I have always believed that case-by-case adjudication was preferable to "blanket treatment."

I will not object to the proposal. I do think we must be deliberate, we do not want to move too swiftly, and we must follow conditions in China carefully and regularly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair and I thank my colleagues.

I certainly support the Mitchell-Dole amendment.

Having met with a number of Chinese students at the University of Alaska, in both Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska/Pacific University, I heard first hand their concern of the reality that suddenly their very existence in this country is at question. That will be laid to rest by the amendment before us and, of course, their concerns, those who are graduating, whether they can go out in the work force.

It is my intention, Mr. President, to introduce at a later time a freestanding amendment to establish a task force on students from the PRC who are in the United States. It would be the purpose of that task to address the continuing situation as things progress with the PRC and their presence in this country being resolved from the standpoint of a number of things clearing information and other material.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act. It will provide our Chinese guests with the breathing room they need to assess the situation at home. It will allow them to remain in the United States until conditions in China improve.

The amendment does three important things. First, it waives the 2-year foreign residency requirement for holders of "J" visas. This was of particular concern to Chinese students. They wanted the opportunity to apply for other visas, or permanent residency, without first going home for 2 years. Our amendment accomplishes this goal.

Second, the amendment allows Chinese nationals in this country to remain in legal status. This means they can get in line for better visas or permanent residency. They do not have to register for protection. Legal status is automatic.

Finally, this amendment establishes a presumption that students can

remain here until June 1992. Their departure is deferred for that period, unless the President certifies to Congress that it is safe for them to return.

Mr. President, this measure is effective and comprehensive. I am pleased that it has received so much support from both sides of the aisle. It is truly a bipartisan proposal.

The amendment is really a safe harbor for our guests. It is not a grant of asylum or an amnesty. Instead, it provides needed relief while respecting our present immigration policy.

I should point out that this amendment is very similar to S. 1218, a bill that I introduced with Senator CRANSTON. In fact, this amendment goes somewhat further than S. 1218 because recent events in China have been so horrible.

In sum, this amendment is a humanitarian gesture. And I hope it will send a strong message to the government in Beijing: We will not tolerate the slaughter of students in the streets. Brute force will not deter the forces of democracy.

They will thrive and they will prevail. In the meantime, we have an obligation to help the Chinese students in our midst.

I want to thank Senators MITCHELL and DOLE for working so well with all of us to help the Chinese. I also appreciate the leadership and the contributions of Senators KENNEDY, SIMPSON, SIMON, and GORTON, as well as Senator DIXON.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, over the last several weeks a number of Senators have labored to develop a measure that will come to the aid of thousands of Chinese students and scholars who were in the United States on that fateful day in June when tanks rolled through Tiananmen Square.

I am gratified to see that we are heeding the calls of the students and am pleased to support this compromise amendment. As many of my colleagues are aware, the students are in a precarious position. Students who are in the United States under what are called "J" visas face having to return to China during a period of unrest and repression, for a period of 2 years.

The need for a solution is thus clear. There is little doubt that many, if not most, of these students and scholars would be persecuted if they returned home. Since the massacre in Tiananmen Square, I have received communications from literally thousands of students detailing their fears and frustrations. This measure will address their fears in a fair and effective manner without trampling the delicate balance achieved by our immigration laws.

I am pleased to have taken part in finding a measured remedy for a most difficult situation. I urge my colleagues to join us in adopting this amendment.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I am most pleased at the compromise amendment offered by the majority and minority leader dealing with the Chinese students. I think we have a good bill. It is very similar to my bill, S. 1222, which Senators SIMON, ADAMS, DODD, and BRADLEY cosponsored, and was the companion bill to Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI's bill in the House.

This amendment is the result of hours of work and negotiation between representatives from both sides of the aisle. I would like to recognize the outstanding work of my colleagues, Senators MITCHELL, DOLE, KENNEDY, SIMPSON, SIMON, KOHL, GORTON, COHEN, CRANSTON, D'AMATO, and their staffs. We can all take great pride in the fine bill crafted and introduced today.

The bill does the following: It allows Chinese students who were in the United States on nonimmigrant visas greater breathing room. They can remain in the United States within legal status through June 5, 1992, unless the Attorney General and the President certify to Congress at any point after June 5, 1990, that the situation in China is safe for the Chinese student's return. The 2-year foreign residency requirement for J-1 visa holders would be waived and those individuals would be able to apply for status adjustment to another nonimmigrant category or for permanent residence.

This amendment also allows all Chinese students in the United States on other nonimmigrant visas to be considered as remaining in legal status as long as the deferred enforced departure status continues.

It covers those Chinese students who have come to the United States under nonimmigrant visas but who may have been out of the country. Work authorization and authorization to travel abroad are also included in the package.

In sum, Mr. President, this bill works. It is sound. It recognizes the needs of the Chinese students and addresses them reasonably. We are not creating a new immigrant class, or automatically allowing all Chinese students to stay. We are providing breathing space, a cooling off period, in order to allow the Chinese students and the United States to assess the changing situation in China.

I will always remember the image of the Chinese student halting a convoy of tanks in Tiananmen Square by the simple, eloquent act of standing silently in front of them. What courage. What resolve. He did not back down in his resolve to end the brutal madness, and so will I not back down from my commitment to stand with them in their pursuit of democratization. The fresh breeze of freedom must replace the stench of brutality and intimidation in China.

It is our duty to stand for those who stand for democracy. I believe this amendment has done so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader controls 10 seconds.

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield back the remainder of my time and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 104 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Adams	Garn	Metzenbaum
Armstrong	Glenn	Mikulski
Baucus	Gore	Mitchell
Bentsen	Gorton	Moynihan
Biden	Graham	Murkowski
Bingaman	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Nunn
Boren	Harkin	Packwood
Bradley	Hatfield	Pell
Breaux	Heflin	Pressler
Bryan	Heinz	Pryor
Bumpers	Helms	Reid
Burdick	Hollings	Riegle
Burns	Humphrey	Robb
Byrd	Inouye	Rockefeller
Chafee	Jeffords	Roth
Coats	Johnston	Rudman
Cochran	Kassebaum	Sanford
Cohen	Kasten	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kennedy	Sasser
Cranston	Kerrey	Shelby
D'Amato	Kerry	Simon
Danforth	Kohl	Simpson
Daschle	Lautenberg	Specter
DeConcini	Leahy	Stevens
Dixon	Levin	Symms
Dodd	Lieberman	Thurmond
Dole	Lott	Wallop
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Durenberger	Mack	Wilson
Exon	McCain	Wirth
Ford	McClure	
Fowler	McConnell	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—3

Boschwitz	Hatch	Matsunaga

So the amendment (No. 239) was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BIDEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 239, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I have cleared this with the distinguished Republican leader and I now ask unanimous consent that Senate amendment No. 239, the Mitchell-Dole amendment on Chinese students, be modified to reflect the change I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 239), as modified, is as follows:

TITLE III—STATUS OF STUDENTS FROM THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989".

SEC. 302. ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIONALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

The Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after section 245A the following new section:

"ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIONALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

"SEC. 245B. (a) WAIVER OF FOREIGN RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT FOR "J" NONIMMIGRANTS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, persons who are nationals of the People's Republic of China may apply for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence or for a change to another nonimmigrant status if such national—

"(1) was admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(J) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(J)), and

"(2) has been continuously resident in the United States since June 6, 1989.

"(b) PRESUMPTION OF CONTINUOUS RESIDENCE FOR CERTAIN PRC NATIONALS.—(1) For purposes of adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) and change of status under section 248 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1228), in the case of any alien who is a national of the People's Republic of China and is present in the United States under section 101(a)(15) (F), (J), and (M), as well as their immediate family.

"(1) Who, as of June 5, 1989, was present in the United States in the lawful status of a nonimmigrant, or

"(2) who was present in the United States before June 5, 1989, but who, as of that date was not present in the United States because of a brief, casual, and innocent trip abroad.

such an alien shall be considerd as having continued to maintain lawful status as such a nonimmigrant (and to have maintained continuously a lawful status) for the period described in subsection (e).

"(c) AUTHORIZATION OF TRAVEL ABROAD.—The Attorney General shall, in accordance with existing regulations, permit an alien described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) to return to the United States after such brief and casual trips abroad as reflect an intention on the part of the alien to continue residence in the United States.

"(d) EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION.—Any national of the People's Republic of China who applies for adjustment of status or change of nonimmigrant status under the terms of this section shall be granted authorization to engage in employment in the United States and shall be provided with an employment authorization document or other appropriate work permit.

"(e) DURATION OF STATUS.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), nationals of the People's Republic of China described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) shall have their departure from the United States deferred until June 5, 1992, or until there has been an adjustment or change of status under subsection (a) or (b).

"(2) On or after June 5, 1990, the Attorney General may terminate the status accorded under this subsection 60 days following the date that the President determines and so certifies to the Congress that conditions in the People's Republic of China permit such aliens to return to that country in safety."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF CHIC HECHT, OF NEVADA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Senate shall return to executive session to further consider the nomination of the Honorable Chic Hecht of Nevada to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas. The time for debate is to be controlled with 10 minutes controlled by the Republican leader's designee and 30 minutes controlled by the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM].

Who yields time? The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin had requested time to make a statement not on this issue but, rather, on the amendment on which we have just voted, so I would ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin, in morning business or in legitimate business, be given that opportunity.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I do not wish to object, but I have been waiting to make a statement on the issue now before the Senate, namely, the nomination of our former colleague. Would the Senator indulge me for 1 minute to address the nomination which I understand is the pending business?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the pending business. Senator DOLE controls the time.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as I understand it there are 30 minutes on that side, 10 minutes on this side. The vote will come at 6 o'clock and any other requests would have to come out of that time. I would yield 1½ minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If I might, the Senator from Florida had the floor and sought recognition and has the floor, so it would be dependent on his decision to give up the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will yield the floor to the distinguished minority leader for purposes of controlling his 10 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. I yield 1½ minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Republican leader and I thank the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Wisconsin for their indulgence.

I simply wanted to add my strong endorsement to the President's nomination to the Senate; that our former colleague, the Senator from Nevada, Mr. Hecht, be accorded the privilege and rank of Ambassador of the United States.

I served with him, as many of us did here in this Chamber, for some several years and, in particular, I would like to address my work with him on the Select Committee on Intelligence of the U.S. Senate. As the Senate recalls, Senator Hecht served in the U.S. Army from 1951 to 1953 in the U.S. Army Intelligence Branch and that knowledge enabled him to go on to service on our committee, the Intelligence Committee, and make considerable contributions. His attendance record was one of the best. He always studied the material before the meeting began and, when he spoke, members listened and listened with care.

So, I wanted to acknowledge that I think he is eminently qualified; that he will bring to bear on this important post considerable breadth of knowledge and it is my hope that the Senate will accord him advice and consent as sought by the President.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader yields 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Republican leader for yielding.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Chic Hecht to be Ambassador to The Bahamas. Chic Hecht is an outstanding American. He served his Nation as an intelligence officer behind the Iron Curtain. For

that work he was elected by fellow intelligence officers nationwide to the Intelligence Hall of Fame. He came back home, went into the dry goods business, worked hard in that business, practiced the ancient art of American business and free enterprise, became wealthy, borrowed moneys from banks until they ended up selling him the bank. He was so successful in these areas that I had an opportunity to sit next to someone on the Banking Committee who actually knew something about commercial banking. He was elected by his fellow citizens to the U.S. Senate from Nevada. He served for 6 years with great distinction.

Mr. President, that is a record of the kind of people that we need representing the United States around the world. And I cannot believe that there can be any question that Chic Hecht ought to be confirmed to be Ambassador to The Bahamas.

If serving your Nation behind the Iron Curtain, if being in business and being successful, if being elected by your fellow citizens to the U.S. Senate, and if serving with distinction for 6 years does not qualify somebody to be Ambassador to The Bahamas, I do not know what qualifications we are seeking.

So I think, quite frankly, it is a little unreasonable that we are here debating this issue. I think Chic Hecht would have been confirmed unanimously. I am happy to add my voice to his support. I intend to vote for him—I am sure he will do an outstanding job—and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield to myself such time as is necessary.

Mr. President, this is a difficult issue. It is not easy to stand on the Senate floor and suggest that it is inappropriate for the U.S. Senate to confirm any individual who has been recommended by the President of the United States for an important position of national service. It is even more difficult to do so when that individual is a friend and former colleague and Member of this body.

But, Mr. President, we have heard many of the words and eloquent rhetoric about the importance of the war on drugs and our Nation waging that war through to victory. This is not going to be a war like the Napoleanic war, or like World War II in which there will be a few climactic battles that will determine the end result. Rather, this is a war which will be fought in a whole series of individual minor skirmishes, and the cumulative effect of those minor skirmishes will be either victory or defeat.

There is no question that this is an issue of deep concern to the people of this Nation. A Gallup poll commissioned by the Times Mirror Group released in March of this year said, "Drug abuse is seen as the most important problem facing the country today followed by the Federal budget deficit."

In early May the Hart Research Group surveyed 1,500 voters across the land. The pollster read a list of 11 issues and asked voters to say what worried them the most. Sixty-four percent of those 1,500 Americans said drugs was their top concern. Out of all the issues on the list, the drug threat was rated No. 1. The Hart poll in May confirmed the finding of the Gallup poll in March that Americans view drugs as the top issue facing this Nation.

Mr. President, while the American people recognize the primacy of this issue, and while we have recognized it in words—and I submit as an example of those words a statement which was issued by the Republican National Senatorial Committee which captured that feeling urging that those who it solicited for support render support because this liberal Democratic Congress has been all talk and no action when it comes to putting the international drug dealers behind bars.

Those are the kind of strong words that we have heard, that we have ourselves uttered or written on this issue. Yet, Mr. President, the fact is that we are losing the war on drugs because we have been unwilling to back those words with effective action.

Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD as an example of one area of that loss an article from the May 27 Washington Post entitled "U.S. Suffering Setbacks in Latin Drug Offensive" which details the fact that the United States is losing the war on drugs as it is being waged in Latin America.

I ask unanimous consent that be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[See exhibit No. 1.]

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, what we are doing today is not only an act, the confirmation of an ambassadorial nomination, but it is also a symbol. It is a symbol which communicates to several important audiences. One of those audiences is the people of The Bahamas. We are asking this relatively small population, a nation of 250,000 people, spread out over 700 islands which are the size of the States of New Jersey and Connecticut combined, we are asking this nation which is spending over 25 percent of its national budget on drug enforcement, drug treatment and drug education, we are asking this nation to redouble its efforts to join in even stronger partnership with the United States.

We currently have a series of joint operations with the Bahamian Government from the northernmost to the southernmost islands of the Bahama Islands. We are communicating to the people of the Government of The Bahamas the seriousness of our commitment to effectively wage the war on drugs with this nomination.

We are also communicating, Mr. President, to other nations in the region—nations which have been racked by violence, by a threat to the very sovereignty of the nation itself as in countries such as Colombia, Panama, and other threatened nations in this region—the seriousness of our intention.

But one concern that I have had in this debate today is that the discussion about who we are communicating to has all been directed at other people—that we want to send a message to The Bahamas that we are serious and we expect them to cooperate, that we want to send a message to other nations in Latin America and the Caribbean that we are serious and we want them to cooperate.

We are also sending a message to ourselves, to the people of the United States of America, as to how serious we are on this issue. We are sending it collectively and individually.

Two weeks ago I was on Grand Exuma Island in The Bahamas where I met with a group of DEA agents, agents who daily face personal threats against their lives because they are disrupting what has been a very profitable drug operation on that island.

We are sending a statement to those young men and women at that level of support that they can expect the degree of dignity, the degree of seriousness of purpose by which this Nation is prepared to back up their willingness to place their lives on the line in order to win the war on drugs.

Mr. President, this war on drugs has many battlefields. The Bahamas is one of the most important. I have a map which indicates the major flow of drugs from Latin America into the United States of America. One of the salient aspects of this map is how dark the lines get over The Bahamas. The reason for those dark lines is that at times in the past as much as 70 percent of the cocaine which has come into the United States has come in through The Bahamas.

What is wrong about this map is that it no longer reflects the reality of the drug trade. This map was done at a time when the typical pattern was large amounts of drugs flown into a particular island in The Bahamas, stored on that island, and then later transshipped into the United States.

In large part, because of effective cooperation between the United States and the Bahamian Government, that pattern of drug distribution has been disrupted.

What has happened is a new form of drug trade shipment has occurred, and that is now taking the form of flights over the island of Cuba to sites in the vicinity of the Florida Keys and the southeast and southwest Florida coast, where drugs are then dropped into the ocean, picked up by small boats and taken immediately into the United States.

What is the relevance of the observation of a change in history of drug trafficking? The relevance is that we are dealing with a very innovative, mobile, highly financed adversary in our war on drugs. The significance is that The Bahamas continue to be a major battleground of this war on drugs. The significance is that the United States depends, in large part, on the effectiveness of our Ambassador and our ability to wage a winning war on drugs in The Bahamas.

Mr. President, The Bahamas have been an increasingly positive partner of the United States efforts. We recently voted on a proposal to decertify The Bahamas. The President and the Secretary of State urged that we not decertify The Bahamas because of the level of their cooperation. This Senate agreed with that recommendation. We did not do so.

We have seen The Bahamas become the first nation in the world, first nation in the world to ratify the new United Nations convention on drugs. We have seen The Bahamas become a leader in efforts to assist the United States in enlightened drug treatment policy. Unfortunately, The Bahamas has become an area of the world with an unusually high level of drug addiction, due to the early introduction of crack into that country.

Mr. President, in some of the early debate, a question was raised about the importance of the Ambassador to The Bahamas, that it is just a figurehead position, that whatever the Ambassador's strengths or weaknesses, they will be offset by an effective staff of professionals who will provide the necessary continuity, the necessary relationship with the Bahamian Government.

Mr. President, I want to offer for the RECORD and ask unanimous consent that this article appear immediately after my remarks, a report from the Tribune, a paper from The Bahamas. This editorial was written July 7 of this year, under the heading, "Not A Laughing Matter." It discusses the nominee that the President has submitted for confirmation as Ambassador to The Bahamas. Let me just read the first few sentences of this editorial as an example of the kind of model that we should have for an Ambassador in a country as important to the United States drug effort as The Bahamas. "Whoever comes after Carol Boyd Hallett as American Ambassador to The Bahamas will have to be outstanding, because comparisons will inevitably be made.

For almost 3 years that she headed the U.S. Embassy in The Bahamas, Mrs. Hallett captured the minds and hearts of the Bahamian people. She will never be forgotten. In the Tribune's files on American Ambassadors stationed in The Bahamas her file is the thickest because she was the most active in the community, and she accomplished the most. She earned a new respect for her country.

And it is because she did so much, because she gave a new dimension to the American image in The Bahamas that her successor will have to be very carefully chosen, or all of her efforts will have been in vain."

That is a statement by a leading opinion voice from The Bahamas of our most recent Ambassador. Carol Hallett did make a difference. She helped energize both our Nation and The Bahamas in an effective partnership against drugs. It is in large part, because of her efforts, that the drug cartel has had to find a new way to bring their illicit product into the United States.

Mr. President, earlier today our colleague, Senator SARBANES, talked about the fact that the United States was going to have to take a new approach to its ambassadorial appointments; that the old way of doing this was no longer acceptable. I could not agree more. We have seen that our adversaries—particularly the Soviet Union—have shifted their emphasis on ambassadorial characteristics in this hemisphere, that the new ambassadors that the Soviet Union is appointing in Latin America and the Caribbean are people who have special cultural and linguistic skills, who are effective in dealing with the people, in representing the commercial, as well as the diplomatic interests of their country.

If the Soviet Union has seen the importance of Latin America and the Caribbean and the Soviet Union has changed the standards by which it is appointing its ambassadors to these countries, why, Mr. President, is it not even more apparent to the United States of America, as the closest friend of these countries, that we need to respond with a new seriousness and a new criteria for who will represent us in these countries.

Mr. President, I regret to say that I do not believe that the current nominee meets the standards that Mrs. Hallett so admirably provided for the United States for the last 3 years in this critically important country. I believe, as do the editorial writers for a number of newspapers, who have pointed out these deficiencies, that we will make a serious error if we comfirm this appointment.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, editorials from the Miami Herald, Orlando Sentinel, and St. Petersburg Times commenting on the adequacy of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, in the final analysis, however, we are the ones who are going to be judged. We do not have to read any editorials. We do not have to refer to resumes of past activities, or we do not have to be persuaded by second or third parties, as to the match of the skills of this nominee and the challenge of service as ambassador in the Bahamas. There is no group of Americans better prepared to make this assessment than the 90 Members of the U.S. Senate who have served with Senator Hecht.

I believe that there are many positions in which Senator Hecht could serve this Nation with great distinction. I consider him to be a friend, and I appreciate the service we had as colleagues. But as I told Senator Hecht, I do not believe that the Bahamas are a place in which his particular background and his skills and his previous talents could best serve this Nation. I believe that we need to have an individual who has not only diplomatic and foreign service background, but also who can serve as a key operational officer in the United States' war on drugs.

We are not going to have very many opportunities to convert our words of opposition to drugs into tangible action that may actually make a difference, as to whether this Nation will begin to gain the offensive in this effort to rid ourselves of the scourge of drugs. Today we have one of those oppportunities.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate, I urge you to exercise that opportunity by voting no on this nominee, and by so doing indicate that in this U.S. Senate, there is a serious purpose about this war on drugs and that we are committed at each opportunity, when we are given the chance to do so, to make a positive contribution toward American victory. Thank you, Mr. President.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 1989]

U.S. SUFFERING SETBACKS IN LATIN DRUG OFFENSIVE

(By Michael Isikoff)

The Drug Enforcement Administration agent and five State Department contract employees who were killed in a plane crash in Peru May 13 had a particularly compelling reason to be on the flight.

Weeks earlier, DEA agents in the Upper Huallaga Valley, the world's prime coca growing region, were instructed to return to

Lima every night for their own safety. Maoist guerrillas aligned with drug traffickers have gunned down 10 policemen in the area this month.

The escalating violence in Peru is the most dramatic example of what many believe is a near breakdown of U.S. antidrug policy throughout Latin America. In recent months, while the Bush administration has increased its rhetorical attack on the drug problem at home, U.S. efforts to control the traffic at its source have suffered crushing setbacks, posing the risk of ever greater shipments of cocaine to the United States and Europe, according to U.S. officials and foreign policy analysts.

"It seems to me we're at the point where our policy has run into the sand," said Gregory Treverton, a senior fellow of the Council on Foreign Relations who studies antinarcotics issues. "It has come to the point . . . where we have to realize that the emperor has no clothes."

According to new government estimates, coca production in Latin America has soared to unprecedented levels, enough to produce more than 1 million pounds of cocaine this year, or nearly twice that during the mid-1980s. Colombian traffickers have begun planting in Amazon jungles of Brazil that are virtually beyond detection, according to recent State Department reports. U.S.-financed programs to manually uproot the coca crop have slowed in Bolivia and come to a halt in Peru.

Meanwhile, fading hopes for air-dropping deadly herbicides in the Upper Huallaga—once a linchpin of U.S. strategy—appear to have dimmed further as a result of the recent opposition of embattled Peruvian President Alan Garcia.

"It's a mess," said John Walters, chief of staff to national drug policy Director William J. Bennett, when asked to assess developments in Peru.

The consequence of these failures, some analysts warn, could be a new wave of cheap cocaine dumped onto the world market by the powerful Colombian drug cartels that control most of the Latin traffic. But critics charge that, at least so far, the dimensions of the problem have not been addressed by senior Bush administration officials.

During his campaign last year, President Bush laid out an ambitious antidrug agenda that included the creation of an "international strike force" to hit drug traffickers, the convening of a hemispheric summit and other measures to embolden Latin governments fighting the drug cartels.

Yet, four months into the administration, nothing has been said publicly on the issue. Meanwhile, a policy debate has raged behind the scenes. U.S. Ambassador to Bolivia Robert Gelbard has urged new "rules of engagement" that would permit U.S. Army Special Forces units to join antinarcotics patrols in that country, according to administration officials.

Others have urged even more drastic action, including covert operations against the cartels and "neutralization" of their leaders. But some State Department and DEA officials, including DEA Administrator John C. Lawn, fear any show of muscle would only trigger a backlash that would play into the hands of leftists and traffickers.

"You're talking about sovereignty issues—here you would have a foreign government bringing military forces," said Lawn, who has argued for a continuation of current DEA operations. "We would have a substantially negative impact."

The result, some critics said, is a policy drift underscored last week when the State Department failed to meet a deadline in the 1988 Antidrug Abuse Act to produce a comprehensive strategy for attacking the Latin cocaine trade.

Rep. Stephen J. Solarz (D-N.Y.), who sponsored the amendment, called the failure "scandalous," saying "a kind of hopelessness" seemed to pervade U.S. policymakers on the issue.

"If intercontinental ballistic missiles were being fired at American cities from Peru and Bolivia, surely our government would have devised a plan to knock out the enemy," Solarz said. "Why, then should we treat the threat posed by the international cocaine cartels so lightly?"

Spokeswoman Catherine Shaw said the State Department has been working with Bennett on an even broader antidrug strategy that is not due until September. But administration sources said that the gravity of the problem has prompted the National Security Council to undertake a more accelerated review that is scheduled to be completed next month.

The NSC review is examining a wide range of options that include military action, an expanded role for U.S. intelligence agencies, and new economic and military aid to the region, administration sources said.

In the meantime, some officials said, the situation on the ground has gone from bad to worse. The greatest concern is in the Upper Huallaga—a 150-mile long tropical region where the Sendero Luminoso ("Shining Path") guerrillas have been gaining in a bloody insurgency that has claimed over 14,000 lives in the past eight years.

Peruvian sources said large parts of the valley are under the control of the Senderos, a band of Maoists who have depicted themselves as protectors of coca-growing peasants and have forged a loose alliance with drug traffickers working for Colombian cartels.

"The valley is heating up and the Shining Path are getting stronger and stronger," said Jose Gonzales, a Lima-based political analyst said last week.

By some estimates, as much as 200,000 acres of coca are cultivated in the Upper Huallaga, making it the source of more than half the cocaine that is flooding the streets of U.S. cities. But U.S. sources said Peruvian army troops in the valley rarely leave their garrisons for fear of encountering the guerrillas. As many as 40 workers for CORAH, the Peruvian Coca Reduction Agency, have been murdered since a U.S.-financed program to manually destroy coca plants began three years ago.

The program was suspended in February, as was a separate DEA initiative—dudded "Snowcap"—in which DEA agents accompanied Peruvian police in paramilitary strikes on the drug traffickers. U.S. officials said the operations were too dangerous until a new, more secure military base could be built to house the DEA agents.

Now, the only government presence in the valley are occasional police convoys that U.S. officials said have become virtual sitting ducks. On May 16, guerrilla forces armed with automatic weapons ambushed a 60-man police column, killing four and wounding seven. "This has been happening with some regularity," one U.S. official said.

It was in this atmosphere that a U.S.-owned Cessna aircraft carrying DEA agent Rick Finley, five State Department contract employees and three Peruvians, including the chief of CORAH, crashed into a mountain on its way back to Lima from the Upper Huallaga Valley May 13.

U.S. and Peruvian officials have said there was no evidence of sabotage, but U.S. officials are conducting a full investigation. "I discount absolutely nothing," Terrance Burke, deputy assistant administrator of DEA for operations, said last week.

But perhaps the crowning blow to U.S. efforts in the region occurred when President Garcia returned from a tour of the Upper Huallaga Valley earlier this month and, in an unusually strong statement, said the government "will never allow massive eradication" by herbicides on the region's coca crop.

The comment seemed to contradict earlier steps by Garcia's government to begin aerial testing of "Spike," the weed-killing herbicide U.S. officials believe offers the only hope for eliminating the coca crop.

Peruvian officials now are too fearful to go forward with the program, political analyst Gonzales said. "They realize if they go ahead with eradication it will only create increasing power for the Shining Path," he said.

U.S. officials said matters have gone only slightly better elsewhere. Despite a new eradication law passed last year, Bolivia's coca agency has destroyed barely 1,500 of that country's 192,000 acres of coca crop this year, less than half of what the United States had set as a "benchmark" for progress.

One reason for the slow pace, U.S. officials said, is that DEA agents working with Bolivian anti-narcotics police have failed to disrupt the coca trade in the Chapare, Bolivia's prime coca-growing region. Prices offered by drug traffickers for the crop are so high—more than $60 per hundredweight—that it is not economical for peasants to grow anything else, officials said.

Earlier this week, conditions in Bolivia grew even more troublesome when two American Morman missionaries were killed by a radical leftist group vowing revenge against "Yankee invaders who come to massacre our fellow farmers."

But some U.S. officials see sporadic glimmers of hope. Lawn contended that one of the reasons for the escalating attacks in Peru is that antidrug operations have hurt the traffickers. In Colombia earlier this year. U.S. trained antinarcotics police discovered a large complex of jungle laboratories that may have been the largest cocaine complex ever found. And in Mexico, after years of searching, federal police recently arrested Felix Gallardo, the most notorious of that country's drug traffickers.

But few outside analysts believe such steps can make a difference given current production levels.

The setbacks have caused some critics to question anew whether there are any useful steps the United States can take given the enormity of production levels. "My guess is you could cut supply [of coca] in half and not have a dramatic effect on cocaine supplies in the U.S.," analyst Treverton said. "This whole emphasis on supply is a loser."

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Tribune Ltd., July 7, 1989]

NOT A LAUGHING MATTER

Whoever comes after Carol Boyd Hallett as American ambassador to The Bahamas will have to be outstanding because comparisons will inevitably be made.

For the almost three years that she headed the U.S. Embassy in The Bahamas

Mrs. Hallett captured the minds and hearts of the Bahamian people. She will never be forgotten. In The Tribune's files on American ambassadors stationed in The Bahamas, her file is the thickest because she was the most active in the community and she accomplished the most. She earned a new respect for her country.

And it is because she did so much; because she gave a new dimension to the American image in The Bahamas that her successor will have to be very carefully chosen—or all her efforts will have been in vain.

Sixty-year-old Chic Hecht of Las Vegas, Nevada, has been nominated for the post. However, if the press reports are to be believed, Mr. Hecht was not nominated because he was considered the right man to carry on Carol Boyd Hallett's work, but because he had friends in the right places.

Apparently after losing his seat for a second term in the United States Senate, Mr. Hecht was out job hunting. He learned that the post of Ambassador to The Bahamas was open. According to one American newspaper he "saw a job he wanted and nominated himself for it."

"I knew about the post and I did ask for it. It's been offered and I accepted it," he said.

According to the Washington Post "Bush adminstration officials said (Paul) Laxalt lobbied for Hecht but that the crucial push came from Senate Minority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.), who made it clear that a Republican administration 'simply had to take care of a member of the club.'"

If this is true and if this is all the thought that has gone into Mr. Hecht's appointment, then the Bush administration is indeed insulting this country and undermining the accomplishments of its last ambassador."

Mr. Hecht's nomination will come under scrutiny on the floor of the Senate on Tuesday when Senator Bob Graham (formerly governor of Florida) has vowed to oppose it.

"The Bahamas," said Senator Graham, "are very important in our war on drugs. This neighboring nation is one of the most—if not the most—important nonsource countries in the world when it comes to interdicting the flow of drugs to the United States.

"Our Ambassador to The Bahamas," he said, "plays a vital, operational role in the war on drugs. Our current Ambassador (Hallett) says she spends most of her time dealing with drug related matters. The United States should send an Ambassador with proven skills in managing complicated international issues of law enforcement and diplomacy.

"If we send a top rate ambassador, that sends a positive signal that we're serious about the war on drugs. If we do otherwise, that sends a signal that we're not serious," Mr. Graham said.

Not only will it send a signal that the United States is not serious, but it will suggest that it considers the whole thing one grand laughing matter. Again, if press reports are to be believed, Mr. Hecht has a way with words that tickles the natural wit in all journalists. In other words he can apparently be counted on to make "good copy."

Despite the fact that he has been a merchant and a banker and spent two years in the U.S. Intelligence Corps (1951-53), his reputation for malapropisms is his undoing. For example, one of the favourite stories after he took his seat in the Senate in 1982. He vowed at that time that if a proposed nuclear-waste repository appeared likely to pose a danger, there would be no 'nuclear suppository' in Nevada.

Reporters seem to find his words good for a laugh—and so probably will The Tribune if he lives up to his reputation—but the serious and delicate problems facing The Bahamas and United States today are no laughing matter—and malapropisms should not be allowed to cloud the issues.

No one doubts Mr. Hecht's seriousness about the drug war or his determination to carry on the fight against it, but if he says the wrong thing at the wrong time, he could unwittingly torpedo many well laid plans. It is understood that Mr. Hecht is so against drug trafficking that during the period he was in the Senate he voted at least once for The Bahamas to be decertified.

But whereas Mrs. Hallett came here with a declared mission—to eliminate drug smugglers who are using The Bahamas as a stepping-stone for their trade to the United States—Mr. Hecht seems more concerned about the attractive lifestyle he can find here– gambling, golf and fishing.

In April Mr. Hecht was quoted as saying, "I am sure I will feel at home in The Bahamas. I've been involved in gambling in Nevada, and I've been involved in banking for 25 years . . . Also, I understand it is a nice lifestyle. I love golf and they have a lot of nice golf courses and good fishing."

"Those sentiments concern Senator Graham," his spokesman told The Tribune from the Senator's Washington office yesterday.

Those sentiments indeed concern many persons here because the so-called Bahamas "lifestyle" is fast disappearing due to the new value system—"everyone can be millionaires"—and the rise in crime. This was the legacy left by the Medellin cartel—such as Joe Lehder at Norman's Cay—and those in The Bahamas who either helped or allowed them to use our archipelago as a gateway to the United States.

This whole area—Florida included—has a vested interest in the United States' new appointment to the Embassy here. No one wants some U.S. Senator's friend who is going to be the "ambassador" to one of The Bahamas' many lovely golf courses. We all want an ambassador who is aware, dedicated and determined to help The Bahamas weed out drugs and corruption—and then, maybe, we can all join the new ambassador in enjoying the "lifestyle" for which these islands were once famous.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Miami Herald, June 29, 1989]

REJECT "CHICK" HECHT AS AMBASSADOR TO BAHAMAS

Surely The Bahamas deserves better. The job of U.S. ambassador to Florida's closest neighbor shouldn't be a consolation prize for a Republican loyalist ousted by voters. Especially for a Republican loyalist who has demonstrated no ability and experience for the job.

The post is important because of The Bahamas' strategic location in the jet stream of U.S.-bound drugs and illegal aliens. At one point, drug smugglers were so blatant that they controlled one Bahamian resort as a trans-shipment point. Associates of Bahamian Prime Minister Lynden Pindling were implicated as conspirators.

One, Nigel Bowe, has yet to be sent to the United States on a 1985 indictment despite an extradition treaty. He is charged with supervising shipments of cocaine from Colombia and protecting smugglers from the police. Recently, through patient diplomacy, the United States has won more assistance from The Bahamas government for cooperative investigations.

The United States and The Bahamas also have a strong trading partnership. Last year The Bahamas bought $725 million in U.S. goods, 70 percent of its imports, and sent to the United States products valued at $238 million, 62 percent of its exports. The Bahamas participates in the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI), which gives those nations trade preferences to build their economies. Key legislation broadening and extending the CBI is pending.

Into those issues, the Bush Administration proposes thrusting one Jacob "Chic" Hecht. Mr. Hecht, a clothier, won a Senate term in 1982 in Nevada after the Republicans targeted veteran Howard Cannon, tainted by a bribery scandal. But Mr. Hecht was laughed out of the seat after one term. Senate aides picked him as the least-effective senator. His verbal gaffes—among them: Nevada shouldn't be a "nuclear suppository"—were widely reported.

Now he says that he'll be at home in The Bahamas because "I've been involved in gambling in Nevada, and I've been involved in banking for 25 years. . . . I love golf, and they have a lot of nice golf courses."

In another era and another place, a nice-guy ambassador conducting a little diplomacy on the golf course would be OK. Not now. Florida's Sen. Bob Graham is urging his colleagues to step beyond senatorial courtesy to an ousted comrade and reject this nomination. And well they should.

[From the Orlando Sentinel, July 3, 1989]

KNOW-NOTHING U.S. DIPLOMATS

Sen. Bob Graham is right to protest the nomination of Chic Hecht as U.S. ambassador to the Bahamas.

Not that Mr. Hecht is alone in deserving to be singled out. He has plenty of company in other White House picks for ambassadorships. Indeed, it will be a race to see who commits the first gaffe.

The point is that putting inexperienced people in these top posts does the United States a disservice.

Consider Peter Secchia, whom President Bush has nominated to be ambassador to Italy. He brings a knowledge of lumber which, though honorable, is no boon to diplomacy.

But Mr. Secchia's better-known "talent" seems to be turning profane and sexist phrases, punctuated by crude hand gestures. That qualifies him to cope with Roman traffic, but little more.

Mr. Secchia has promised to clean up his behavior if he's approved, but who wants to risk diplomatic relations on the basis of an unconvincing commitment from a blowhard who once opined, "I saw the new Italian navy. Its boats have glass bottoms so they can see the old Italian navy."

He represents, in short, perpetual potential for embarrassment.

Back in the Bahamas, there's a more pressing reason to have a top-notch ambassador: the battle against drugs.

Clearly, the ambassador needs to be someone familiar with such critical issues, not someone who thinks of the islands in terms of gambling and golf—some of Mr. Hecht's stated interests.

Also, as Mr. Graham says, if the United States appoints an ambassador who's unqualified, "that sends a signal that we're not serious" about fighting drugs.

Mr. Bush has the option to nominate whomever he wishes. After all, the job of ambassador is considered a reward for political support.

But surely there are more impressive resumes among the Republican faithful.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, July 10, 1989]

KEEP HECHT AT HOME

Sen. Bob Graham is absolutely right. Someone who thinks gambling, golf and fishing are the most important things about the Bahamas has no business being the U.S. ambassador there. That's why Graham is trying to defeat the confirmation of former Sen. Chic Hecht of Nevada, on which the Senate will vote Tuesday. Here's wishing Graham luck.

The Congressional Black Caucus has advanced other good reasons for rejecting Hecht. As a Senator, he voted against the Martin Luther King holiday and against strong South African sanctions—hardly the kind of record that would commend him to a nation whose population is 90 percent black.

Ambassadorial portfolios should not be treated as consolation prizes for defeated politicians. Let George Bush find some other reward for Hecht, if he must, but let the Senate insist on an ambassador to the Bahamas who understands that the most important issue on his agenda will be drugs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOLE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I rise to say I am delighted to support the nomination of our former colleague Chic Hecht to be the United States Ambassador to The Bahamas.

We all knew Chic Hecht. I had the privilege of knowing him his entire time here in the Senate, and I found him an able, worthy colleague that I greatly enjoyed working with on a variety of issues.

Now, Mr. President, as has been previously cited, this is an important time in the relationship between the United States and The Bahamas. In the past few years our countries have worked closely together in a series of matters, of course, particularly in a strategy to combat the drug trade.

Through its geographic location, The Bahamas is an area that became involved with drug trafficking. Just because the flight routes, the routes that go actually right across The Bahamas, in addition to the abundance of lslands that are there that constitute The Bahamas, many unoccupied with small strips that are available for airplanes to land on, thus it became a natural place for drug trafficking to take place.

Our Nation and the Bahamian Government have worked closely together to try to do something about this drug traffic. This cooperation is absolutely vital, Mr. President, to the interests of both countries as we strive to eliminate this illegal drug trafficking from both our landscapes. I am confident that our former colleague, Senator Hecht, will do a fine job in fostering and strengthening this joint effort. I wish him well in his new post, and I support his nomination with enthusiasm. I thank the Chair, and I thank our distinguished leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader has 4 minutes left.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it is a real personal pleasure to urge Senate advice and consent to the nomination of Chic Hecht as Ambassador to The Bahamas.

We all know Chic Hecht well. He served with us in the Senate for 6 years—doing outstanding work on the Banking, Energy, and Intelligence Committees. Among the causes he championed was a strong national defense and a more capable national intelligence community.

Prior to his tenure here, Chic served 8 years in the Nevada State Senate—including performing with distinction in a job I personally know to be one of the toughest around, minority leader. Before entering the political arena, he was a very successful businessman in Las Vegas.

He also happens to be one the nicest and finest men I have come into contact with in this body.

The President has designated Chic Hecht as Ambassador to The Bahamas, and he will do a fine job. The issues he will deal with—narcotics, economic development, trade—are issues on which he has worked, and which he knows well.

Chic Hecht is concerned about drugs—he understands the tragedy and he recognizes the threat. That is one of the reasons why I am confident Chic will get the job done in The Bahamas. When he was in this body, Senator Hecht was actively involved in the push for tougher and tougher measures for drug dealers, the traffickers, and the users.

Oh, he was not a headline hunting Senator. He was not holding press conferences and patting himself on the back. But he was doing what he was supposed to be doing—working hard and making a difference.

I know, because this Senator worked with Senator Hecht. I know the man, and I know what he accomplished in this body. I do not have to rely on someone else's account; some rumor, some wisecrack, or some reporter.

So if anyone has the mistaken notion that Chic Hecht somehow will not be up to the drug challenge, I say take another look—look at the record, not some hatchet job in a newspaper.

I congratulate Chic and his fine family—his wife Gail, and his two children, Lori and Leslie—on the well-deserved honor the President has bestowed on them, and I urge unanimous Senate confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining on the Republican side, and the Senator from Florida controls 8 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. BREAUX. I thank the President and the distinguished Senator from Florida for yielding.

The question before the Senate, Mr. President, is the confirmation of an Ambassador to an area that has become more and more critically important to the United States as we try and attempt to find out how to reduce the seemingly unfettered export of drugs into this country that are killing our citizens. There is no question, as the Senator from Florida pointed out, that something like 50 to 60 percent of cocaine and marijuana traffic that is entering into the United States is finding its way through the Bahamian Islands. That is an incredible statistic.

Who we appoint as Ambassador is a message to the rest of the world, to the Bahamian Government, to drug traffickers around the world as to how serious we are going to be in trying to stem the flow of drugs coming from that country.

I have absolutely no problem with the President appointing a Republican. Democrats for years in our administration have always generally appointed Democrats. There is no problem with that. I have no problem whatsoever. It is the right of the President. The right of the President also includes the right to appoint a candidate who ran for office who was not successful. I support that right.

The question here, however, is the qualifications of this particular individual to serve this particular assignment in this especially difficult time. We can say that some of the statements by the nominee were not in keeping with what he should say, but I have not seen any report that he has said, "I did not say it," or "I did not mean to say it," or "I was misinterpreted." The facts, as I have read them, clearly indicate that the former Senator, Senator Hecht, said when asked about his qualifications to serve as Ambassador, he was quoted along the lines as saying, "Well, they have nice fishing and I like to fish; they have gambling and I know something about gambling and it is a nice assignment."

Mr. President, in these critical times, the appointment of Ambassador is not a vacation trip. The person who will serve as our Ambassador will be serving on the frontline of the battle in the war against drugs, not on the background of a golf course. I think what we are doing in voting on this ambassadorship is to send a signal to everyone that when it comes to drugs, it is not going to be business as usual. There are going to be different standards. There are going to be higher standards. This person is our representative to the rest of the world and our representative to that country. I simply think we can do better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I congratulate President Bush on his selection of former Senator Chic Hecht as United States Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, and I am pleased to express my support and vote for his nomination today.

Chic Hecht is qualified for the position of the United States Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas. He is an experienced legislator on both the Federal and State levels, serving as our colleague in the U.S. Senate from 1983 to 1989 and as a Nevada State senator from 1966 to 1974. In addition to serving his country in this capacity, he also has been a successful businessman. He was owner and operator of two Las Vegas women's apparel stores, and major owner and director of Nevada State Bank.

Chic Hecht's qualifications extend well beyond these I have mentioned. After receiving his B.S. from St. Louis University in 1949, he served in the United States Army between 1951 and 1953 during the Korean war and was inducted into the Army Intelligence Hall of Fame. He also holds membership in the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the American Legion, the Eagle Scout Society, and the American Bankers Association.

Beyond this background, I came to know Senator Hecht very well during our work together in the Senate for 6 years. He is very able, dedicated, and experienced in government and public affairs. I believe he has much to offer his country and is well qualified for a key position in a country which is very important to the United States.

Mr. President, as discussed extensively in "Drugs, Law Enforcement and Policy," a report prepared by the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations in December 1988, The Bahamas is a major source for the transit of illegal narcotics. That country's problems of drugs and corruption are endemic and entrenched. The U.S. Department of State also reported in its March 1989 "International Narcotics Control Strategy Report" that "U.S. law enforcement agencies estimate that The Bahamas are a major transit point for a significant portion of cocaine and marijuana entering the United States." The report also found that "the hijacking of narcotics shipments continues and the level of violent crime continues to rise" in The Bahamas.

Nevertheless, on February 28, 1989, the President issued Presidential Determination No. 89-11 on "Certifications for Narcotics Source and Transit Countries." The President certified that The Bahamas and 16 other "major narcotics producing and/or major narcotics transit countries cooperated fully with the United States, or have taken adequate steps on their own, to control narcotics production, trafficking, and money laundering," and thus should receive U.S. foreign aid.

The Presidential determination included a specific statement of explanation for The Bahamas as an appendix. Many Senators, including this Senator, disagreed with the certification and believed that the United States should not provide The Bahamas with foreign assistance moneys until that country does more to fight the war on drugs. On May 10, 1989, the full Senate considered Senate Joint Resolution 100 to disapprove the Presidential certification of The Bahamas. While I supported this joint resolution of disapproval, it failed by a vote of 40-57. Nevertheless, it is clear that many in the Senate concluded that The Bahamas simply is not doing enough to stem the flow of illegal narcotics.

I believe the new United States Ambassador to The Bahamas should take an active role with local government officials to address this serious problem. In addition, the new U.S. Ambassador also should ensure that the foreign assistance provided is effectively used in this effort. Based on my personal knowledge of former Senator Hecht and the duties of our Ambassador to The Bahamas, I believe he is well suited for this position.

I support the nomination of Chic Hecht to this post. If confirmed by the Senate, as I am sure he will be, I have every confidence that he will skillfully perform his duties, and I look forward to working with Chic Hecht to pursue an end to illegal drug trafficking in The Bahamas.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, the United States relationship with The Bahamas as we enter the 1990's is at a crucial stage. It is a stage which cries out for a strong and effective Ambassador.

It cries out for such an ambassador for one simple reason: Drugs, the problem that all of us, and the American people, believe is one of our top national priorities.

The conflict against the drug problem has many fronts—the streets of America, our schools and homes, countries across the Western Hemisphere. Although many Americans may not realize it, one of the most important fronts is The Bahamas, which serves as a large cog in the drug machine.

The Bahamas is so important to the drug trade, in fact, that if we could capture all of the narcotics transiting The Bahamas, we would make a major impact on the problem fast becoming a blight on this country.

The Bahamas serves as one of the major transshipment points for narcotics coming into this country. In 1988, United States law enforcement agencies estimated that 50 to 60 percent of all cocaine and marijuana that entered the United States transited Bahamian territory.

The Bahamas' 700 islands and cays are spread over 100,000 square miles, making it, in the words of the State Department, "an ideal site for air and sea smuggling." In the highly specialized world of the drug trade, The Bahamas plays a crucial role as the stopping-off point for narcotics from South America.

From the standpoint of the United States, the United States-Bahamas relationship hinges on one issue—narcotics. It has occupied center stage of the bilateral agenda for the past few years. The most recent U.S. Ambassador said that she had spent "95 percent of her time" on drug-related activities. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of this issue to the relationship.

In recent years, the United States-Bahamas relationship has frayed because many of us in Congress—including this Senator—have questioned the commitment of The Bahamas to fighting the drug trade. I will not detail what I believe are the shortcomings in the Bahamian effort. They have been discussed many times before, and I am sure will be again.

Although I will concede that The Bahamas has increased its efforts in recent years, I am not convinced that the Bahamian Government is doing everything it can. I am not alone in this view. Just 2 months ago the Senate considered a resolution disapproving the certification that The Bahamas was "fully cooperating" in the drug effort.

Forty Senators voted for that resolution; 40 Members of this body who believe The Bahamas is not doing enough to combat the drug problem. Although we did not succeed in our efforts to decertify The Bahamas, we have succeeded in gaining the attention of the Bahamian Government.

But now that we have their attention, we must continue to hold it. We must continue to work at the highest level to gain even closer cooperation

29-059 O-90-29 (Pt. 10)

with The Bahamas. We do this not merely because narcotics are destroying our country, but because they are destroying other countries in the Western Hemisphere as well.

Colombia is, of course, the best example of the devastating effect that drugs can have on the social fabric of a nation. But the problem goes well beyond Colombia, and is undermining governmental institutions in Peru, Bolivia, and elsewhere. Latin leaders are becoming increasingly aware of the threat posed by narcotics to their own countries. Recently, Jamaican Prime Minister Michael Manley called for a multinational strike force to deal with the problem, a stunning statement by a politician who in the past never hesitated to blame the United States for many of the world's ills.

The Bahamas itself is coming under threat of drugs. Although no significant amounts of drugs are cultivated or refined in The Bahamas, cocaine addiction in The Bahamas is rising, and according to the State Department, the rising domestic crime rate appears to be directly linked to increases in addiction.

It is in this context that the nomination of a new ambassador to The Bahamas is crucial. We need an experienced person in this post who will continue to convey to The Bahamas the importance that the United States attaches to the drug problem. Moreover, as cooperation with The Bahamas continues to increase, we will need a strong envoy on hand to closely monitor and coordinate the many facets of this effort.

It would seem obvious that President Bush—who has pledged many times to rid the Nation of the scourge of drugs—would want to send an ambassador who has a strong background in both narcotics and the Caribbean.

I am thus disappointed by the President's nomination of someone who does not possess these qualities. In my view, this choice makes us look just a bit hyprocritical. Because for all these years we have lectured and pushed and prodded the Bahamians—as well as other nations—to increase their efforts against the drug trade. And when the President chooses a political appointee without the necessary experience and background, it sends a terrible signal to The Bahamas, and undermines our efforts to convince the Bahamians that we mean business.

So I will oppose this nomination. I do so reluctantly, because I served in this body with Chic Hecht, and I have great respect for him. But I do so in the belief that this nomination is ill-advised and may well do harm to our continuing struggle against the drug trade.

I also do so with no illusions that his nomination will be defeated. I hope Senator Hecht will fully understand my strong concerns about the importance of waging the drug fight in The Bahamas, and I urge him to act quickly to gain a strong understanding of the narcotics issue so that he can be an effective Ambassador.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, Senator Chic Hecht is the right man to be the United States' next Ambassador to The Bahamas. His unique qualifications ensure he will successfully handle one of America's most important diplomatic posts.

Much of America's future is tied to The Bahamas. Many in the United States think of this beautiful island group only as one of America's key vacation spots. But the stepped-up war on drugs prove it to be much more important than that.

In the last 10 years, The Bahamas has become one of the key points through which drug shipments enter the United States. With more than 700 islands dispersed across an area slightly larger than New Jersey and Connecticut combined, The Bahamas is an easy haven for drug traffickers. Most drug shipments entering the United States originate somewhere in South America, are flown by private plane to a small, desolate Caribbean island where they are then loaded onto another small plane and airlifted into the United States.

These small Caribbean islands, where drugs can be temporarily stored or directly transferred to waiting aircraft, are the real choke points in the war on drugs. Longer routes or direct flights from the South American mainland require much larger aircraft, which are much more easily tracked and monitored by American antidrug authorities. Shutting down these island shelters as waypoints for drug traffickers will go a long way toward insuring the success of U.S. antidrug efforts.

Without a qualified Ambassador in Nassau to act as America's spokesman, our efforts to end drug traffickings through The Bahamas could suffer severe setbacks. Chic Hecht has the right qualifications to bring our efforts to fruition.

First and foremost, an Ambassador to The Bahamas who will effectively represent the President and America's "War On Drugs" must have full support of the President and the Secretary of State. In addition to that, he must be someone whose opinion they respect, whose personal identification with the President's objectives is well-known and whose knowledge of the inner workings of American Government is extensive. Chic Hecht is a man whose clear identification with President Bush and his objectives is beyond question.

For the past 6 years, Chic worked along with George Bush and Jim Baker and many of us here in the Congress to restore America to the position of greatness she once enjoyed. His efforts, joined with those of many of us, have paid off. In 1979, the world did not listen when America spoke. Today, the world listens. The part Chic played in the restoration of American greatness has earned him the trust and respect of the President, the Secretary of State and many of us here in Congress. When Chic Hecht relays his thoughts and concerns about the situation in The Bahamas, you can be certain Jim Baker and George Bush will listen.

Second, for an Ambassador to be effective in aiding U.S. antidrug efforts in this small but labyrinthine commonwealth, he must be intimately acquainted with the U.S. intelligence community. It is through our intelligence collection sources that the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Coast Guard, and the Defense Department are able to interdict drug traffickers before they cross our borders. The increasing sophistication of the world's drug network requires that we use increasingly sophisticated intelligence collection. Chic Hecht has some of the best credentials of any American to operate in an environment highly dependent on U.S. intelligence capabilities.

Senator Hecht was a special agent in the U.S. Army Intelligence Corps from 1951 to 1953. He served on the Senate's Select Committee on Intelligence from 1985 to 1988, and he is a member of the National Counter Intelligence Corps and the National Military Intelligence Association. Few Americans with Senator Hecht's political and government experience can boast such a record of intimate involvement with the intelligence community.

Third, a U.S. Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas who will effectively advance U.S. interests must be an experienced statesman. We have seen recently the imbroglio created in the Republic of Panama when the involvement of General Noriega in drug-running activities came to light, and the difficult role required of the President's representative in that nation. Chic Hecht is an experienced politician and an able statesman. His 8 years in the Nevada Senate, his experience as the Nevada Senate minority leader, and his term in the U.S. Senate have given him the knack for dealing effectively with very difficult, highly-charged situations.

In my judgment, Senator Chic Hecht was a wise selection by President Bush. As our Ambassador to the Bahamas, he will effectively represent United States Foreign Policy and help clamp down on drug trafficking in this corner of the world. In the areas most essential to success as the United States Ambassador to the Bahamas, Senator Chic Hecht is an exceptionally qualified choice. He is the man that the President believes will best lead

the charge for America in the Bahamas—and the facts show the President is right.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, on May 10 of this year, I voted for S. 100, a bill which would have found that the Bahamas had not fully cooperated in efforts to reduce drug trafficing in that country. Thirty-nine other Senators joined me in supporting that indictment of the Bahamas. Even those who opposed our position conceded that the Bahamas are a major stop in the drug trade. They also agreed that the Bahamas could do a great deal more to deal with the problem. They claimed then that the best way to get more from the Bahamas was to continue to give them funds as part of a sophisticated diplomatic version of the old "carrot and stick" ploy.

To the extent that the majority was right back in May, then there ought to be a majority in opposition to this nomination in July.

I did not serve with Chic Hecht and did not know him. Some might say that puts me at a disadvantage in evaluating the nomination. To the contrary, I believe that it allows me to objectively measure the nomination on the basis of the record before us. On the basis of that record, I can clearly conclude that our former colleague is an outstanding individual who certainly deserves a responsible position in the administration. It just ought not be this position. There is nothing in his record—as substantial as it is—which suggests that he has the experience or the skill or the background to deal with the demands of this position. We are not sending someone to the Bahamas to deal with golf and gambling; we are sending someone down there to deal with the No. 1 menace in our society—drugs.

Mr. President, if we are serious about dealing with the drug problem, if we are serious about putting pressure on the Bahamas, if we are serious about the messages we send our constituents about our war on drugs—then we ought to send the most qualified candidate available to the Bahamas as our Ambassador. Former Senator Hecht may have been an outstanding intelligence officer and an outstanding member of this body, but he is not the most qualified candidate available to be our Ambassador to the Bahamas. While there are many posts I believe former Senator Hecht could fill admirably, this is not one of them. I can not give my consent to his confirmation to this post.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join my colleagues in supporting the nomination of Senator Chic Hecht to be our Ambassador to the Bahamas.

The President made an excellent choice when he named Senator Hecht to this position. His past experiences—both in and out of government—will serve him well as he takes on this new challenge.

Chic has solid experience in foreign affairs stretching back over more than three decades. He first served his country as an Army intelligence officer behind the Iron Curtain. More recently, during his term in the Senate, he served as a member of the Select Committee on Intelligence.

For 2 years, I had the pleasure of serving with Chic on the Senate Banking Committee. During that time the committee dealt with many issues that are important in our relationship with the Bahamas, most notably money laundering. This experience will serve him well as he faces one of the stickiest issues between our two countries. In addition, his service as director of the Nevada State bank will provide him with further background on these issues.

Chic's qualifications go beyond his knowledge of banking and financial issues. His extensive experience as a businessman will make it easy for him to deal with the important business community in Nassau, and his many years as a legislator will equip him well for his dealings with government officials.

Mr. President, Chic Hecht is a man of strong convictions. He demonstrated that often during his votes on this floor. He always voted his conscience, and he often paid the political price for those votes. The United States certainly will benefit from once again having the service of a man with his resolve.

During his service in the Senate, most of us had the opportunity to work closely with Chic, to spend time with him, and to discover what a warm and caring person he is. Although I served with Chic for only 2 years, because he was born and raised in Missouri, I have known and worked with his family for decades and I know that Chic comes from a family that represents the best that Missouri and this country have to offer.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise to strongly support the nomination of my good friend and former colleague, Chic Hecht, as Ambassador to the Bahamas.

I had the privilege of serving in the Senate with Chic for 6 years as well as working with him on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. From my personal association with Senator Hecht, I can unequivocably say that he is a bright, dedicated hardworking individual who takes very seriously his duty of serving the public.

Our next Ambassador will be faced with some very tough issues of extreme importance to the well-being of the American people. The Bahamas has long been a transshipment point for the flow of illegal drugs into the United States. The United States Government has been working with the Bahamian Government for a number of years to encourage them to step up their efforts to combat this flow of drugs. We have had some successes and the Bahamians have worked closely with United States law enforcement personnel.

However, our next Ambassador will face some tough issues such as extradition of drug traffickers and increasing the level of cooperation between United States and Bahamian antidrug forces. Because of the importance of these issues and the need to stop the flow of drugs through the Bahamas we need somebody of Chic Hecht's ability and dedication to public service.

Senator Hecht has a distinguished military record, has been a leader in the business community in Nevada, and has been a leader in the political community in Nevada. In short, Chic Hecht has succeeded in every endeavor he has undertaken and I am very confident that as the President's choice for this important post he will represent the United States in a highly professional and successful manner.

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I am extremely happy and proud to rise today and speak strongly in favor of the nomination of our former colleague, Senator Chic Hecht of Nevada, to be the next Ambassador to the Bahamas.

During his service in the Senate, Chic Hecht and I became close and warm friends. It is partly for that reason that I feel so comfortable in supporting his nomination; I think it is a splendid choice.

Nevertheless, it is more important that we, his friends, stress Chic's distinguished career in both the private and the public sector. Chic Hecht has been an extremely successful businessman, owning and managing his own clothing store in Las Vegas as well as owning and directing a large bank. His business experience also includes his partnership in a hotel franchise in Arizona.

Chic Hecht's political career includes his election to the Nevada State Senate where he served from 1967–75. His service in the State Senate was highlighted by a stint as minority leader. Chic Hecht also was a chief political operative for Ronald Reagan in various Presidential campaigns, including: South Nevada chairman of Reagan for President in 1976, and Nevada deputy director of Reagan for President in 1980.

Obviously, emphasis should be placed on his valuable service in the U.S. Senate. He served on the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence—both of which have jurisdiction over areas significant to our relations with The Bahamas.

Chic's experience on the Banking Committee and his previous extensive background in the banking profession more than adequately prepare him to handle the difficult task of combating the use of Bahamian banks for illicit purposes. I am confident Chic will deal skillfully and forcefully with those financial institutions in The Bahamas assisting the international drug trade through money laundering.

Similarly, Chic's vast background in intelligence matters makes him uniquely qualified to serve in a post with national security concerns. In addition to his service on the Senate's intelligence panel, Chic's Korean war-era military service consisted of work in Berlin for the United States Army Intelligence Corps. Evidence of Chic's interest in and dedication to this field of endeavor includes his membership in the National Counterintelligence Corps and the National Military Intelligence Association. Chic was also recently inducted into the Army Intelligence Hall of Fame.

Mr. President, some individuals have chosen to denigrate Chic Hecht in a manner that I find unfortunate, unfair, and unjustified. It appears that in the minds of some, he is not eloquent enough, not strident enough, not sufficiently inside the beltway, so to speak. I submit that these qualities are what made Chic Hecht a breath of fresh air in this Chamber; what made Chic Hecht a pleasure to work with; and what I miss the most by his absence.

Conversely, Chic possesses and embodies precisely those qualities I sometimes find most lacking in political Washington today: Honesty, sincerity, modesty, decency, self-deprecation, unpretentiousness, and principle. In the Senate Chic Hecht represented what many inside the beltway types hold in contempt: A dedication to his conservative principles and the courage to defend them in the face of political adversity. Combine this with Chic's demonstrated love for this country and his proven loyalty to her, and I think you have the ingredients of an ambassador who will ably, adeptly, and successfully represent his President and his Nation in a delicate and difficult position.

Mr. President, to conclude, once again I wish to announce my unqualified support for Chic Hecht's nomination to be Ambassador to The Bahamas. I trust the Senate will overwhelmingly approve the President's choice.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Senator Chic Hecht to the post of Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas. Although I did not have the fortune to serve with him in the Senate, I have worked with and respect Chic Hecht.

The Commonwealth of The Bahamas possess unique challenges and assets that our next United States Ambassador must be equipped to deal with. Senator Hecht is so equipped. He is an experienced and dedicated public servant who has served his country with distinction for over two decades. He is also a successful businessman and a veteran of foreign wars.

Among the greatest challenges in The Bahamas is the ongoing fight to cut the flow of drugs to the United States. On March 1, 1989, under terms of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, President Bush certified that The Bahamas was cooperating with the United States in the war on drugs. While I have doubts as to the extent and success of that cooperation to date, our next Ambassador must be capable of continuing the cooperative effort with the Commonwealth of The Bahamas. I believe Senator Hecht is well qualified for this task. As an Army intelligence officer from 1951 through 1953, he worked undercover in Berlin, earning a spot in the Army Intelligence Hall of Fame, an honor that only 87 other men have ever been given. Furthermore, he served for 4 years on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

The Bahamas are heavily reliant on the tourism industry. Senator Hecht was an elected official for 22 years in a State which also relies on the tourism industry. In addition to his public service, he acquired personal business experience in the hotel industry as an owner and operator from 1977 to 1982.

Senator Hecht's unique blend of public and private sector experience and expertise in the areas that most affect the Commonwealth of The Bahamas make him uniquely qualified for this post.

For these reasons, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations gave Senator Hecht their unanimous support, and reported to the Senate that he would be "an excellent candidate for the United States Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas." I would like to add my support to their recommendation.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the President's Ambassador-designate to The Bahamas, Senator Chic Hecht.

Although I did not have the pleasure of working with Senator Hecht during his time in the Senate, I have done some research on my own and come to the conclusion that he is more than qualified to assume the duties of Ambassador to The Bahamas.

Many of the diplomatic skills required of an ambassador are very similar to those required of a U.S. Senator. We all know that the nature of this business involves diplomacy and perfecting the delicate art of compromise while understanding a wide variety of issues and being prepared to act on them. Many of the toughest issues the Senate dealt with over the last several years were in the areas of foreign policy, law enforcement, and drug-related problems. These are obviously some of the most important issues that effect The Bahamas as well as the United States.

Just by the virtue of being in the Senate, Senator Hecht has developed skills in these areas. In fact, just last year the Senate passed the omnibus drug bill of 1988 which focused on U.S. efforts against drugs in this country, including strict law enforcement penalties for the drug dealer as well as the drug user. The 1988 bill also emphasized drug interdiction and U.S. policies for dealing with drug producing and exporting countries. Senator Hecht was a strong supporter of this legislation, thus maintaining his image as one of the most aggressive Senators on drug matters ever to serve in this body.

During his Senate term Senator Hecht consistently supported tough law-and-order judges, stricter sentencing guidelines, including the death penalty, and the use of all of the Government's resources to fight the war on drugs. Senator Hecht's voting record on drug matters clearly illustrates his understanding of the seriousness of the drug problems in this world.

In addition to his experience as a Senator, Chic Hecht served as a military intelligence agent in the U.S. Army Intelligence Corps and worked behind the Iron Curtain. His service there earned him the honor of being placed in the Army Intelligence Hall of Fame. Senator Hecht maintained his interest and knowledge of intelligence matters by serving as a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee during his tenure in the Senate.

I have heard some say that Chic Hecht was one of the most knowledgeable Senators on matters of intelligence during his time here—that knowledge and experience is a credit and a qualification for dealing with drug matters. He understands how an undercover, underground person's mind works, which is essentially how a drug dealer operates.

We should not forget Hecht's years as a successful businessman. He knows what it takes to meet a payroll and stay within a budget. His years in the banking industry will be invaluable. He spent years practicing good management techniques, relying on hard work, sheer determination, and the art of negotiation to succeed in this field.

There is no question in my mind that Senator Hecht is qualified to be our next Ambassador to The Bahamas. There is also no question that he will do a great job.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to lend my strong support to the

nomination of our former colleague, Chic Hecht, to be our Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

Senator Hecht has served his State and country with distinction as an Army intelligence special agent, a Nevada State Senator, and a U.S. Senator. Senator Hecht served on both the Senate Banking and Intelligence Committees, gaining invaluable insight into the illegal manipulation of financial and business institutions by illicit criminal enterprises.

The Commonwealth of The Bahamas represents a challenge to the United States as we struggle through our war on drug-related criminal enterprises that we, unfortunately, seem to be losing. The Bahamas is a focal point in this drug war, since the island nation has the misfortune to be located in the midst of major drug transportation lanes leading to the United States.

Recently, the issue of illegal drug activity and its connection with The Bahamas was debated on the Senate floor. In a very close vote, a resolution to decertify The Bahamas failed to pass. However, the vote signifies that a large group of Senators are not satisfied with past Bahamian efforts to help put an end to the drug trade. For instance, in looking at Bahamian arrest and conviction records, it is clear that although arrests and convictions may have been made, there were very few long-term jail sentences carried out. Most sentences in Bahamian drug cases have, unfortunately, amounted to slaps on the wrist that have no real deterrent value.

However, it is my hope that the future situation will improve. This is precisely why we need an ambassador that not only understands the problems, but has a close working relationship with Congress and has inside knowledge of how the Government bureaucracies work—or do not work, as is often the case.

Chic Hecht has the experience, knowledge, and ability that will be necessary in prosecuting an effective policy against the drug lords and their businesses operating in and around The Bahamas. I look forward to working with Ambassador Hecht and the Government of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas as we encourage stronger international relations and stronger mutual efforts to win the war on drugs.

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, I rise today to support the nomination of former Senator Chic Hecht to be the United States Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas. I believe that my former colleague will serve President Bush and the interests of the United States admirably.

The Commonwealth of The Bahamas and the United States have a strong friendship, but the relationship is not without challenges. Senator Hecht has the necessary skills to deal with the problems of our relations, including the drug interdiction struggle and the issues of immigration. He dealt with similar issues while representing the State of Nevada. As a Senator from a neighboring State, I had the opportunity to work with Senator Hecht on difficult issues involving Western States interests. he was consistently forthright and honorable in his dealings.

I had the pleasure to serve with Senator Hecht on two committees. First, on the Senate's Select Committee on Intelligence, where he brought to bear his experience as an intelligence officer in the Eastern bloc. Second, I worked closely with him on the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. Chic served as chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking Committee in the 99th Congress, while I was chairman of the full committee. I witnessed Senator Hecht's willingness to work hard for initiatives he believed in and his courage to voice opposition when he disagreed with positions of the administration or the committee. These qualities will benefit the interests of the United States while he serves in The Bahamas.

Senator Hecht is an uncommon man who was not overwhelmed by the trappings of being a Senator. Chic did not lose his sense of decency in the atmosphere of Washington, DC. His affable demeanor will reflect well upon the United States and people will find Chic a pleasure to work with.

Again, I am happy to support Senator Hecht's nomination.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join my colleagues in supporting the nomination of Senator Chic Hecht to be our Ambassador to The Bahamas.

The President made an excellent choice when he named Senator Hecht to this position. His past experiences—both in and out of government—will serve him well as he takes on this new challenge.

Chic has solid experience in foreign affairs stretching back over more than three decades. He first served his country as an Army intelligence officer behind the Iron Curtain. More recently, during his term in the Senate, he served as a member of the Select Committee on Intelligence.

For 2 years, I had the pleasure of serving with Chic on the Senate Banking Committee. During that time the committee dealt with many issues that are important in our relationship with The Bahamas, most notably money laundering. This experience will serve him well as he faces one of the stickiest issues between our two countries. In addition, his service as director of the Nevada State Bank will provide him with further background on these issues.

Chic's qualifications go beyond his knowledge of banking and financial issues. His extensive experience as a businessman will make it easy for him to deal with the important business community in Nassau, and his many years as a legislator will equip him well for his dealings with government officials.

Mr. President, Chic Hecht is a man of strong convictions. he demonstrated that often during his votes on this floor. He always voted his conscience, and he often paid the political price for those votes. The United States certainly will benefit from once again having the service of a man with his resolve.

During his service in the Senate, most of us had the opportunity to work closely with Chic, to spend time with him, and to discover what a warm and caring person he is. Although I served with Chic for only 2 years, because he was born and raised in Missouri, I have known and worked with his family for decades and I know that Chic comes from a family that represents the best that Missouri and this country have to offer.

● Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I must tell you that I am dumbstruck that we are spending valuable Senate time debating the nomination of our former colleague, Chic Hecht, to be Ambassador to The Bahamas.

Aside from the obvious—that, barring some clearly disqualifying evidence—the President should have the right to name his team, Chic is well known to most of us as conscientious, hard working, and warm-hearted. If he was your friend, he would do all he could for you—a rather rare commodity in this town. Chic represented his State ably for 6 years in this body. Those who served with him can well recall how hard he fought for the interests of his State. He was dogged in their pursuit.

Do any of us really doubt Chic's ability to carry out the responsibilities of being our Ambassador to The Bahamas? Chic has ample qualifications to serve our country in this post. He has a broad international background, developed both through his private business activities, which require extensive travel, and his service in the Senate.

As a Senator, Chic sat on the Select Committee on Intelligence. This gave him unique insight and information into many of the same issues which he would have to deal with as Ambassador. Among these are the drug trade, international money laundering, and international cooperation in stopping the flow of drugs.

Chic took his assignment on the committee with extraordinary seriousness. Unique among his colleagues, Chic would, nearly every weekend, travel to a different CIA post around the world. Chic wanted to see first

hand how CIA functioned in the field, what successes it was having, what changes could be made to make its operations more effective. This was a truly selfless use of his time which made his work on the committee all the more effective.

As a result, Chic was inducted him into the Intelligence Hall of Fame—an honor which he richly deserved.

Mr. President, the partisan wrangling that the Senate has engaged in this session is really unprecedented during my more than 10 years of experience in this body. The President has repeatedly offered his hand to work with us and has graciously forgotten or forgiven the reception he has received in return. Yet, here we go again, and I fear, not necessarily for the last time.

Yes, I know that there are some here who say the Senate is just exercising its legitimate right of advice and consent. It seems to me, however, that what is really going on here is nothing more than political gamesmanship for short-term partisan advantage largely unrelated to policy considerations. We began this with the Tower nomination and we continue it today.

Well, I believe this nonsense has to stop, and it should stop here or we may find ourselves so mired that we lose our ability to do what we were really sent here to do—the Nation's affairs. I suggest, Mr. President, that we quickly confirm Senator Hecht and get on to more pressing business.●

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today with pride to speak in support of my friend and former colleague Chic Hecht to be the United States Ambassador to The Bahamas.

Mr. President, I worked beside Chic Hecht for 6 years in the Senate on both the Intelligence and Energy and Natural Resources Committees. In all those years, Chic consistently proved himself to be a valued colleague and a trusted friend. I am encouraged to know that these qualities will now be devoted to the task representing the United States in The Bahamas.

The challenge that the President has asked Chic to assume is not an easy one. The Bahamas is a small country, but it is strategically located for drug traffickers seeking to transport their lethal product to the United States. Despite the magnitude of this challenge, however, I am confident that Chic Hecht will meet this problem with the same commitment and tenacity that characterized his tenure in the Senate. I wish him success as our Ambassador to The Bahamas.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have worked with Chic Hecht, legislated with him, and come to know him quite well during the time we both served in the Senate. I so enjoyed the opportunity of sharing time with him and legislating with him. I also had the pleasant experience of traveling with him on one occasion. I thoroughly enjoyed that, too.

During his time in the Senate, I learned to appreciate his warmth, sincerity and good humor.

His background in the intelligence community will serve him well at this post. I wish Chic and his fine wife, Gail, the very best. They will represent our country well. We expect much of him. He will deliver.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not been ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Chic Hecht, of Nevada, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUTENBERG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 105 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Armstrong	Gore	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Gorton	Moynihan
Bentsen	Gramm	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grassley	Nickles
Bond	Hatfield	Nunn
Boren	Heflin	Packwood
Bryan	Heinz	Pell
Bumpers	Helms	Pressler
Burdick	Hollings	Pryor
Burns	Humphrey	Reid
Byrd	Inouye	Riegle
Chafee	Jeffords	Robb
Coats	Johnston	Roth
Cochran	Kassebaum	Rudman
Cohen	Kasten	Sanford
Conrad	Kennedy	Sasser
D'Amato	Kerrey	Shelby
Danforth	Kerry	Simon
Dixon	Levin	Simpson
Dodd	Lieberman	Specter
Dole	Lott	Stevens
Domenici	Lugar	Symms
Durenberger	Mack	Thurmond
Exon	McCain	Wallop
Garn	McClure	Warner
Glenn	McConnell	Wilson

NAYS—19

Adams	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Fowler	Mitchell
Bradley	Graham	Rockefeller
Breaux	Harkin	Sarbanes
Cranston	Kohl	Wirth
Daschle	Lautenberg	
DeConcini	Leahy	

NOT VOTING—3

Boschwitz	Hatch	Matsunaga

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nominee was confirmed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1989

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is recognized to offer a substitute amendment with time limited to 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Massachusetts.

The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina is entitled to be heard. I see he is here. May I ask that there be order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate must be in order. Conversation in the Chamber must cease.

The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, this was the last rollcall vote today. The next rollcall vote will be at 11:30 tomorrow morning on the amendment now to be offered by the Senator from North Carolina. There will be a half-hour debate tonight. A half-hour debate from 11 to 11:30 tomorrow morning. Then it is my hope and intention that we complete action on this bill tomorrow. Senators should be aware that there will be rollcall votes throughout the day tomorrow but we do intend to complete action on this bill on tomorrow.

I thank Senators for their attention and I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 240

(Purpose: To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to change the level, and preference system for admission, of immigrants to the United States, and for other purposes)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 240.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, immigration is a particularly important issue in America because we are a nation of immigrants. This country has always had a very generous immigration policy. A lot of people do not know this, but we accept more immigrants each year than all the other countries combined, and I am proud of that fact.

Mr. President, Senator KENNEDY and Senator SIMPSON have provided commendable leadership over the years on the immigration issue. Last year, they introduced a comprehensive bill to reform legal immigration. Many of the provisions of the 1988 Kennedy-Simpson bill appealed to me: It provided a national level, it limited entrance under the fifth preference to brothers and sisters who have never been married, and created a new category for new seed immigrants.

The 1988 bill was viewed as a consensus position on legal immigration reform. However, the consensus position was thrown out of kilter by a compromise made last month with Senator SIMON. So in this Senator's judgment, and I say this with all due respect, the Kennedy-Simpson-Simon compromise is a step backward from the 1988 consensus position. It drops the limited definition of the fifth preference from the 1988 Kennedy-Simpson bill and increases the national level to 600,000. The compromise increases family immigrant visas by 44,000 while doing nothing for business immigrants.

I have offered a compromise substitute amendment to restore the 1988 consensus position, that at the same time, addresses the needs of our Nation and the business community.

Mr. President, my amendment is a compromise amendment—it does not go as far as I would like, but on the whole I think we accomplish several worthy objectives. Let me briefly summarize the major points.

First, we limit the definition of the fifth preference without reducing the number of fifth preference visas. Frankly, I would have preferred to eliminate the fifth. Second, we increase the employer-sponsored visas without increasing the overall national level.

Let me say parenthetically that my amendment incorporates the Dole-Mitchell amendment regarding Chinese students that has just been passed by the Senate.

Third, we retain Congress' power to set immigration policy instead of allowing the President to usurp that authority. The current bill allows for an automatic increase in the national level upon the President's recommendation. My amendment deletes that automatic mechanism. Fourth, we retain the points for English language that were included in the point system in the original version of the bill. Finally, we keep the national level of 600,000 per the Kennedy-Simpson-Simon bill. I happen to think that 600,000 is too high. The polls show that the American people do not want an increase of 105,000 in the level of immigration. That is why in the bill I introduced on June 21, I set the national level at 550,000.

Mr. President, as I stated, my amendment keeps a limited definition of the fifth preference. The fifth preference presently allows a citizen to bring in his brothers, his sisters, his brothers-in-law, his sisters-in-law, his nieces and his nephews. Obviously, this causes a chain migration problem; a citizen can bring in his brother-in-law who, once he becomes a citizen, can bring in his brother-in-law and his family. One famous example is the man in New York who brought in 64 relatives under the fifth preference category.

My amendment simply limits the fifth to allow a citizen to bring in those brothers and sisters who have never been married. This is exactly the same definition set forth in the Kennedy-Simpson bill which passed 88 to 4 last year. However, in the spirit of compromise, my amendment does not reduce the number of fifth preference visas for the first 3 years, and only slightly reduces the numbers thereafter. A limited definition will eventually reduce demand and shorten waiting periods for fifth preference visas.

Mr. President, almost everyone agrees that something must be done to deal with the fifth preference. On one occasion this Senate passed a bill to eliminate completely the fifth preference and quite frankly I would prefer that approach. Since I try to stay within the framework of the 1988 Kennedy-Simpson bill, I stick with merely a limited definition of the fifth preference. Furthermore, a limited definition overwhelmingly passed the Senate in 1983 and in 1988.

These measures passed because Senators realized that we must set priorities. As Senators KENNEDY and SIMPSON have stated on several occasions, we should give priority to those immigrants who are the closest family members to American citizens. I agree, for example, that spouses and children of permanent residents should be given priority over brothers-in-law. That is why my bill keeps a limited definition of the fifth preference and doubles the number of second preference visas.

Another reason to limit the fifth preference is because there are tremendous backlogs of immigrants in this category. Over 1.5 million people are waiting for their number to come up. This causes long delays—up to 20 years in some cases—and fosters illegal immigration. As Senator KENNEDY correctly states, this creates "an illusory and false hope of family reunification."

Mr. President, we do not need an immigration policy that creates false hope.

The second major aspect of my amendment addresses the business visas.

Mr. President, I agree with Senators KENNEDY and SIMPSON that we must strive for an immigration policy that is based on "the needs of the country." A recent Department of Labor study entitled "Workforce 2000" made a detailed assessment of what our labor needs will be over the next two decades. The report concluded that we will experience a shortage in skilled workers and that we need policies that facilitate the immigration of skilled workers.

My amendment addresses the needs of our country by increasing employer-sponsored visas—third and sixth preferences—by 37,200, without increasing the overall national level and without reducing the number of fifth preference visas. Other amendments may be offered to increase the number of employer-sponsored visas, but they also increase the overall national level. The primary sponsors of the bill have indicated they will oppose any effort to increase the overall national level.

The third preference allows an employer to bring in professionals who are in short supply, or people with exceptional abilities. Under the sixth preference, an employer can bring in skilled workers who are in short supply. The underlying bill made a new requirement; third preference immigrants would have to have an advanced degree. This is unnecessary, so my amendment drops that additional requirement.

Mr. President, I think we need a policy that encourages people with skills and exceptional abilities to come to our country. Unfortunately, our present system discourages them from immigrating because there is a 1- to 3-year wait to get a third or sixth preference visa.

As a result, American companies have difficulty recruiting highly skilled workers who have crucial knowledge of international markets and pioneer research. If there is a shortage of skilled workers in a particular profession, the business loses the competitive edge waiting 3 years to bring in someone to fill the slot.

The additional numbers for employer-sponsored visas in my bill will help reduce the delays for immigrants with skills or exceptional ability. This will allow businesses to find enough skilled workers and thereby maintain a competitive position in international markets.

Mr. President, skill-based, employer-sponsored visas only account for a small percentage of the overall number of visas. Only 10 percent are skill-based, whereas 90 percent are based on family connections.

In case there is any doubt, there are several safeguards that ensure American jobs will not be displaced by these increases. For example, before a person can be admitted under a third or sixth preference visa, the Department of Labor must determine that there is a labor shortage in the particular field and that the business cannot find an American skilled worker to fill the slot. In the alternative, under the third preference, they must determine that the potential immigrant is a member of a profession with "exceptional abilities."

Mr. President, as we debate the issue of legal immigration, we must keep one fundamental concept in mind—for America to remain a great country, we must have an immigration policy based on the needs of our country and focused on what is in the best interest of the Nation as a whole.

I urge Senators to support my amendment when the vote occurs tomorrow morning.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I congratulate and commend my friend from North Carolina for the points he has raised this evening and the support he has given to many of the provisions which we have included in our proposal—the compromise bill worked out between the Senator from Wyoming and myself.

He has touched on a number of proposals which we have debated at different times. But when we look back over the debate of just last year—where the vote was 88 to 4—the good Senator from North Carolina had sufficient objections to that proposal to be one of the four to vote against it. Yet much of that bill has been included in his substitute amendment. The fact that this evening he would support most of the provisions of our bill of last year, demonstrates a remarkable coming together of those of us who have supported the immigration reforms included in the Kennedy-Simpson bill—a number of which the Senator from North Carolina has included in his amendment.

So I do want to acknowledge at the outset that we have, with his support, and with his substitute, we have come a long way from the kinds of concerns he had at another time when he voted as one of four Senators in opposition to the legislation.

The Senator has mentioned a number of different areas in which we find agreement and some in which we have differences. I think, quite frankly, he has explained some of the reasons why he supports one approach and we support another. But let me just review very briefly the advantages I think are included in the proposal which Senator SIMPSON and I have placed before the Senate.

First of all, we set in motion a procedure which requires this body to revisit the issue of immigration 3 years from now. We have recognized that even when we required studies, for example, in the 1965 act, when we had the Western Hemisphere Commission that was to make recommendations, after they made the recommendations, that was it—no longer was there a possibility the Senate would revisit these issues.

So we require a review under expedited parliamentary procedures, so the country, the Senate, and the House are going to have to focus on these issues if there are inequities, and if there is unfairness. We are going to have to revisit it. An administration is going to have to take a position. I think that is important.

His proposal recommends some study but does not, I think, put any teeth into it with the kind of procedures I think are of such great importance.

The Senator rightly points out that we gave priority to members of families who are the closest members of the family, children rather than older members of the larger nuclear family. I think a strong case can be made for that. But quite frankly, in conversations with those groups which are most affected by that particular provision, I have been convinced that their position about the support for the larger nuclear family was sufficiently persuasive that we made adjustment on that point in restoring fifth preference.

The Senator points out the need for greater skills. We have taken steps as the Senator has pointed out even in the third preference where we require greater skills. To quote: "Visas shall be made available next and in a number not to exceed 23 percent of the worldwide level to qualified immigrants who are members of professions holding advanced degrees," but then we also point out "or because of their exceptional ability" in the sciences, arts, and business will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are supported by an employer. It is pretty broad.

We tried to provide some greater direction in the third preference in terms of skills. Again he mentions the importance of skills. We tried to address that. We also addressed it in the sixth preference where we have given a greater preference for skills, and I reference the legislation on page 93 that spells that out. And also in the independent category we provide points for skills.

So the Senator points out the greater number, and the greater need for skills. We made important progress, I think, in that area, but not as far as the Senator from North Carolina would like to go.

The principal concern that I have with this proposal is the cutback in the fifth preference. I have described it as illusory. The Senator was correct in that, because I think it is unfortunate to create a false sense of expectation that people may be eligible to get in when the waiting time may be in some instances many years.

I think it would be more realistic quite frankly if we followed what has been adopted in other countries where if they are not going to get in in 3, 4 years—a couple of countries have 2 years—we basically purge the list and start over again. But we have not had the hearings on that type of proposal. And it seems to me that until we are able to give that more adequate consideration it is not wise to cut back on the fifth preference and reallocate those visas in other areas until we are prepared to come to grips with the kinds of concerns that many of us have with the fifth preference.

It is not a perfect solution. The Senator from Wyoming knows that very well as I do. But this is not perfect legislation. But it does represent a compromise—the best we can, at this time, recommend to the Senate, and we think it is a solid product.

Mr. President, in conclusion, we have addressed the concerns which are included in the Senator's amendment in terms of skills. We have also recognized the longstanding tradition of giving special recognition to family reunification. The Senator from North Carolina's substitute would undermine an important aspect of that. And we set in motion a requirement that we will revisit this legislation in 3 years, which does not exist in his amendment.

So I want to say that I welcome the Senator's observations about the benefits of this legislation. The areas that we have a difference in I believe are

important, but measured against where we have come from, and the progress that we have made, I think this demonstrates the remarkable consensus that has really been developed in this whole legislative area.

Therefore, I indeed welcome the opportunity to clarify these differences. They are important, and I hope the Senator's amendment will be defeated. But I think it demonstrates how far we have come as an institution in immigration policy when we are able to have those who have expressed such serious reservations about this legislation a year and a half ago are prepared now to recognize and support many of those items which we have again included in this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that whenever the time is yielded in the allocation of amendments the time be equally divided between myself and the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, my remarks will be brief. We have approximately how much time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-one minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to congratulate our colleague from North Carolina for his very reasonable and generous amendment. It is something I am familiar with. That is the bill that Senator KENNEDY and I worked long and hard on, and to see if we could not bring it to fruition. But in the activity of legislating we come to, as I said earlier, the appropriate time to compromise an issue without compromising one's self. We did that in the bill that was presented to the Judiciary Committee. The amendment of Senator HELMS would hold the overall level of family-based immigration steady at current levels and increase immigration in the independent category. We are familiar with that. Senator KENNEDY has outlined well how far we have all come in our understanding of the legal immigration reform.

While preserving most of the visas in our new point system category, Senator HELMS would substantially increase the number of visas in the employer-sponsored category of visa. In fact, his amendment would increase the present third and sixth preferences in excess of 35,000 numbers. I believe one of the overall objectives of legal immigration reform is to try to preserve the present level of family-based immigration and increase the number of immigrants who would come here because they have these certain skills and qualities that would serve us well. That is indeed in our national interest. I believe Senator HELMS' proposal is a good way to achieve just that.

But when this bill, S. 358, passed the Senate Judiciary Committee I very reluctantly and yet very vividly and very much aware entered into a compromise that increased the overall number of visas in the family system without reallocating visas to the closest family member.

In my additional views to the committee report I said this: "The fifth preference should be deemphasized so that we may give proper priority to closer family members, skilled workers and other immigrants that our labor market needs. I deeply regret that the committee bill does not recognize this principle."

I am very aware that the fifth preference was eliminated right here on this floor twice on previous occasions. And I deeply feel that it is something that should be revisited, and yet part of my accommodation and compromise would be that we would retain the fifth preference exactly as it is. I am committed to that. I will support that. That will be evident.

But I certainly say to my colleagues that the Helms amendment responds to what I believe should be the priorities in our immigration policy, and yet I am bound by my earlier agreement to my subcommittee members, my colleagues, Senator KENNEDY, and Senator SIMPSON, to vote against the amendment. I do so but I still believe very strongly—as we all have come to support—that a national level of immigration to me is more important than anything we are attempting to reach. And for that reason I will not be able to support the Helms amendment.

But I think it is obviously a very thoughtful proposal, and I think the distinctions drawn by the Senator from Massachusetts with his thoughtful approach gives all of us a better idea of what it is we are trying to do, and that is continue to keep our eye on the rabbit; and, that is our national interest. That is what we are here to serve. If we can keep that in mind, we will process this bill appropriately.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, we will have a half-hour to continue this debate tomorrow morning, starting at 11 o'clock, the idea that we will have a yea-and-nay vote at 11:30.

In terms of the consideration of the legislation, we will not have further debate on this legislation but, as I understand, when we go off morning business tomorrow, we will have a half-hour for debate on this, the time to be evenly divided between the Senator from North Carolina and the managers of the bill; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 31 minutes—16 minutes for the Senator from North Carolina and 14 minutes for the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is fine. Understanding if that is agreeable with the Senator from North Carolina, we will continue the debate tomorrow and move on to other matters this evening.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Kalbaugh, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawals which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations and withdrawals received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States announced that on June 30, 1989, he approved and signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 694. An act to extend title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

S. 1077. An act to authorize the President to appoint Admiral James B. Busey to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

S. 1180. An act to authorize the President to appoint Rear Admiral Richard Harrison Truly to the Office of Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

S. 1184. An act to allow the obsolete destroyer United States Ship *Edson* (DD946) to be transferred to the Intrepid Sea-Air-Space Museum in New York before the expiration of the otherwise applicable sixty-day congressional review period.

S.J. Res. 96. Joint resolution designating July 2, 1989, as "National Literacy Day".

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1989, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 27, 1989, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 1077. An act to authorize the President to appoint Admiral James B. Busey to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration;

S. 1180. An act to authorize the President to appoint Rear Admiral Richard Harrison Truly to the Office of Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

H.R. 923. An act to redesignate the Federal hydropower generating facilities located

at Dam B on the Neches River at Town Bluff, Texas, as the "Robert Douglas Willis Hydropower Project";

H.R. 2402. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 132. Joint resolution to designate the second Sunday on October of 1989 as "National Children's Day";

H.J. Res. 276. Joint resolution designating September 14, 1989, as "National D.A.R.E. Day"; and

H.J. Res. 298. Joint resolution designating July 14, 1989, as "National Day to Commemorate the Bastille Day Centennial".

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1989, the enrolled bills and joint resolutions were subsequently signed on June 28, 1989, during the recess of the Senate, by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1989, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 28, 1989, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives stating that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1184. An act to allow the obsolete destroyer United States Ship *Edson* (DD 946) to be transferred to the Intrepid Sea-Air-Space Museum in New York before the expiration of the otherwise applicable sixty-day congressional review period.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2119) to authorize the exchange of certain Federal public land in Madison County, Illinois.

The message further announced that the Speaker, under the authority granted by the House on June 22, 1989, makes the following corrections in the appointment of conferees on H.R. 1278, to reform, recapitalize, and consolidate the Federal deposit insurance system, to enhance the regulatory and enforcement powers of Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies, and for other purposes:

First. For the second panel from the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, delete section 223 of the House bill from the sections under consideration.

Second. For the first panel from the Committee on Ways and Means, add section 1412 of the Senate amendment as a section for consideration.

Third. For the second panel from the Committee on Ways and Means, delete section 503 of the Senate amendment from the sections under consideration.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 1184. An act to allow the obsolete destroyer United States Ship *Edson* (DD 946) to be transferred to the Intrepid Sea-Air-Space Museum in New York before the expiration of the otherwise applicable sixty-day congressional review period.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1989, the enrolled bill was signed on June 29, 1989, during the recess of the Senate, by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1989, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 29, 1989, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 694. An act to extend title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act; and

H.R. 2119. An act to authorize the exchange of certain Federal public land in Madison County, Illinois.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1989, the enrolled bills were signed on June 29, 1989, during the recess of the Senate by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1989, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 30, 1989, received a message from the House of Representatives, announcing that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 694) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to extend the authority for the strategic petroleum reserve, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 403(a)(3) of Public Law 100-533, the minority leader appoints from private life Ms. Marilu Meyer, Chicago, IL, to serve as a member of the National Women's Business Council, on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 403(a)(3) of Public Law 100-533, the Speaker appoints the following individuals from private life to the National Women's Business Council, on the part of the House: Mrs. Esther Shapiro, Los Angeles, CA; and Ms. Gilliam Rudd, Washington, DC.

The message also announced that the Speaker appoints Mr. JAMES as an additional conferee in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1278) entitled "An Act to reform, recapitalize, and consolidate the Federal deposit insurance system, to enhance the regulatory and enforcement powers of Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies, and for other purposes", vice Mr. HYDE, excused.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following joint resolutions, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 10, 1989, through September 16, 1989, as "National Check-Up Week";

S.J. Res. 96. Joint resolution designating July 2, 1989, as "National Literacy Day"; and

S.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution designating January 7, 1990, through January 13, 1990, as "National Law Enforcement Training Week".

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

S.J. Res. 96. Joint resolution designating July 2, 1989, as "National Literacy Day".

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1989, the enrolled joint resolution was signed on June 30, 1989, during the recess of the Senate by the Vice President.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:21 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 536. An act to amend chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, to allow claims against the United States under that chapter for damages arising from certain negligent medical care provided members of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 801. An act to designate the United States Court of Appeals Building at 56 Forsyth Street in Atlanta, GA, as the "Elbert P. Tuttle United States Court of Appeals Building";

H.R. 901. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve programs for the recruitment and retention of health-care personnel of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to extend certain expiring programs of that Department, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1048. An act to provide for the acquisition and publication of data about crimes that manifest prejudice based on certain group characteristics;

H.R. 1199. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve recruitment and retention of nurses in the Department of Veterans Affairs by providing greater flexibility in the pay system for those nurses and to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide certain procreative services for married veterans with service-connected disabilities which impair their ability to procreate;

H.R. 1334. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove a limitation relating to the payment of pension to veterans furnished hospital care by the Department of Veterans Affairs on a long-term basis and to reduce the period of time that a surviving spouse must have been married to a veteran who dies while in receipt of compensation for a service-connected disability in order for the surviving spouse to be eligible for dependency and indemnity compensation;

H.R. 2214. An act to ratify certain agreements relating to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations;

H.R. 2467. An act entitled the "1988 Disaster Assistance Extension Act";

H.R. 2557. An act to designate the outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be located on New Jersey State Route 70 in Brick Township, NJ, as the

"James J. Howard Veterans Outpatient Clinic";

H.R. 2569. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Saginaw, MI, as the "Aleda E. Lutz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center";

H.R. 2655. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to rewrite the authorities of that act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and to eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions to amend the Arms Export Control Act and redesignate that act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1990 and 1991, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2696. An act making appropriations for energy and ester development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2705. An act relating to the method by which Government contributions to the Federal employees health benefits program shall be computed for 1990 or 1991 if no Government-wide indemnity benefit plan participates in that year;

H.R. 2749. An act to authorize the conveyance of a parcel of land in Whitney Lake, TX;

H.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution designating February 16, 1990, as "Lithuanian Independence Day";

H.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to designate the decade beginning January 1, 1990, as the "Decade of the Brain"; and

H.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to authorize entry into force of the Compact of Free Association between the United States and the Government of Palau, and for other purposes.

At 4:33 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2136. An act to amend the District of Columbia Code to limit the length of time for which an individual may be incarcerated for civil contempt in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill, received by the Senate for concurrence on June 22, 1989, was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2550. An act to provide for certain forms of assistance to Poland and Hungary to encourage the process of democratic reforms in those countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 536. An act to amend chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, to allow claims against the United States under that chapter for damages arising from certain negligent medical care provided members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 801. An act to designate the United States Court of Appeals Building at 56 Forsyth Street in Atlanta, Georgia, as the "Elbert P. Tuttle United States Court of Appeals Building"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 901. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve programs for the recruitment and retention of health-care personnel of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to extend certain expiring programs of that Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1048. An act to provide for the acquisition and publication of data about crimes that manifest prejudice based on certain group characteristics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1199. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve recruitment and retention of nurses in the Department of Veterans Affairs by providing greater flexibility in the pay system for those nurses and to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide certain procreative services for married veterans with service-connected disabilities which impair their ability to procreate; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1334. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove a limitation relating to the payment of pension to veterans furnished hospital care by the Department of Veterans Affairs on a long-term basis and to reduce the period of time that a surviving spouse must have been married to a veteran who dies while in receipt of compensation for a service-connected disability in order for the surviving spouse to be eligible for dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2136. An act to amend the District of Columbia Code to limit the length of time for which an individual may be incarcerated for civil contempt in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2467. An act entitled the "1988 Disaster Assistance Extension Act"; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 2557. An act to designate the outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be located on New Jersey States Route 70 in Brick Township, New Jersey, as the "James J. Howard Veterans Outpatient Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2569. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Saginaw, Michigan, as the "Aleda E. Lutz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 2655. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to rewrite the authorities of that Act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and to eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions, to amend the Arms Export Control Act and redesignate that Act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1990 and 1991, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2696. An act making appropriations for energy and ester development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2749. An act to authorize the conveyance of a parcel of land in Whitney Lake, Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution designating February 16, 1990, as "Lithuanian Independence Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to designate the decade beginning January 1, 1990, as the "Decade of the Brain"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to authorize entry into force of the Compact of Free Association between the United States and the Government of Palau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2705. An act relating to the method by which Government contributions to the Federal employees health benefits program shall be computed for 1990 or 1991 if no Governmentwide indemnity benefit plan participates in that year.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate announced that he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

On June 28, 1989:

S. 1007. An act to authorize the President to appoint Adm. James B. Busey to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration; and

S. 1180. An act to authorize the President to appoint Rear Adm. Richard Harrison Truly to the Office of Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

On June 29, 1989:

S. 694. An act to extend title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act; and

S. 1184. An act to allow the obsolete destroyer United States ship Edson (DD 946) to be transferred to the Intrepid Sea-Air-Space Museum in New York before the expiration of the Otherwise applicable sixty-day congressional review period.

On June 30, 1989:

S.J. Res. 96. Joint resolution designating July 2, 1989, as "National Literacy Day."

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1312. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National School Lunch Act and Child Nutrition Act of 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

EC-1313. A communication from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a contract award report for the period July 1, 1989, to August 31, 1989; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1314. A communication from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the update of the RDT&E Annex to the 5-year defense program for the fiscal years 1990 and 1991 budget revision; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1315. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide the Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy authority to confer the degree of master of arts in leader development; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1316. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize increased flexibility in the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship Program by providing a grant to medical residents studying in critically needed skills in return for military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1317. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles 10, 14, and 37, United States Code relating to the promotion, separation, and mandatory retirement of warrant officers of the armed forces, establish the grade of chief warrant officer WS5, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1318. A communication from the Deputy Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles 10, and 37, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the management of health care personnel in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1319. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Naval Petroleum Reserves Divestiture and Energy Security Enhancement Act"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1320. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to make such refinements to medical care sections as necessary for consistency and clarification; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1321. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to permit members of the uniformed services and their dependents to defer travel authorized in conjunction with a consecutive overseas tour for up to one year; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1322. A communication from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 ("Advisers Act") to provide for the establishment of one or more self-regulatory organizations for registered investment advisers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1323. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on security expenditures in public housing; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1324. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the results of a review of regulatory and examination documents related to thrifts which failed between January 1, 1985, and September 30, 1987; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1325. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Land Remote-Sensing Commercialization Act of 1984 in order to transfer responsibility for archiving land remote sensing data to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1326. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 for the period of January 1, 1988, through December 31, 1988; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1327. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the requirements for the issuance and retention of licenses, certificates of registry and merchant mariners documents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1328. A communication from the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consent to certain amendments enacted by the legislature of the State of Hawaii to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1329. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law the Federal Coal Management Report for fiscal year 1988; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1330. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the U.S. Continental Scientific Drilling Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1331. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain overpayments of offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1332. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain overpayments of offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1333. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Building Project Surveys for Boulder, Colorado, and Monterey, California, and three lease prospectuses; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1334. A communication from the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Authority; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1335. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "High Volume and High Payment Procedures in the Medicaid Population"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1336. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1988; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1337. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 8-43 adopted by the Council on May 30, 1989; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1338. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 8-43 adopted by the Council on May 30, 1989; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1339. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 8-44 adopted by the Council on May 30, 1989; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1340. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 8-46 adopted by the Council on May 30, 1989; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1341. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 8-45 adopted by the Council on May 30, 1989; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1342. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Electronic Funds Transfer Salary Act of 1989", and an analysis and a comparative type; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1343. A communication from the Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Commission under the Freedom of Information Act for fiscal year 1988; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1344. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend provisions of law relating to settlement of admiralty claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1345. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General of the Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on alternatives to the present manner of prosecuting Federal drug related offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1346. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the "Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1347. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a document entitled "Final Regulations for the Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship Program"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1348. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Higher Education Act Amendments of 1989"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1349. A communication from the Assistant Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Children and Youths"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1350. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, section 5004(a)(3)(A), United States Code, to raise the Department of Veterans Affairs' minor construction cost limitation

from $2 million to $3 million and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1351. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Senior Executive Salary Act"; to the Committee on the Government Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-166. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Heflin, Alabama, urging support for an extension of the Small Issue Bond Program for manufacturing facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

POM-167. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 6

"Whereas the First Congress of the United States of America, at its first session, sitting in New York, New York, on September 25, 1789, in both houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds, has proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words:

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled two thirds of both Houses concurring,* That the following (Article) be proposed to the legislatures of the several states, as (an Amendment) to the Constitution of the United States, * * * which (Article), when ratified by three fourths of said legislatures, to be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the said Constitution, viz;

"'(An Article) in addition to, and Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, proposed by Congress, and ratified by the legislatures of the several states, pursuant to the fifth Article of the original Constitution.

"'ARTICLE

"'No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.'

"Whereas Article V of the Constitution of the United States allows the ratification of the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution by the legislature of the State of Minnesota; and

"Whereas the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States has already been ratified by the legislatures of twenty-seven states: Maryland on December 19, 1789; North Carolina on December 22, 1789; South Carolina on January 19, 1790; Delaware on January 28, 1790; Vermont on November 3, 1791; Virginia on December 15, 1791; Ohio on May 6, 1873; Wyoming on March 3, 1978; Maine on April 27, 1983; Colorado on April 18, 1984; South Dakota on February 21, 1985; New Hampshire on March 7, 1985; Arizona on April 3, 1985; Tennessee on May 23, 1985; Oklahoma on July 10, 1985; New Mexico on February 13, 1986; Indiana on February 19, 1986; Utah on February 25, 1986; Arkansas on March 5, 1987; Montana on March 11, 1987; Connecticut on May 13, 1987; Wisconsin on June 30, 1987; Georgia on February 2, 1988; West Virginia on March 10, 1988; Louisiana on July 6, 1988; Iowa on February 7, 1989; and Idaho on March 28, 1989; and

"Whereas Article V of the Constitution of the United States does not state a time limit on ratification of an amendment submitted by Congress, and the First Congress specifically did not provide a time limit for ratification of the proposed amendment; and

"Whereas the United States Supreme Court has ruled in *Coleman* v. *Miller*, 307 U.S. 433 (1939), that an amendment to the United States Constitution may be ratified by states at any time, and Congress must then finally decide whether a reasonable time has elapsed since its submission when, in the presence of certified ratifications by three-fourths of the states, the time arrives for the promulgation of the adoption of the amendment; and

"Whereas Section 9 of Article IV of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota provides that "No increase of compensation shall take effect during the period for which the members of the existing House of Representatives may have been elected."; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Minnesota finds that the proposed amendment is still meaningful and needed as part of the United States Constitution; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is ratified by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; and be it further

"Resolved That the Secretary of State of Minnesota shall transmit certified copies of this memorial to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration."

POM-168. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

"RESOLUTION No. 1717

"Whereas the ongoing labor dispute between the management of Eastern Airlines and the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers is having a significant impact on the economy of Florida and the traveling public both within and without the state, and

"Whereas by example, for the first three quarters of 1988, Eastern Airlines had 41 percent of the share of total traffic carried by all air carriers serving Miami, 37 percent of the total serving Pensacola, and 79 percent of the total serving Gainesville, and

"Whereas if the strike against Eastern Airlines continues, the detrimental impact upon the commercial and tourist-related activities within Florida will increase to levels which may have a permanent effect upon the economy of the state, and

"Whereas, the 101st Congress of the United States is presently considering H.R. 1231, which would direct the President of the United States to create a board to investigate and report to the President respecting the disputes between Eastern Airlines and the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, the Airline Pilots Association, and the Transport Workers Union of America, and

"Whereas creation of such a board would expedite the solution of the dispute between the aforementioned parties, resulting in a return to normal air service in Florida to the betterment of all interests concerned at the earliest possible date, now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States is requested to adopt H.R. 1231 at the earliest possible date so that a resolution to the dispute between Eastern Airlines and its collective bargaining units may be secured in an orderly and timely manner; and be it further

"Resolved That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of June 22, 1989, the following reports of committees were submitted on July 6, 1989:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 83. A bill to establish the amount of costs of the Department of Energy's uranium enrichment program that have not previously been recovered from enrichment customers in the charges of the Department of Energy to its customers (Rept. No. 101-60).

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 267. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Idaho to Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Blevins of Kuna, ID (Rept. No. 101-61).

S. 830. A bill to amend Public Law 99-647, establishing the Blackstone River Valley Heritage Corridor Commission, to authorize the Commission to take immediate action in furtherance of its purposes and to increase the authorization of appropriations for the Commission (Rept. No. 101-63).

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

H.R. 1485. A bill to provide for the sale of certain Federal lands to Clark County, NV, for national defense and other purposes (Rept. No. 101-65).

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of July 6, 1989, the following reports of committees were submitted on July 6, 1989:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 338. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the development of a trails interpretation center in the city of Council Bluffs, IA, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 101-62).

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 310. A bill to remove a restriction from a parcel of land in Roanoke, VA, in order for that land to be conveyed to the State of Virginia for use as a veterans nursing home (Rept. No. 101-64).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment:

S. 797. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to improve the education of children by establishing a National Endowment for Children's Educational Television, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 101-66).

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 890. A bill to authorize a certificate of documentation for the vessel *HMS Discovery* (Rept. No. 101-67).

S. 904. A bill to permit issuance of a certificate of documentation for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for the vessel the *African Queen* (Rept. No. 101-68).

S. 1148. A bill to authorize issuance of a certificate of documentation for the vessel M/V *Northern Victor* (Rept. No. 101-69).

S. 1172. A bill to authorize a certificate of documentation for a vessel (Rept. No. 101-70).

H.R. 840. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Federal Maritime Commission (Rept. No. 101-71).

H.R. 968. A bill to provide for the Federal reimbursement of local noise abatement funds (Rept. No. 101-72).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1036. A bill to improve the economic, community, and educational well-being of rural America, and for other purposes (Rept. 101-73).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

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

S. 1282. A bill to provide disaster assistance to producers on a farm who suffered certain losses in the quantity of the 1989 crop of a commodity harvested as the result of damaging weather or related conditions in 1988 or 1989, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 1283. A bill to provide disaster assistance to producers who suffered certain losses in the quantity of the 1989 crop of a commodity harvested as the result of damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. BURNS):

S. 1284. A bill to provide for repayment of Impact Aid overpayments for the Hays Lodge Pole school district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 1285. A bill to provide for the gradual reduction of expenses incurred by the United States in deploying United States forces in NATO countries and in Japan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KASTEN:

S. 1286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a maximum long-term capital gains rate of 15 percent and indexing of certain capital assets; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. DECONCINI):

S. 1287. A bill to provide for adherence with the MacBride Principles by United States persons doing business in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DECONCINI:

S. 1288. A bill to provide for a temporary stay of deportation for nationals of the People's Republic of China, to provide authority to work during the temporary stay, and to provide a mechanism for adjustment to permanent status at the end of the temporary stay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. GORTON):

S. 1289. A bill to improve the management of forests and woodlands and the production of forest resources on Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SIMON:

S. 1290. A bill to guarantee a work opportunity for all Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DODD, Mr. SIMON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. GLENN):

S. 1291. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1292. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on tefluthrin; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HEINZ:

S. 1293. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to clarify that such Act applies to benefits, to authorize employers to employ older individuals while permitting such employers to provide unequal benefits to such older individuals in certain instances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 1294. A bill to encourage the transfer of national defense energy technology from the Department of Energy's defense program contractors to the private sector for commercialization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARN (for himself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BOND, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PELL, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SASSER, and Mr. SHELBY):

S.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to designate July 2, 1989, as "Space Exploration Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

S. 1282. A bill to provide disaster assistance to producers on a farm who suffered certain losses in the quantity of the 1989 crop of a commodity harvested as the result of damaging weather or a related condition in 1988 or 1989, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE EXTENSION ACT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation to extend the provisions of the Disaster Assistance Act of 1988 to cover 1989 crops, to improve assistance to livestock producers, to provide emergency water assistance to small communities and to provide assistance to rural businesses.

We have heard much about the severe damage to the winter wheat crop. However, other areas of the Nation are also suffering from the continuing drought.

In Iowa, for example, we are receiving a little more rain than last year, but not nearly enough to recover from the severe drought of 1988. The first 6 months of 1988 were the driest ever on record in Iowa, so it doesn't take much rain to do a little better.

For the first 6 months of 1989, Iowa received an average of 5 inches less than normal precipitation. Nearly all of the State remains in extreme drought.

According to the Iowa Crops and Weather Report for the week ending July 9, 93 percent of the respondents across the State indicated that topsoil is short of moisture, while 99 percent indicated subsoil moisture as short.

With the temperatures in Iowa at or above 100 degrees in recent days, our row crops are hanging by a thread and yields are beginning to suffer. Hay, pasture, and small grains have already been hit hard.

In fact, Iowa farmers face the prospect of even worse losses than last year because of the lack of subsoil moisture reserves.

Even if we had normal rainfall from now on, our crops will suffer from the lack of subsoil reserves, which are badly needed during the critical growing months of July and August.

So the legislation I am introducing today covers all crops.

And I commend our Agriculture Committee Chairman Senator LEAHY for scheduling a hearing on disaster assistance for July 13 at which we will consider the condition of all crops in

the various regions of the country and the assistance that is needed.

Secretary Yeutter has said that the administration would accept a winter wheat bill, but not a bill covering all crops. This Senator is not about to accept a bill that will help the producers of only one crop while farmers in Iowa and other parts of the country are left out.

Secretary Yeutter has also said that losses to crops other than winter wheat have not yet been shown and that it's too early to pass a broader bill. But we already have losses in other crops. Moreover, disaster payments are not made unless actual losses occur.

We don't need to wait until later to act. We can do something that we do far too seldom in Government—get out in front of the problem and have a program in place to respond to needs if and when they arise.

Some have suggested that a winter wheat bill would be fair because winter wheat producers did not receive assistance in 1988. But winter wheat was covered in the 1988 bill and disaster assistance was available to those producers if they had needed it.

It's just that 1988 was generally a good year for winter wheat producers, with basically good yields and prices. Now the question is the assistance to be provided for 1989 crops.

I cannot see any reason to give winter wheat special treatment in 1989 simply because winter wheat producers were fortunate enough not to need disaster payments in 1988.

The year 1988 will be remembered as the year this Nation was hit by the worst widespread drought in over 50 years.

It will also be remembered as the year in which Congress and the administration worked together in a spirit of bipartisan cooperation to craft fair and comprehensive disaster assistance legislation.

It's now clear that the devastation of the drought did not end with the 1988 crop, and that our job of helping to deal with that devastation is not yet finished.

I sincerely hope that we will again see that spirit of bipartisan cooperation between the administration and Congress as we formulate disaster assistance this year.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 1283. A bill to provide disaster assistance to producers who suffered certain losses in the quantity of the 1989 crop of commodity harvested as the result of damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE EXTENSION ACT

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today, on behalf of Senator PRESSLER and myself, I am introducing a comprehensive disaster assistance bill for agriculture.

We all know that the drought has devastated the winter wheat crop in Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and other winter wheat States. And despite rains earlier this year it is now clear that the drought is continuing. Spring crops in many States are threatened.

In my own State of North Dakota, Mr. President, the fields were green just 3 weeks ago. It looked like we were finally recovering from last year's drought—the worst in over half a century. But record temperatures in the past few days have blistered the crops in my State. Wind and heat have destroyed the topsoil moisture, and last year's drought left us with no subsoil moisture. We have no reserves to draw on.

Already in North Dakota we will now lose an average of 35 percent of our crops statewide. In some areas the losses will be as high as 80 percent.

Mr. President, the drought hit my State harder than any other last year. North Dakota's economy is dependent on agriculture, and we took a beating. We simply cannot sustain another.

We are not alone in North Dakota. Farmers all across the Great Plains face the same bleak outlook. American winter wheat production is down some 8 percent from last year—the lowest in 11 years. Winter winds ripped away more than 14 million acres of topsoil in the Great Plains. Subsoil moisture levels in the Plains States are well below the 5-year average, despite some rainfall in some parts in recent weeks.

Cattle producers must sell off their stock because of poor pasture conditions, scarce feed, and low water supplies. Many rural communities are struggling to supply their residents with drinking water. Projections from North Dakota State University indicate that crops in many regions can withstand only 1 or 2 weeks of hot, dry weather before yield losses match those of 1988. Unfortunately for all of us, hot, dry weather is exactly what the forecasters are promising.

Mr. President, in the last 2 days of my trip to North Dakota and temperatures reached 105 degrees. Just for a moment, think about what that means. We are 2 weeks away from a repeat of last year, the worst drought this Nation has seen in 50 years. A dozen counties in North Dakota have already suffered crop losses ranging from 60 to 80 percent.

North Dakota State University estimates we will lose 31 percent of our spring wheat, 26 percent of our durum, and 25 percent of our barley, and that is if conditions do not deteriorate. Without consistent rainfall between now and harvest, crops like corn and soybeans will also suffer heavy losses. It is not likely the rain we will need will come.

Forecasters predict high temperatures with low rainfall for July. That forecast spells disaster for the Great Plains farmers. The winter wheat farmers already hit by the drought in Kansas, Oklahoma, and other States deserve assistance. Make no mistake, we are only going to get one crack at a drought relief bill this year. We will have one bill and one chance to provide help to those in need. We must be ready to offset spring crop losses farmers have already suffered and the further losses which are likely to come. The bill we are introducing today, the Disaster Assistance Extension Act of 1989, will accomplish those goals.

The bill extends the provisions of last year's drought relief legislation with some important changes. Major revisions include coverage for organic production and other excluded crops; increased daily feed allotments for livestock; use of extension service data and other sources for nonprogrammed crop histories; upgraded water assistance programs; and aid for grasslands maintenance.

Mr. President, the 1988 bill was a good bill, but it overlooked a few critical needs. This measure seeks to correct those problems, while continuing the core provisions of the 1988 law. Some will argue that disaster assistance to farmers will be costly. That is simply not true. Because of last year's drought, enormous savings were realized in the Federal program. A total of $3.9 billion was spent on drought relief last year for a savings of more than $8 billion in the farm program.

In other words, Mr. President, the cost was more than offset by the savings created by the drought. Those savings were a direct result of the drought and were borne by the farmers who suffered in the drought. The past decade has been the hardest for farmers since the Great Depression. Net farm income has plummeted. The sagging farm economy has rippled out to cause real hardship in rural communities around the Nation. Farm-based rural economics cannot withstand another blow.

Mr. President, I want to take a moment to commend Chairman LEAHY for his foresight and leadership on this issue. Some weeks ago, when some of our colleagues were pressing for immediate action on a bill to relieve winter-wheat farmers, Chairman LEAHY recognized the need to proceed with caution. His good judgment has been validated by the weather forecasters, and I thank him for his support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Disaster Assistance Extension Act of 1989 be printed in its entirety and two drought-related arti-

cles from the Fargo Forum and Minot Daily News be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1283

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Disaster Assistance Extension Act of 1989".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—EMERGENCY CROP LOSS ASSISTANCE

SUBTITLE A—ANNUAL CROPS

Sec. 101. Payments to program participants for target price commodities.
Sec. 102. Payments to program nonparticipants for target price commodities.
Sec. 103. Peanuts, sugar, and tobacco.
Sec. 104. Soybeans, and nonprogram crops.
Sec. 105. Crop quality reduction disaster payments.
Sec. 106. Effect of Federal crop insurance payments.
Sec. 107. Crop insurance coverage for the 1990 crops.
Sec. 108. Crops harvested for forage uses.
Sec. 109. Payment limitations.
Sec. 110. De minimis yields.

SUBTITLE B—FOREST CROPS

Sec. 121. Eligibility.
Sec. 122. Assistance.
Sec. 123. Limitation on assistance.
Sec. 124. Definition.
Sec. 125. Duplicative payments.

SUBTITLE C—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sec. 131. Ineligibility.
Sec. 132. Timing and manner of assistance.
Sec. 133. Commodity Credit Corporation.
Sec. 134. Regulations.

TITLE II—EMERGENCY LIVESTOCK ASSISTANCE

Sec. 201. Quantities of emergency feed assistance.
Sec. 202. Livestock transportation assistance.
Sec. 203. Assistance for ponds.
Sec. 204. Livestock water development projects.

TITLE III—COMMODITY STOCK ADJUSTMENT

Sec. 301. Planting of alternate crops on permitted acreage.

TITLE IV—DISASTER CREDIT AND FORBEARANCE

Sec. 401. Emergency loans.
Sec. 402. 1990 farm operating loans.
Sec. 403. Forbearance and restructuring for farm loans.

TITLE V—CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE

Sec. 501. Haying and grazing on CRP acreage.
Sec. 502. Management of National Grasslands.

TITLE VI—RURAL BUSINESSES

Sec. 601. Disaster assistance for rural business enterprises.

TITLE VII—WATER-RELATED ASSISTANCE

Sec. 701. Emergency conservation program.
Sec. 702. Emergency community water assistance grant program.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) DAMAGING WEATHER.—The term "damaging weather" includes drought, hail, excessive moisture, freeze, tornado, hurricane, or excessive wind, or any combination thereof.

(2) RELATED CONDITION.—The term "related condition" includes insect infestation, plant disease, or other deterioration of a crop of a commodity either before or after harvest that is accelerated or exacerbated naturally as a result of damaging weather.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE I—EMERGENCY CROP LOSS ASSISTANCE

Subtitle A—Annual Crops

SEC. 101. PAYMENTS TO PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS FOR TARGET PRICE COMMODITIES.

(a) DISASTER PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective only for producers on a farm who elected to participate in the production adjustment program established under the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.) for the 1989 crop of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, extra long staple cotton, or rice, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, if the Secretary determines that, because of damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989, the total quantity of the 1989 crop of the commodity that such producers are able to harvest on the farm is less than the result of multiplying 65 percent of the farm program payment yield established by the Secretary for such crop by the sum of the acreage planted for harvest and the acreage prevented from being planted (because of a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary) for such crop, the Secretary shall make a disaster payment available to such producers at a rate equal to—

(A) 65 percent of the established price for the crop for any deficiency in production greater than 35 percent, but not greater than 75 percent, for the crop; and

(B) 90 percent of the established price for the crop for any deficiency in production greater than 75 percent for the crop.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) ACREAGE IN EXCESS OF PERMITTED ACREAGE.—Payments provided under paragraph (1) for a crop of a commodity may not be made available to producers on a farm with respect to any acreage in excess of the permitted acreage for the farm for the commodity.

(B) CROP INSURANCE.—Payments provided under paragraph (1) for a crop of a commodity may not be made available to producers on a farm unless such producers enter into an agreement to obtain multiperil crop insurance, to the extent required under section 107.

(3) DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS.—The total quantity of a crop of a commodity on which deficiency payments otherwise would be payable to producers on a farm under the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall be reduced by the quantity on which a payment is made to the producers for the crop under paragraph (1).

(b) ADVANCE DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS.—

(1) APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION.—This subsection shall apply only to producers on a farm who elected to participate in the production adjustment program established under the Agricultural Act of 1949 for the 1989 crop of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, or rice.

(2) FORGIVENESS OF REFUND REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), if because of damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989 the total quantity of the 1989 crop of the commodity that the producers are able to harvest on the farm is less than the result of multiplying the farm program payment yield established by the Secretary for such crop by the sum of the acreage planted for harvest and the acreage prevented from being planted (because of a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary) for such crop (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "qualifying amount"), the producers shall not be required to refund any advance deficiency payment made to the producers for such crop under section 107C of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1445b-2) with respect to that portion of the deficiency in production that does not exceed 35 percent of the qualifying amount.

(B) CROP INSURANCE.—Producers on a farm shall not be eligible for the forgiveness provided for under subparagraph (A), unless such producers enter into an agreement to obtain multiperil crop insurance, to the extent required under section 107.

(3) ELECTION FOR NONRECIPIENTS.—The Secretary shall allow producers on a farm who elected, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, not to receive advance deficiency payments made available for the 1989 crop under section 107C of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to elect (within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act) whether to receive such advance deficiency payments.

(4) EARLIEST DATE FOR REFUND REQUIREMENT.—Effective only for the 1989 crops of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice, if the Secretary determines that any portion of the advance deficiency payment made to producers for the crop under section 107C of the Agricultural Act of 1949 must be refunded, such refund shall not be required prior to July 31, 1990, for that portion of the crop for which a disaster payment is made under subsection (a).

SEC. 102. PAYMENTS TO PROGRAM NONPARTICIPANTS FOR TARGET PRICE COMMODITIES.

(a) DISASTER PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective only for producers on a farm who elected not to participate in the production adjustment program established under the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.) for the 1989 crop of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, extra long staple cotton, or rice, if the Secretary determines that because of damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989, the total quantity of the 1989 crop of the commodity that such producers are able to harvest on the farm is less than the result of multiplying 65 percent of the county average yield established by the Secretary for such crop by the sum of acreage planted for harvest and the acreage for which prevented planted credit is approved by the Secretary for such crop under subsection (b), the Secretary shall make a disaster payment available to such producers.

(2) PAYMENT RATE.—The payment shall be made to the producers at a rate equal to—

(A) 65 percent of the basic county loan rate (or a comparable price if there is no current basic county loan rate) for the crop, as determined by the Secretary, for any deficiency in production greater than 35 percent, but not greater than 75 percent, for the crop; and

(B) 90 percent of the basic county loan rate (or a comparable price if there is no

current basic county loan rate) for the crop, as determined by the Secretary, for any deficiency in production greater than 75 percent for the crop.

(b) PREVENTED PLANTING CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide prevented planting credit under subsection (a) with respect to acreage that producers on a farm were prevented from planting to the 1989 crop of the commodity for harvest because of damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) MAXIMUM ACREAGE.—Such acreage may not exceed the greater of—

(A) a quantity equal to the acreage on the farm planted (or prevented from being planted due to a natural disaster or other condition beyond the control of the producers) to the commodity for harvest in 1987 minus acreage actually planted to the commodity for harvest in 1989; or

(B) a quantity equal to the average of the acreage on the farm planted (or prevented from being planted due to a natural disaster or other condition beyond the control of the producers) to the commodity for harvest in 1985, 1986, and 1987 minus acreage actually planted to the commodity for harvest in 1989.

(3) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall make appropriate adjustments in applying the limitations contained in paragraph (2) to take into account crop rotation practices of the producers.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) ACREAGE LIMITATION PROGRAM.—The amount of payments made available to producers on a farm for a crop of a commodity under subsection (a) shall be reduced by a factor equivalent to the acreage limitation program percentage established for such crop under the Agricultural Act of 1949.

(2) CROP INSURANCE.—Payments provided under subsection (a) for a crop of a commodity may not be made available to the producers on a farm unless such producers enter into an agreement to obtain multiperil crop insurance, to the extent required under section 107.

SEC. 103. PEANUTS, SUGAR, AND TOBACCO.

(a) DISASTER PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective only for the 1989 crops of peanuts, sugar beets, sugarcane, and tobacco, if the Secretary determines that, because of damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989, the total quantity of the 1989 crop of the commodity that the producers on a farm are able to harvest is less than the result of multiplying 65 percent of the county average yield (or program yield, in the case of peanuts) established by the Secretary for such crop by the sum of the acreage planted for harvest and the acreage for which prevented planted credit is approved by the Secretary for such crop under subsection (b), the Secretary shall make a disaster payment available to such producers.

(2) PAYMENT RATE.—The payment shall be made to the producers at a rate equal to—

(i) 65 percent of the applicable payment level under paragraph (3), as determined by the Secretary, for any deficiency in production greater than 35 percent, but not greater than 75 percent, for the crop (or in the case of a crop of burley tobacco or fluecured tobacco, for any deficiency in production greater than 35 percent, but not greater than 75 percent, of the farm's effective marketing quota for 1989); and

(ii) 90 percent of the applicable payment level under paragraph (3), as determined by the Secretary, for any deficiency in production greater than 75 percent for the crop (or, in the case of burley tobacco or fluecured tobacco, for any deficiency in production greater than 75 percent of the farm's effective marketing quota for 1989).

(3) PAYMENT LEVEL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the payment level for a commodity shall be equal to—

(A) for peanuts, the price support level for quota peanuts or the price support level for additional peanuts, as applicable;

(B) for tobacco, the national average loan rate for the type of tobacco involved, or (if there is none) the market price, as determined under section 104(a)(2); and

(C) for sugar beets and sugarcane, a level determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in relation to the level of price support established for the 1989 crops of sugar beets and sugarcane, and that, insofar as is practicable, shall reflect no less return to the producer than under the 1989 price support levels.

(b) PREVENTED PLANTING CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide prevented planting credit under subsection (a) with respect to acreage that producers on a farm were prevented from planting to the 1989 crop of the commodity for harvest because of damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) MAXIMUM ACREAGE.—Such acreage may not exceed the greater of—

(A) a quantity equal to the acreage on the farm planted (or prevented from being planted due to a natural disaster or other condition beyond the control of the producers) to the commodity for harvest in 1987 minus acreage actually planted of harvest in 1989; or

(B) a quantity equal to the average of the acreage on the farm planted (or prevented from being planted due to a natural disaster or other condition beyond the control of the producers) to the commodity for harvest in 1985, 1986, and 1987 minus acreage actually planted to the commodity for harvest in 1989.

(3) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall make appropriate adjustments in applying the limitations contained in paragraph (2) to take into account crop rotation practices of the producers and any change in quotas for the 1989 crops of tobacco.

(c) LIMITATION.—Payments provided under subsection (a) for a crop of a commodity may not be made available to the producers on a farm unless such producers enter into an agreement to obtain multiperil crop insurance, to the extent required under section 107.

(d) SPECIAL RULES FOR PEANUTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) a deficiency in production of quota peanuts from a farm, as otherwise determined under this section, shall be reduced by the quantity of peanut poundage quota that was the basis of such anticipated production that has been transferred from the farm;

(2) payments made under this section shall be taken into account whether the deficiency for which the deficiency in production is claimed was a deficiency in production of quota or additional peanuts and the payment rate shall be established accordingly; and

(3) the amount of undermarketings of quota peanuts from a farm for the 1989 crop that may otherwise be claimed under section 358 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1358) for purposes of future quota increases shall be reduced by the quantity of the deficiency of production of such peanuts for which payment has been received under this section.

(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR TOBACCO.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) the amount of undermarketings of quota tobacco from a farm for the 1989 crop that may otherwise be claimed under section 317 or 319 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1314c or 1314e) for purposes of future quota increases shall be reduced by the quantity of the deficiency of production of such tobacco for which payment has been received under this section; and

(2) disaster payments made to producers under this section may not be considered by the Secretary in determining the net losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation under section 106A(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1445-1(d)).

(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR SUGAR.—A producer of the 1989 crop of sugarcane or sugar beets that is unable to process the commodity into sugar due to the inability of local processing plants to process sugar as a result of damaging weather or related condition in 1989 shall be eligible for disaster payments in accordance with subsection (a) for any loss in sugar production attributable to such inability. Disaster payments made available under this subsection for such loss of production shall be reduced by an amount equal to any proceeds received by the producer from the disposition of that portion of the crop on which disaster payments are made.

SEC. 104. SOYBEANS AND NONPROGRAM CROPS.

(a) DISASTER PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) ELIGIBILITY.—Effective only for the 1989 crops of soybeans and nonprogram crops, if the Secretary determines that, because of damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989, the total quantity of the 1989 crop of the commodity that the producers on a farm are able to harvest is less than the result of multiplying 65 percent of—

(i) with respect to soybeans, the State, area, or county yield, adjusted for adverse weather conditions during the 1985, 1986, and 1987 crop years, as determined by the Secretary, for such crop by the sum of the acreage planted for harvest and the acreage for which prevented planting credit is approved by the Secretary for such crop under subsection (b);

(ii) with respect to nonprogram crops (other than honey), the yield established by the Commodity Credit Corporation under section (d)(2) for such crop by the sum of the acreage planted for harvest and the acreage for which prevented planting credit is approved by the Secretary for such crop under subsection (b); and

(iii) with respect to honey, the production level established by the Commodity Credit Corporation under subsection (d)(3),

the Secretary shall make a disaster payment available to such producers.

(B) PAYMENT RATE.—The payment shall be made to such producers at a rate equal to—

(i) 65 percent of the applicable payment level under paragraph (2), as determined by the Secretary, for any deficiency in production greater than 35 percent, but not greater than 75 percent, for the crop; and

(ii) 90 percent of the applicable payment level under paragraph (2), as determined by the Secretary, for any deficiency in production greater than 75 percent for the crop.

(2) PAYMENT LEVEL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the payment level for a commodity shall equal the simple average price received by producers of the commodity, as determined by the Secretary subject to paragraph (3), during the marketing years for the immediately preceding 5 crops of the commodity, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest in such period.

(3) PAYMENTS BASED ON CROP AND VARIETY.—

(A) CROP.—The Secretary shall make disaster payments under this subsection on a crop by crop basis, with consideration given to markets and uses of the crops, under regulations issued by the Secretary.

(B) VARIETY.—For purposes of determining the payment levels on a crop by crop basis, the Secretary shall consider as separate crops, and develop separate payment levels insofar as is practicable for, different varieties of the same commodity, and commodities produced using organic techniques, for which there is a significant difference in the economic value in the market.

(4) EXCLUSIONS.—For purposes of determining the total quantity of the 1989 nonprogram crop of the commodity that the producers on a farm are able to harvest under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall exclude—

(A) commodities that cannot be sold in normal commercial channels of trade; and

(B) dockage, including husks and shells, if such dockage is excluded in determining yields under subsection (d)(2).

(b) PREVENTED PLANTING CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide prevented planting credit under subsection (a) with respect to acreage that producers on a farm were prevented from planting to the 1989 crop of the commodity for harvest because of damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) MAXIMUM ACREAGE.—Such acreage may not exceed the greater of—

(A) a quantity equal to the acreage on the farm planted (or prevented from being planted due to a natural disaster or other condition beyond the control of the producers) to the commodity for harvest in 1987 minus acreage actually planted for harvest in 1989; or

(B) a quantity equal to the average of the acreage on the farm planted (or prevented from being planted due to a natural disaster or other condition beyond the control of the producers) to the commodity for harvest in 1985, 1986, and 1987 minus acreage actually planted to the commodity for harvest in 1989.

(3) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall make appropriate adjustments in applying the limitations contained in the preceding sentence to take into account crop rotation practices of the producers.

(c) LIMITATION.—Payments provided under subsection (a) for a crop of a commodity may not be made available to the producers on a farm unless such producers enter into an agreement to obtain multiperil crop insurance, to the extent required under section 107.

(d) SPECIAL RULES FOR NONPROGRAM CROPS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF NONPROGRAM CROP.—As used in this section, the term "nonprogram crop" means all crops (including sweet potatoes and honey) for which crop insurance through the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was available for crop year 1989, and other commercial crops (including sweet potatoes and honey) for which such insurance was not available for crop year 1989, except that such term shall not include a crop covered under section 101, 102, or 103, or soybeans.

(2) FARM YIELDS.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Commodity Credit Corporation shall establish disaster program farm yields for nonprogram crops (other than honey) to carry out this section.

(B) PROVEN YIELDS AVAILABLE.—If the producers on a farm can provide satisfactory evidence to the Commodity Credit Corporation of actual crop yields on the farm for at least one of the immediately preceding 3 crop years, the yield for a farm shall be based on proven yields.

(C) PROVEN YIELDS NOT AVAILABLE.—If such data does not exist for any of the 3 preceding crop years, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall establish a yield for the farm by using a county average yield for the commodity. If adequate data for each county is not available, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall establish a yield for the farm using the State average yield or national average yield.

(D) DATA.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Commodity Credit Corporation may use data from the Extension Service or other sources.

(3) PRODUCTION LEVELS FOR HONEY.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Commodity Credit Corporation shall establish production levels for honey to carry out this section.

(B) PROVEN PRODUCTION AVAILABLE.—If the producers on a farm can provide satisfactory evidence to the Commodity Credit Corporation of actual crop production on the farm for the immediately preceding 5 crop years, the production level for a farm shall be based on the average of the proven production on the farm for the immediately preceding 5 crops of honey, excluding the year in which such production was the highest and the year in which such production was the lowest in such period.

(C) PROVEN PRODUCTION NOT AVAILABLE.—If such data is not available for the preceding 5 crop years, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall establish a production level for the producers on a farm by using a State average production per hive or a national average production per hive.

(4) BURDEN OF PROOF.—It shall be the responsibility of the producers of nonprogram crops to provide satisfactory evidence of 1989 crop losses resulting from damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989 in order for such producers to obtain disaster payments under this section.

SEC. 105. CROP QUALITY REDUCTION DISASTER PAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To ensure that all producers of 1989 crops covered under sections 101 through 104 are treated equitably, the Secretary may make additional disaster payments to producers of such crops who suffer losses resulting from the reduced quality of such crops caused by damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) ELIGIBLE PRODUCERS.—If the Secretary determines to make crop quality disaster payments available to producers under subsection (a), producers on a farm of a crop described in subsection (a) shall be eligible to receive reduced quality disaster payments only if such producers incur a deficiency in production of not less than 35 percent and not more than 75 percent for such crop (as determined under section 101, 102, 103, or 104, as appropriate).

(c) MAXIMUM PAYMENT RATE.—The Secretary shall establish the reduced quality disaster payment rate, except that such rate shall not exceed 10 percent, as determined by the Secretary, of—

(1) the established price for the crop, for commodities covered under section 101;

(2) the basic county loan rate for the crop (or a comparable price if there is no current basic county loan rate), for commodities covered under section 102;

(3) the payment level under section 103(a)(3), for commodities covered by section 103; and

(4) the payment level under section 104(a)(2), for commodities covered under section 104.

(d) DETERMINATION OF PAYMENT.—The amount of payment to a producer under this section shall be determined by multiplying the payment rate established under subsection (c) by the portion of the actual harvested crop on the producer's farm that is reduced in quality by such natural disaster in 1988 or 1989, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 106. EFFECT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE PAYMENTS.

In the case of producers on a farm who obtained crop insurance for the 1989 crop of a commodity under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.), the Secretary shall reduce the amount of payments made available under this subtitle for such crop to the extent that the amount determined by adding the net amount of crop insurance indemnity payment (gross indemnity less premium paid) received by such producers for the deficiency in the production of the crop and the disaster payment determined in accordance with this subtitle for such crop exceeds the amount determined by multiplying—

(1) 100 percent of the yield used for the calculation of disaster payments made under this subtitle for such crop; by

(2) the sum of the acreage of such crop planted to harvest and the acreage for which prevented planting credit is approved by the Secretary (or, in the case of disaster payments under section 101, the eligible acreage established under sections 101(a)(1) and 101(a)(2)(A)); by

(3)(A) in the case of producers who participated in a production adjustment program for the 1989 crop of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, extra long staple cotton, or rice, the established price for the 1989 crop of the commodity;

(B) in the case of producers who did not participate in a production adjustment program for the 1989 crop of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, extra long staple cotton, or rice, the basic county loan rate (or a comparable price, as determined by the Secretary, if there is no current basic county loan rate) for the 1989 crop of the commodity;

(C) in the case of producers of sugar beets, sugarcane, peanuts, or tobacco, the payment level for the commodity established under section 103(a)(3); and

(D) in the case of producers of soybeans or a nonprogram crop (as defined in section 104(d)(1)), the simple average price received by producers of the commodity, as determined by the Secretary, during the marketing years for the immediately preceding 5 crops of the commodity, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest in such period.

SEC. 107. CROP INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR THE 1990 CROPS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Subject to the limitations under subsection (b), producers on a farm, to be eligible to receive a disaster payment under this subtitle or forgiveness of the repayment of advance deficiency payments under section 101(b), must agree to obtain multiperil crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) for the 1990 crop of the commodity for which such payments or forgiveness are sought.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Producers on a farm shall not be required to agree to obtain crop insurance under subsection (a) for a commodity—

(1) unless, with respect to producers of a crop planted in 1988 for harvest in 1989, such producers' deficiency in production, with respect to a crop planted in 1988 for harvest in 1989 for which a disaster payment under this subtitle otherwise may be made, exceeds 65 percent;

(2) where, or if, crop insurance coverage is not available to the producers for the commodity for which the payment or forgiveness is sought;

(3) if the producers' annual premium rate for such crop insurance is an amount greater than 125 percent of the average premium rate for insurance on that commodity for the 1989 crop in the county in which the producers are located;

(4) in any case in which the producers' annual premium for such crop insurance is an amount greater than 25 percent of the amount of the payment or forgiveness sought; or

(5) if the producers can establish by appeal to the county committee established under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590(b)) that the purchase of crop insurance would impose an undue financial hardship on such producers and that a waiver of the requirement to obtain crop insurance should, in the discretion of the county committee, be granted.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) COUNTY COMMITTEES.—The Secretary shall ensure (acting through the county committees established under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and located in the counties in which the assistance programs provided for under sections 101 through 105 are implemented) that producers who apply for assistance, as described in subsection (a), obtain multiperil crop insurance as required under this section.

(2) OTHER SOURCES.—Each producer who is subject to the requirements of this section may comply with such requirements by providing evidence of multiperil crop insurance coverage from sources other than through the county committee office, as approved by the Secretary.

(3) COMMISSIONS.—The Secretary shall provide by regulation for a reduction in the commissions paid to private insurance agents, brokers, or companies on crop insurance contracts entered into as a result of the requirements of subsection (a) sufficient to reflect that such insurance contracts principally involve only a servicing function to be performed by the agent, broker, or company.

(d) REPAYMENT OF BENEFITS.—Each producer subject to the requirements of this section shall make immediate repayment to the Secretary of any disaster payment or forgiven advance deficiency payment that the producer otherwise is required to repay at any time (prior to the end of the 1990 crop year for the commodity involved) that the crop insurance coverage required of the producer under this section is canceled by the producer.

SEC. 108. CROPS HARVESTED FOR FORAGE USES.

Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall announce the terms and conditions by which producers on a farm may establish a 1989 yield with respect to crops that will be harvested for silage and other forage uses.

SEC. 109. PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.

(a) LIMITATION.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the total amount of payments that a person shall be entitled to receive under one or more of the programs established under this subtitle may not exceed $100,000.

(b) NO DOUBLE BENEFITS.—No person may receive disaster payments under this subtitle to the extent that such person receives a livestock emergency benefit for lost feed production in 1989 under section 606 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1471d).

(c) COMBINED LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No person may receive any payment under this subtitle or benefit under title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.) for livestock emergency losses suffered in 1989 if such payment or benefit will cause the combined total amount of such payments and benefits received by such person to exceed $100,000.

(2) ELECTION.—If a producer is subject to paragraph (1), the person may elect (subject to the benefits limitations under section 609 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1471g)) whether to receive the $100,000 in such payments, or such livestock emergency benefits (not to exceed $50,000), or a combination of payments and benefits specified by the person.

(d) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations—

(1) defining the term "person" for the purposes of this section, that shall conform, to the extent practicable, to the regulations defining the term "person" issued under section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) and section 211 of the Disaster Assistance Act of 1988 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note); and

(2) prescribing such rules as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure a fair and reasonable application of the limitations established under this section.

SEC. 110. DE MINIMIS YIELDS.

(a) DISASTER PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine a de minimis yield for each crop eligible for reduced yield disaster payments under this subtitle.

(2) LEVEL.—The de minimis yield shall be set at a level that will minimize any incentive provided by the prospect of disaster payments to abandon crops that have a value that exceeds the cost of harvesting. In no case may the de minimis yield be less than the amount of production that, when valued at current market prices, equals the average cost of harvesting the crop, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) ACTUAL YIELD LESS THAN DE MINIMIS YIELD.—Any producer whose actual yield for a crop is equal to or less than the de minimis yield for such crop shall be considered as having an actual yield of zero for the purpose of calculating any reduced yield disaster payments for such crop under this subtitle.

(b) CROP INSURANCE.—If the actual yield for a crop on a farm is equal to or less than the de minimis yield for the crop determined by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a), neither the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (including its agents and employees), nor companies reinsured by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (including their agents and employees) may require the destruction of any portion of that crop as a condition for making a full crop loss indemnity payment to a producer under the terms of a valid contract of insurance on such crop.

(c) TREATMENT OF PRODUCERS.—For the 1988 crops of barley, oat and wheat, insured producers whose crop losses were appraised by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation prior to July 5, 1988, shall be treated similarly to those producers whose crop losses were appraised by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation after July 4, 1988, with respect to the calculation of de minimis yields.

Subtitle B—Forest Crops

SEC. 121. ELIGIBILITY.

(a) DROUGHT LOSS.—Subject to the limitation in subsection (b), the Secretary shall provide assistance, as specified in section 122, to eligible tree farmers that planted tree seedlings in 1988 or 1989 for commercial purposes but lost such seedlings as a result of drought or related condition in 1989, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) LIMITATION.—An eligible tree farmer shall qualify for assistance under subsection (a) only if such tree farmer's tree seedling mortality, as a result of the natural disaster, exceeds 35 percent (adjusted for normal mortality).

SEC. 122. ASSISTANCE.

The assistance provided by the Secretary to eligible tree farmers for losses described in section 121 shall consist of either—

(1) reimbursement of 65 percent of the cost of replanting seedlings lost due to drought or related conditions in 1989 in excess of 35 percent mortality (adjusted for normal mortality); or

(2) at the discretion of the Secretary, sufficient tree seedlings to reestablish the stand.

SEC. 123. LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.

(a) LIMITATION.—The total amount of payments that a person shall be entitled to receive under this subtitle may not exceed $25,000, or an equivalent value in tree seedlings.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations—

(1) defining the term "person" for the purposes of this subtitle, that shall conform, to the extent practicable, to the regulations defining the term "person" issued under section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) and section 211 of the Disaster Assistance Act of 1988 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note); and

(2) prescribing such rules as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure a fair and reasonable application of the limitation established under this section.

SEC. 124. DEFINITION.

As used in this subtitle, the term "eligible tree farmer" means a person who produces annual crops from trees for commercial purposes or who grows trees for harvest for commercial purposes, and owns 1,000 acres or less of such trees.

SEC. 125. DUPLICATIVE PAYMENTS.

The Secretary shall establish guidelines to ensure that no person receives duplicative payments under this subtitle and the forestry incentives program, agricultural conservation program, or other existing Federal program.

Subtitle C—Administrative Provisions

SEC. 131. INELIGIBILITY.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—A person who has qualifying gross revenues in excess of $2,000,000 annually, as determined by the Secretary, shall not be eligible to receive any disaster payment or other benefits under this title.

(b) QUALIFYING GROSS REVENUES.—For purposes of this section, the term "qualifying gross revenues" means—

(1) if a majority of the person's annual income is received from farming, ranching, and forestry operations, the gross revenue from the person's farming, ranching, and forestry operations; and

(2) if less than a majority of the person's annual income is received from farming, ranching, and forestry operations, the person's gross revenue from all sources.

SEC. 132. TIMING AND MANNER OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) TIMING OF ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) FULL PAYMENT AS SOON AS PRACTICABLE.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall make full disaster assistance available under this title as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) APPLICATION APPROVAL REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no payment or benefit provided under this title shall be payable or due until such time as a completed application for a crop of a commodity therefor has been approved.

(2) LATEST DATE FOR APPLICATION.—A person eligible to receive payments under subtitle A shall make application for such payments not later than March 31, 1990, or such later date that the Secretary, by regulation, may prescribe.

(b) MANNER.—The Secretary may make payments available under subtitle A in the form of cash, commodities, or commodity certificates, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 133. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.

(a) USE.—The Secretary shall use the funds, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation in carrying out this title.

(b) EXISTING AUTHORITY.—The authority provided by this title is in addition to, and not in place of, any authority granted to the Secretary or the Commodity Credit Corporation under any other provision of law.

SEC. 134. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary or the Commodity Credit Corporation, as appropriate, shall issue regulations to implement this title as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, without regard to the requirement for notice and public participation in rule making prescribed in section 553 of title 5, United States Code, or in any directive of the Secretary.

TITLE II—EMERGENCY LIVESTOCK ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. QUANTITIES OF EMERGENCY FEED ASSISTANCE.

Section 605(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1471c(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking out "Each" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, each"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(4) The daily allowance for all livestock (except fish raised for food) for emergency feed assistance under the programs specified in section 606(a) shall be at least—

"(A)(i) in the case of cattle (other than dairy cattle), 15 pounds of feed grain equivalent per day per animal unit; and

"(ii) in the case of dairy cattle, 25 pounds of feed grain equivalent per day per animal unit; or

"(B) such lesser quantity as is determined by the State or county committee.

"(5) In determining the quantity of feed available on a farm for utilization by a particular species of livestock, the Secretary shall not include any feed or feedstuff that cannot be utilized by the species of livestock, unless the feed or feedstuff can be readily transported and sold in an established market.

"(6) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall adjust the daily allowance for all livestock for emergency feed assistance under the programs specified in section 606(a) to levels that represent the actual quantities necessary for animals fully to perform the functions for which they are kept, including growth, reproduction, lactation, and work.".

SEC. 202. LIVESTOCK TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE.

Section 606 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1471d) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may make available at least $25,000,000 to provide livestock transportation assistance under subsection (a)(6) for livestock emergencies in 1989.".

SEC. 203. ASSISTANCE FOR PONDS.

Section 607(b)(2)(B) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1471e(b)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting "or ponds" after "wells".

SEC. 204. LIVESTOCK WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

Section 607 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1471e) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may make available at least $25,000,000 to provide special assistance under subsection (b)(2) for livestock emergencies in 1988 and 1989.".

TITLE III—COMMODITY STOCK ADJUSTMENT

SEC. 301. PLANTING OF ALTERNATE CROPS ON PERMITTED ACREAGE.

Section 504(b)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1464(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) in the case of the 1990 crop year, acreage in an amount equal to but not to exceed 20 percent of the permitted acreage for a program crop, if—

"(i) the acreage considered to be planted is planted to canola, rapeseed, sunflower, safflower, flaxseed, kenaf, crambe, guayule, milkweed, or meadowfoam;

"(ii) the producers on the farm plant for harvest to the program crop at least 50 percent of the permitted acreage for such crop; and

"(iii) payments are not received by producers under section 107D(c)(1)(C), 105C(c)(1)(B), 103A(c)(1)(B), or 101A(c)(1)(B), as the case may be; and".

TITLE IV—DISASTER CREDIT AND FORBEARANCE

SEC. 401. EMERGENCY LOANS.

Section 321(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961(b)) shall not apply to a person who otherwise would be eligible for an emergency loan under subtitle C of such Act (subject to the person's compliance with the requirements of section 107 of this Act), if such eligibility is the result of damage to an annual crop planted for harvest in 1989.

SEC. 402. 1990 FARM OPERATING LOANS.

(a) DIRECT CREDIT.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that direct operating loans made or insured under subtitle B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1941 et seq.) for 1990 crop production are made available to farmers and ranchers suffering major losses due to damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989, as authorized under existing law and under regulations of the Secretary that implement the objective of enabling farmers and ranchers to stay in business.

(b) LOAN GUARANTEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall make available in fiscal year 1990, guarantees to commercial or cooperative lenders for loans under subtitle B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, to refinance and reamortize 1989 operating loans, or 1989 or 1990 installments due and payable on real estate debt, farm equipment or building (including storage facilities) debt, livestock loans, or other operating debt, of farmers and ranchers that otherwise cannot be repaid due to major losses incurred by such farmers or ranchers as a result of damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989.

(2) REAMORTIZATION.—Each fiscal year 1990 guaranteed loan for 1988 or 1989 natural disaster purposes, as described in paragraph (1), shall contain terms and conditions governing the reamortization of the debt of the farmer or rancher that will provide the farmer or rancher a reasonable opportunity to continue to receive new operating credit while repaying the guaranteed loan, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) ELIGIBILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person eligible to receive payments under subtitle A of title I shall be deemed eligible to have guaranteed, in accordance with this subsection, loans made to such person by a commercial or cooperative lender to refinance installment payments that are or become due and payable during 1989 or 1990, as described in paragraph (1), except that, to be deemed eligible to have such loan guaranteed, the person must otherwise—

(A) be current in the person's obligation to the commercial or cooperative lender that agrees to accept the guarantee in consideration of allowing the person to make the 1989 or 1990 payment or installment over a period of time not to exceed 6 years from the original due date of such payment or installment; and

(B) meet the criteria for guaranteed loan borrowers under subtitle B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act established by the Secretary.

(c) USE OF ACIF FUNDS.—For purposes of providing guaranteed loans in accordance with subsection (b), in addition to funds otherwise available, the Secretary may use any funds available from the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund during fiscal years 1989 or 1990 for emergency insured and guaranteed loans under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.) to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters, except that funds available from such Fund first shall

be used to satisfy the level of assistance estimated by the Secretary to meet the needs of persons eligible for emergency disaster loans.

SEC. 403. FORBEARANCE AND RESTRUCTURING FOR FARM LOANS.

(a) FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should, with respect to farmers and ranchers who suffer major losses due to damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989—

(1) exercise forbearance in the collection of interest and principal on direct farmer program loans under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) outstanding for such farmers and ranchers;

(2) expedite the use of credit restructuring and other credit relief mechanisms authorized under the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-233) and similar provisions of law for such farmers and ranchers; and

(3) encourage commercial lenders participating in guaranteed farmer lending programs under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to exercise forbearance before declaring loans to such farmers and ranchers under such programs in default.

(b) FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION.—It further is the sense of Congress that the Farm Credit Administration should in its oversight of Farm Credit System institutions, with respect to farmers and ranchers who suffer major losses due to damaging weather or related condition in 1988 or 1989—

(1) ensure that Farm Credit System institutions exercise forbearance in the collection of principal and interest on loans outstanding to such farmers and ranchers;

(2) expedite the use of credit restructuring and other credit relief mechanisms authorized under the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 and related provisions of law for such farmers and ranchers; and

(3) encourage other lenders participating with Farm Credit System institutions in mutual loan agreements to exercise forbearance before declaring loans to such farmers and ranchers in default.

TITLE V—CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE

SEC. 501. HAYING AND GRAZING ON CRP ACREAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) HAYING AND GRAZING ON CRP ACREAGE.—In the case of an owner or operator of land who has entered into a conservation reserve program contract under subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.) and hays or grazes livestock during the 1989 crop year on acreage subject to such contract as authorized by the Secretary, the Secretary may not reduce the amount of rental payments made to such owner or operator as the result of such haying or grazing to the extent that the owner or operator—

(A) carries out additional conservation practices, approved by the Soil Conservation Service in consultation with appropriate Federal and State agencies, to enhance soil, water, and wildlife conservation on or in the vicinity of lands subject to such contract; and

(B) pays the costs of carrying out such practices.

(2) AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—The amount of the reduction prohibited under paragraph (1) shall equal one-half of the amount paid by the owner or operator to cover the costs of carrying out the conservation practices.

(b) CONSERVATION PRACTICES.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term "conservation practices" includes—

(1) establishment of permanent shelterbelts and windbreaks;

(2) restoration of wetlands;

(3) establishment of wildlife food plots; or

(4) planting of trees.

SEC. 502. MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL GRASSLANDS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture, for repairing drought-related damage to the National Grasslands managed by the Forest Service under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1000 et seq.), $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1990 and 1991.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) may be used for range management activities, including enhancement of wildlife habitat, replacement of fences, development and maintenance of water supplies, and noxious weed control.

(c) COST SHARING.—Funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) may be expended under agreements between the Forest Service and grazing associations or individual permittees providing for the sharing of the costs of range management activities by the Federal Government and such grazing associations or permittees, except that the share of costs to be borne by a permittee shall be reduced as necessary to allow participation by permittees who cannot afford to participate.

TITLE VI—RURAL BUSINESSES

SEC. 601. DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES.

(a) LOAN GUARANTEES.—The Secretary shall guarantee loans made in rural areas to—

(1) public, private, or cooperative organizations, to Indian tribes on Federal and State reservations or other Federally recognized Indian tribal groups, or to any other business entities to assist such organizations, tribes, or entities in alleviating the distress caused to such organizations, tribes, or entities, directly or indirectly, by the drought, hail, freeze, excessive moisture, or related condition in 1988 or 1989; and

(2) such organizations, tribes, or entities that refinance or restructure debt as a result of losses incurred, directly or indirectly, because of such natural disasters in 1988 or 1989.

(b) ELIGIBLE LOANS.—Loans guaranteed under this section shall be loans made by any Federal or State chartered bank, savings and loan association, cooperative lending agency, insurance company, or other legally organized lending agency.

(c) LOAN GUARANTEE LIMITS.—

(1) PERCENTAGE OF PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST.—No guarantee under this section shall exceed 90 percent of the principal and interest amount of the loan or $500,000, whichever is the lesser amount.

(2) TOTAL AMOUNT.—The total amount of loan guarantee under this section shall not exceed $200,000,000.

(d) USE OF THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND.—The Secretary shall use the Rural Development Insurance Fund established under section 309A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1929a) for the purposes of discharging the obligations of the Secretary under this section.

TITLE VII—WATER-RELATED ASSISTANCE

SEC. 701. EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations to carry out section 402 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2202), or take such other action as is necessary, to provide payments for emergency water conservation or water enhancing measures that benefit confined animals within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 702. EMERGENCY COMMUNITY WATER ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Subtitle A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by inserting after section 306 (7 U.S.C. 1926) the following new section:

"SEC. 306A. EMERGENCY COMMUNITY WATER ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide grants in accordance with this section to assist the residents of rural areas and small communities to secure adequate quantities of safe water—

"(1) after a significant decline in the quantity or quality of water available from the water supplies of such rural areas and small communities;

"(2) when repairs, partial replacement, or significant maintenance efforts on established water systems would remedy—

"(A) an acute shortage of quality water; or

"(B) a significant decline in the quantity or quality of water available.

"(b) PRIORITY.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

"(1) give priority to projects described in subsection (a)(1); and

"(2) provide at least 70 percent of all such grants to such projects.

"(c) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to obtain a grant under this section, an applicant shall—

"(1) be a public or private nonprofit entity; and

"(2) in the case of a grant made under subsection (a)(1), demonstrate to the Secretary that the decline referred to in such subsection occurred within 2 years of the date the application was filed for such grant.

"(d) USES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Grants made under this section may be used for water line extensions from existing systems, laying of new water lines, repairs, significant maintenance, digging of new wells, equipment replacement, hook and tap fees, and any other appropriate purpose associated with developing sources of, or treating, storing, or distributing water, and to assist communities in complying with the requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.).

"(2) JOINT PROPOSALS.—Nothing in this section shall preclude rural communities from submitting joint proposals for emergency water assistance, subject to the restrictions contained in subsection (e). Such restrictions should be considered in the aggregate, depending on the number of communities involved.

"(e) RESTRICTIONS.—

"(1) MAXIMUM POPULATION AND INCOME.—No grant provided under this section shall be used to assist any rural area or community that—

"(A) includes any area in any city or town with a population in excess of 5,000 inhabit-

ants according to the most recent decennial census of the United States; or

"(B) has a median household income in excess of the State nonmetropolitan median household income according to the most recent decennial census of the United States.

"(2) SET-ASIDE FOR SMALLER COMMUNITIES.—Not less than 75 percent of the funds allocated under this section shall be allocated to rural communities with populations that do not exceed 3,000 inhabitants.

"(f) MAXIMUM GRANTS.—Grants made under this section may not exceed—

"(1) in the case of each grant made under subsection (a)(1), $500,000; and

"(2) in the case of each grant made under subsection (a)(2), $75,000.

"(g) FULL FUNDING.—Subject to subsection (e), grants under this section shall be made in an amount equal to 100 percent of the costs of the projects conducted under this section.

"(h) APPLICATIONS.—

"(1) NATIONALLY COMPETITIVE APPLICATION PROCESS.—The Secretary shall develop a nationally competitive application process to receive grants under this section. The process shall include criteria for evaluating applications, including population, median household income, and the severity of the decline in quantity or quality of water.

"(2) TIMING.—The Secretary shall make every effort to review and act on applications within 60 days of the date that such applications are submitted.

"(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $35,000,000 for fiscal year 1990, and $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1991, such sums to remain authorized until fully appropriated.".

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall publish—

(A) interim final regulations to carry out section 306A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (as added by subsection (a) of this section) not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) final regulations to carry out section 306A of such Act not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) FUNDS.—

(A) OBLIGATION.—The Secretary shall designate 70 percent of the funds made available for the first fiscal year for which appropriations are made under section 306A(i) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act not later than 5 months after the date such funds are appropriated.

(B) RELEASE.—The Secretary may release funds prior to the issuance of final regulations under paragraph (1)(B) for grants under section 306A(a)(1) of Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

HEAT, LACK OF RAIN THREATEN TO CUT CROP YIELDS

(By Mikkel Pates)

High temperatures and lack of rain are shriveling crop prospects throughout the region, say crop experts.

Carl Fanning, North Dakota State University Extension Service agronomist, said large areas south of Bismarck, N.D., and others in extreme northwest North Dakota have lost 60 percent to 80 percent of their yield potential.

"Things are going downhill so fast it's hard to put a number on it," Fanning said late Wednesday.

Psychologically, the situation is bad because it's more sporadic than last year. A farmer might be hit hard by drought, while a neighbor five miles away has gotten rain.

"That's terribly discouraging to the growers," Fanning said. "Last year everybody was in the same boat."

Duane Hauck, Cass County extension agent in Fargo, said the heat isn't unusual for July, but this year there aren't subsoil moisture reserves to carry the crops through.

In the Red River Valley, clay based soils don't dry out as quickly as the sandier soils to the west in the Buffalo, N.D. area, for example. Hauck has heard that the small grains are starting to "fire". Their lower leaves dry up and turn white.

"We're in need of rain to get this crop filled, especially the later-seeded crops," Hauck said.

Ken Pazdernik, Norman County extension agent at Ada, Minn., said farmers who were anticipating a 70-bushel per acre yield now are looking at a 50-bushel yield potential.

Bob Deutsch, vice president of Agvise Inc., a crop consulting company at Northwood, N.D., said his area has received almost as little rain as last year, the driest year since the 1930s.

"If it continues hot and dry we could end up with the same yield as last year," Deutsch said, adding that they were cut in half of normal. "Last year we had good subsoil moisture, and this year we don't have any."

If rain and cooler temperatures come within a week, there is still a chance for normal yields, Deutsch said.

Frank Sobolik, NDSU extension agronomist for 12 central counties, said a large area is suffering irreparable drought damage.

Sobolik said small grains are down to the main stem heads in many areas, meaning at least 40 percent of the crop potential is lost.

Crops literally close down their pores and shut down their growth factory when temperatures get above 90 degrees, Sobolik said. That means no growth and reduced yields.

Row crops—such as corn, beans and sunflowers—are faring better, but also will suffer without cooler, wetter weather.

Despite the comparisons, 1989 would have to get much worse to be as bad as 1988.

John Enz, NDSU soil science climatologist, said Fargo had only two days above 90 degrees as of July 4. Last year, there were five days in May above 90 degrees and another 13 in June.

The problem this year is that there are too many crops running out of water.

The weekly U.S. Department of Agriculture crop report rated North Dakota's spring wheat crop at 3 percent poor, 26 percent fair, 69 percent good and 2 percent excellent.

Durum was rated 1 percent poor, 24 percent fair, 69 percent good, and 6 percent excellent.

Crop progress remained at the five-year average for both the small grains and the row crops. Pastures were rated 4 percent very poor, 2 percent poor, 59 percent fair and 39 percent good. Stockwater supplies are 2 percent very short, 3 percent short and 95 percent adequate.

CROPS STRESSED BY HEAT

Scorching heat and rainless skies are shriveling crop prospects throughout North Dakota, as well as drying up pastures and putting strain on livestock, experts say.

"It now seems to be getting pretty clear . . . that we have a very serious situation on our hands in this state," Gov. George Sinner said Thursday.

The governor said he had spoken with North Dakota's congressional delegation "about the urgency of drought legislation."

Large areas south of Bismarck and other portions of extreme northwestern North Dakota have lost 60 to 80 percent of their crop yields, said Carl Fanning, an agronomist for the North Dakota State University Extension Service.

"Things are going downhill so fast it's hard to put a number on it," Fanning said Wednesday.

A number of areas in North Dakota have baked in 100-degree-plus temperatures this week, although the heat abated somewhat Thursday.

Meanwhile, topsoil moisture is very short in 13 percent of the state and short in 36 percent, according to the latest weekly crop report from the North Dakota Agricultural Statistics Service. Subsoil moisture is very short in 18 percent of the state and short in 70 percent, the report said.

Karl Silverman, lead forecaster for the National Weather Service in Bismarck, attributed the hot and dry weather to a high-pressure ridge that is "rather typical for North Dakota in the summer."

But that is still bad news following a drought like the state suffered last year, which was called the worst since the 1930s, Silverman said. Records show "a year of less-than-average rainfall—70 to 80 percent of normal—is rather typical following a year of very little rain," he said.

Bob Deutsch, vice president of Agvise Inc., an agricultural consulting company in Northwood, said his area had received almost as little rain as last year.

"If it continues hot and dry, we could end up with the same yield as last year," which was about half of normal, he said. "Last year, we had good subsoil moisture, and this year we don't have any."

Still, 1989 would have to get much worse to be as bad as 1988, experts say.

The latest weekly crop report said despite the heat and inadequate moisture, small-grain and row-crop development advanced this week. However, crop conditions deteriorated, the report said.

Compared with last summer's dry weather, "we have more of the state that's in good shape," Sinner said.

"But we have a large share of the state that's hurt pretty badly and it's getting hurt every day as this heat wears on," the governor said.

A large area of North Dakota is suffering irreparable drought damage said Frank Sobolik, NDSU extension agronomist for 12 counties in central North Dakota.

Small grains are down to the main-stem heads in many areas, meaning at least 40 percent of the crop potential is lost, Sobolik said.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator for his statement and on his observations regarding the severity of the problem, and I commend him for his legislation and ask the question: Is the legislation he is introducing limited to a particular number of crops, or does it specify a list of crops, or can he elaborate on that for a moment?

Mr. CONRAD. No; there is not a limitation. I think the Senator may be re-

ferring to nonprogram and speciality crops—we have all crops provided for and included. We have devised this legislation, I might say to my friend from Louisiana, in consultation with our friends in the South who have experienced severe losses in various crops that we do not have in our part of the country, but also to certain perils that we have not experienced. This is a comprehensive drought relief bill.

Mr. BREAUX. If the Senator will yield further, I commend him for that approach. The real question is looking at crops that have suffered a disaster, regardless of the type of crop. It is a question of whether a particular crop has experienced a disaster, and whether it is a disaster of any type, not just a drought.

We had 40 inches of rain in 1 week. We put much of our land under 2 to 3 feet of water. This bill is very timely, and I commend him for it, and I ask that I be added as a cosponsor of the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I might just add that this bill does go beyond drought. It is for excessive moisture, and deals with those who suffered from hurricanes and deals with those who have suffered from freezing. So it deals with the disasters that people have experienced. A disaster is a disaster, and we ought to be ready to assist those who are faced with an impossible situation.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield.

Mr. CONRAD. Yes.

Mr. DOLE. I wonder if you might give me an estimate of the cost the Senator from North Dakota intends to pay for this comprehensive drought legislation.

Mr. CONRAD. I think it is impossible for us, at this point, to give a clear estimate of the cost. I think the reason for that is clear. We, at this time, do not know the final dimensions of the disaster. The Senator from Kansas perhaps missed my earlier indication that in my State now 12 counties are estimated to have already suffered a loss of from 60 to 80 percent—not unlike what the Senator from Kansas experienced in the winter wheat areas of his State.

Mr. DOLE. The only point I make—and we are going to have this discussion later this week in the committee and maybe next week and hopefully before the August recess on the floor—as I understand the information that is available to me, there is only one crop where there has been any savings, and that is winter wheat, because we have already had the disaster that wiped out about half the crop in the State of Kansas, which is the number one wheat-producing State—probably not this year.

But I am wondering where the additional savings come from and that if we open this bill up to everything, as the House bill did, 540 different crops, does that all come out of the savings on winter wheat so that the winter wheat producers who have already been devastated, instead of getting what farmers received last year, get 10 percent of that or 5 percent of that or very little?

It seems to me it is great to introduce these bills saying we ought to cover everything; every crop ought to be covered, whether it is a program crop or not, and then not say how we are going to pay for it.

It seems to me we cannot do that any more here. We have to pay for it, and I hope it is not coming out of the pockets of the winter wheat farmers when we are covering a lot of crops that are not even certain they are going to have a disaster. We had ours. It has cost the State of Kansas $1.6 billion.

Others say we want to wait to see what happens in July, August, September, and October.

When do we finally pass a drought bill and when do we provide relief for those who have already suffered the disaster?

I am certain this Senator is sympathetic to crops in other parts of the country, particularly program crops.

It would seem to me that we need to limit the scope of some of this legislation or find some way to pay for it.

I listened to the Senator from North Dakota saying, well, we spent $3.9 billion last year and saved $8 billion. I guess the inference is there is $4 billion around. But it is not around. There is not any money.

I am advised there is not going to be but $200 million or $300 million available for drought aid.

Where is it going to go? I would hope it would go first to the wheat producers in the six or seven States that already suffered losses, and I would hope that, if we are going to expand it, that we mandate that those who have already suffered the disaster be taken care of and authorize additional disaster coverage if corn, soybeans, whatever, may be destroyed because of drought, or in the case of Louisiana because of flood, or whatever it may be. But somehow we have to pay for it.

I just say, maybe parochially, I hope it is not all coming out of those who already suffered the loss so what they will receive will be of much less benefit than farmers received last year.

But again, we need to know the cost.

Mr. CONRAD. I respect very much what the Senator from Kansas has said. I feel very strongly that we must pay for what we spend. I think if anyone has demonstrated a sincerity on that question, I have.

Let me also say to my friend from Kansas that his people have suffered and my people have suffered. No State was harder hit by drought last year than mine and now we have a repeat of what we faced last year.

Already, as I indicated, 12 counties in my State have experienced losses on spring-planted crops of from 60 to 80 percent, according to my State university.

My State simply cannot stand another devastation by drought, simply cannot stand it. My State is on the ropes. It is the biggest outmigration State in the Nation, according to the moving companies. My State had the biggest loss of personal income of any State in the Nation last year. We lost 5 percent of personal income in my State last year and now we are faced with a situation in which things looked good 3 weeks ago, they looked green, but there was no subsoil moisture and now we have had 3 weeks of extreme heat, extreme wind, and in place after place in my State the crops are devastated. They are already gone. The loss has been suffered. There is 60 to 80 percent loss in 12 counties already.

I simply say to my friend from Kansas, last year it is true we spent $3.9 billion as a result of drought. We saved $8 billion. Those were not the estimates of USDA. If you will recall, they said we were spending that much then. So I will question their estimates this year until we have some greater knowledge of what the extent of the loss is.

But I can say in my State, and I fear in many others, we are faced with a loss that is devastating, and in my State we simply cannot afford any more.

I thank the President and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I will just say, as one who has followed ag legislation fairly carefully over the years in the Senate and worked with, I guess, all commodities, I am not certainly quarreling with the fact that we should not address losses in other areas, except I think we get a little off base when we start bringing in nonprogram crops because the program crops are the ones that have to follow the regulations and limit their planting and certain set-asides, but last year it was so massive it covered everything, over 600 crops, even fish, I think, we covered in last year's disaster bill.

So it would seem to me that if we are going to have a drought relief package, and I would assume we will have, we need to find some way to work it out so where the loss has been

suffered and they have been waiting for weeks and weeks and weeks for some relief, they ought to have a priority where we have some indication. I picked up the Wall Street Journal this morning and read where there is going to be above normal rainfall in all the areas, so the soybean prices and corn prices are falling.

Now I do not know whether it is going to rain or when it is going to rain in North Dakota, Kansas, or anywhere else, but we do not know whether they are going to have a loss in some of those crops for weeks and weeks and months, and we need to find some way to address that when it comes. And maybe the way you do it is to mandate immediate relief for those farmers who have already suffered losses in winter wheat areas, primarily in Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Nebraska, South Dakota, and maybe a bit in Missouri, and then authorize the Secretary to provide relief for losses in other areas when those losses have been determined, but in the meantime those of us on the Agriculture Committee have to find savings, $500 million, $600 million. I do not know what the programs will cost, and savings are hard to come by.

My only point in representing my State, I do know my farmers are certainly sympathetic with farmers everywhere and we voted for the disaster bill last year, although Kansas had a pretty good year, it did not benefit from it but very little.

However, if there is only savings from one area, wheat, we do not believe it is fair to say let us take it all out of the winter wheat saving, to pay for all the other losses we are not certain are going to happen yet. To me that is not the way we are going to legislate, and I would hope that we could find some way to resolve this very important issue but do it quickly.

We have already waited 6 weeks. We have lost a lot of time. The farmers in my State really need to know very quickly if they are going to have any legislation.

The House passed an irresponsible bill that covered every crop anyone could think of and cost $1.3 billion. There is not that much savings. Where do we find the additional money?

I would just say to my colleagues I would be happy to help find the savings and I would certainly be happy to help cover other crops where there has been a serious disaster.

I wish we would keep an eye on program crops versus nonprogram crops, but in the end we need to do it very quickly.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, if I might just say to my friend from Kansas, we all have a concern about the cost. I think all of us are ready to be responsible and look at what the savings are and what the costs are. We did that last year. The proof is in the result. And there will be savings again this year due to the weather conditions.

The result last year was the cost was $3.9 billion and the savings were $8 billion and we took care of a problem that was the most serious in 50 years.

This year we are faced with a repeat. I wish we were not. But I would simply say to my friend from Kansas, for the people of my area it is a very good thing that we waited. If we would have acted when the Senator from Kansas was urging us to act, his people would have been taken care of and my people would not have been taken care of. And my people are on the brink of facing a disaster every bit as serious as what his people face.

There has to be some equity around here. There has to be some recognition that if the people of the northern plains suffer a loss, that is as serious as the people of the central plains. And that is what we are faced with again this year.

I hope that my colleagues would say that when people in this country face a disaster we are ready to help. That is part of the American ethic. Neighbors come to help.

In my State, if the barn burns down at the neighbor's place, you go to help. If somebody is sick and cannot harvest his crop, you go to help. That is part of the ethic of America. I hope we do not lose that in this country.

But now we are faced with another disaster. None of us could have known for sure 3 weeks ago that that was going to be the case. We know it now. It is here now. I hope that we are going to respond.

Mr. DOLE. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CONRAD. If I could, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BENTSEN of Texas be added as an original cosponsor of the bill, as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I will just take a second. I want to correct any misimpression that might be left by the Senator from North Dakota who indicated that I might not be sympathetic to the farmers in North Dakota. That has not been my record over the years. If there is going to be a disaster, we act on it. We do not wait until the end of every year to see how many people are going to have disasters and then have one bill at the end of the year.

There are a lot of ways we could legislate. One is, I suggest, take care of those who have already had the disaster and authorize the relief for the others. And that relief would be contingent not only on having another bill but finding the money to pay for it. So I think that is a responsible way to act.

Plus, I think we have to point out that we all represent farmers and they are the best people I know. But the Government cannot do it all. The Government cannot walk in every year and say, "Well, we will take care of all the farm disasters but if you are in business you do not get any relief. You may get a small business loan you have to pay back."

So I think farmers recognize, too, that there are limits on what the Federal Government can do. We have crop insurance. We have a crop insurance program. Most businesses buy insurance to protect themselves. Many farmers buy insurance to protect themselves. The crop insurance program is not perfect. We hope to revise it and modify it some this year to make it more attractive to farmers.

But the Government is spending $400 million for crop insurance. Premiums are subsidized by about 30 percent. Farmers, by and large, have had good treatment from the Congress. They appreciate it and their families appreciate it and people up and down Main Street appreciate it.

My only point it, let us get on with the drought relief package. It is much more than the rural development, the so-called rural development package pending in the committee. Let us get on with the drought relief package and let us work it out if we can pay for it, so that those who have already suffered a loss, not those who may suffer a loss, are taken care of and if those who may suffer a loss do suffer a loss in the future, then we will have some provisions to take care of them.

But I generally find, at least in the past, maybe it is changing, on the Agriculture Committee, a consensus, not a partisan consensus, but a consensus of those of us from farm States to make certain there is equity being done. But equity is not holding one group hostage for 6, 7, 8 months until we take care of everybody else in the country. To me, that is not equity. It may be in North Dakota, but I do not think so.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I would like to clear up a misunderstanding, as well.

Before the break, the Senator from Kansas was arguing strenuously that we move a bill that took care of winter wheat. If we would have done that, spring wheat and other spring crops would have been left out, because it is clear there is only going to be one drought bill moved through Congress.

Now, some of us fought that because we did not think it was fair just to take care of winter wheat. We know that winter wheat was covered in the last bill. These producers suffered minimal damage last year. Now they

are suffering great damage, and they ought to be helped. That is fair.

But we understand there is going to be only one bill moved and it ought to cover everyone who suffers a disaster. That is fair.

Let me just say that my State has suffered grievously. No State has suffered more. I indicated earlier the biggest loss in personal income in this country was suffered by my State. The worst devastation by the drought was suffered by my State.

I wish we did not have to come and ask for additional help. I wish we were not having a repeat of the drought. But we are.

And if we are going to treat each other with respect and treat each other equally, then it is only fair that we deal with all those who suffer, not just single out one who suffered first and say to those who come later, "Good luck." That is not good enough.

Those of us who represent spring wheat crops and the other spring crops are going to stand up for our people and make sure that they are fairly treated. That is our job and we intend to dispatch it.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

THE APPLE INDUSTRY

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I think it is appropriate that the distinguished senior Senator from Washington State is in the chair. As we knows, the apple industry has undergone a real dressing down in America this year. It is incredible to me that the United States of America is a nation that produces the best, the safest, the healthiest, the cleanest, the most convenient, the highest quality and lowest priced food for the consumers of this country.

Mr. President, there is no place in the world that have the convenience for shopping, the wide-spread distribution, or the availability of so many different kinds of foods. Whether we talk about frozen foods, fresh produce, or canned fruits and vegetables, the wide variety of food that is made available for the American people at such low prices is one of the real miracles of the private-enterprise profit-and-loss system we enjoy in the United States of America. There is no place on Earth that has supermarkets with the good, healthy, clean, fresh produce like we have in the United States.

The apple industry and many people in the apple industry have suffered enormously this year because of the emotional, demagogic and misleading scare tactics of the Natural Resources Defense Council [NRDC] and others. I think the U.S. Government has failed to stand up and make enough noise to put some of these naysayers down when they have told American consumer that healthy and nutritious foods were somehow harmful.

CBS, with 60 Minutes, wreaked havoc with the apple industry. The price of apples has dropped from about $12 to $14 a box [FOB] for shippers in Washington State and other States, down to about $8 a box for the extra fancy grades. People stopped eating apples because of the scare tactics seen in the 60 Minutes story. It devastated and will cause very serious financial problems for many, many apple farmers in the State of the distinguished Presiding Officer. It had a similar effect on my State on fewer people. But those who had apples in storage suffered the same losses as they did in Oregon and any other States where apples were still held in cold storage.

The reason I was interested in the comments of the distinguished minority leader, Senator DOLE, in his colloquy with Senator CONRAD about the drought bill, is that we seem to have the same kind of a problem now with respect to apples. I have the greatest sympathy for those apple growers in Washington State who are now wishing to have the Government buy some apples. This is being done now through section 32 funds. So the U.S. military, Federal prisons, and other places will enjoy the benefit of good, healthy, clean apples to eat as a result of this.

The tragic part of it is that many people in Washington State and other States where they had apples in storage have already taken their losses and sold their crop. They get very little benefit out of having the Federal Government step in at this late date and buy some apples. I do not have an answer for them. I was only interested in Senator DOLE's comments about the problems they have had in Kansas and how it relates to the drought in North Dakota.

It is always hard to have a program where the Government steps in to try to help out some people who have been harmed in part by their own Government and by the policies that allowed misinformation to scare millions of Americans away from the apple market.

In this country we can say the drought comes from the Almighty and not the Government, so those of us in the Senate, at least, do not have to take the blame for the drought. But I do think oftentimes Government intervention to try to help out some people, such as in the case of the recent purchase of these apples, really does not help the people who went ahead, took their lumps, sold their apples and lost their money. But hope springs eternal that maybe people will come back to their senses and realize that they would have fewer peoblems if they eat apples every day than if they listen to the NRDC and 60 Minutes and chose not to have a well-rounded, healthy diet that includes apples.

I am not overly excited about having the Federal Government purchase apples in this glut at this time. Those people who still have apples ought to be able to get rid of them, but a lot of their neighbors have already taken their lumps and sold their crop and they will not get any benefit from any purchase of this distressed crop at this late hour.

The same thing happens in the drought program. Some people benefit from it, some people do not. I have seen it happen in my State. The farmers who have good bankrolls when we have a drought program can drill a well and get paid half of the price of the well by the Government. The neighbor down the road who does not have such a fat bankroll cannot afford to spend $10,000 or $15,000 or $20,000 to drill a well, and so he cannot get that money reimbursed from the Government. It seems that is what happens all too often.

I long for the day when in this country farmers will have the opportunity to farm freely in a marketplace that is fair. I hope that someday they will not have so much interference from other factors that distort the markets and, in the long run, either keep some people in business who should have had the opportunity in the profit-and-loss system to get out of business, or likewise have the opportunity to benefit in the time that they do manage to hang on and run a frugal operation. Then farmers can be free when opportunity knocks to have a profitable venture from the production of their crops.

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 1285. A bill to provide for the gradual reduction of expenses incurred by the United States in deploying United States forces in NATO countries and in Japan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

COST SHARING IN THE DEPLOYMENT OF NATO FORCES

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the time has come for a coherent policy toward the issue of burdensharing. We have spent far too long approaching this issue on a piecemeal basis, and pursuing conflicting policies. Far too often, the end result has been to irritate our allies, rather than persuade them. At the same time, it has been to emphasize goals that do not matter at the price of the goals that do, and to accept legislation which often is little more than ally bashing or whose net effect is to reduce our military effectiveness.

The bill that I am proposing today has the following major features:

It establishes reducing the cost of deploying U.S. forces overseas as the policy goal in burdensharing negotiations.

It calls for the President to negotiate with the nations of Central Europe and Japan to increase their contributions to the cost of deploying United States troops in their countries.

It sets the goal for allied contributions as 50 percent of United States costs for the NATO Central Region and 100 percent of United States costs for Japan.

It requires an estimate of the total cost of deploying United States forces for the defense of Japan and the NATO central region, and of the total value of the contributions those nations make toward offsetting these costs.

It requires that the NATO central region countries, and Japan, increase the total value of their offset of United States costs by at least 5 percent per year until they reach the applicable goal. In the event that they should fail to do so, the President would cut the total estimated cost of deploying U.S. forces by 5 percent for the next fiscal year.

It requires comprehensive annual reporting on the estimated annual cost of all U.S. deployments overseas, of the size of allied offsets, and of the efforts the United States has made to increase those offsets.

It allows the President to delay any reductions otherwise mandated by the bill by 1 additional year if he feels this is necessary for either urgent national security or arms control reasons.

This approach to burdensharing marks a major departure from past precedents. It establishes a coherent mix of goals for our burdensharing efforts that I believe all my colleagues will eventually share.

SETTING THE GOAL OF REDUCING THE COST OF STATIONING U.S. FORCES

The bill clearly states that our policy goal at this point in time should be to reduce the cost of stationing our forces overseas, and not subsidiary goals such as improvements in allied forces, research and development, or other less critical efforts. This policy recognizes the fact that changes in the threat allow us to focus our burdensharing efforts on maintaining the forces most critical to deterrence, to securing our critical strategic interests, and to negotiating effective arms control agreements.

SEEKING 100-PERCENT OFFSET OF THE COST OF DEPLOYING UNITED STATES FORCES FROM JAPAN

The bill recognizes the special status of our military relationship with Japan, and that Japan benefits more directly from our military deployments overseas than any other nation. It recognizes the fact that Japan is currently unwilling or unable to spend more than 1 percent of its GNP on defense, and that Japan's economic wealth allows it to pay a substantially higher percentage of offset for United States forces than any other nation.

The most recent report by the Secretary of Defense on allied contributions to the common defense shows that Japan ranks 15th after all our European allies in terms of the amount of its GNP that it spends on defense. It spent only 1 percent in the most recent year reported by the Secretary of Defense, versus 3.1 percent for West Germany, 4 percent for France, and 4.7 percent for the U.K. Japan also has the lowest share of population devoted to active military manpower and active and reserve military manpower. At the same time, Japan ranks second to the United States in GDP, and now has a GDP twice the size of that of the next closest major ally: West Germany.

No one in the United States has any justification to penalize Japan for its economic success, except to the limited degree this success has been achieved through restraints on trade. Defense burdensharing should not be an exercise in Japan bashing or in attacking any other ally. At the same time, Japan has been able to achieve much of its economic growth, and restrain its defense efforts, largely because of the extraordinary strategic commitments the United States has now made for more than four decades.

The strategic interests of the United States and Japan are also very different from those of the United States and its NATO central region allies. No one will benefit if Japan seeks to become a military superpower in Asia or to replace United States military forces in the region. The forward presence of United States forces helps guarantee the immediate security of Japan, and provides a long-established military presence that helps ensure the security of South Korea and the balance of power between the People's Republic of China and U.S.S.R. Japanese forces cannot play this role, and a major further Japanese buildup could well arouse new fears of Japanese military expansion.

Our burdensharing negotiations should recognize Japan's special status, and that Japan can bring its present offset of United States costs up from the present figure of roughly 40 percent to 100 percent for a fraction of one percent of its GDP. We should put the specialized role the United States plays in Northeast Asia on a sound and stable fiscal basis, and put an end to the kind of minor negotiating efforts which do as much to irritate United States and Japanese relations as to establish regional strategic stability.

SEEKING A 50-PERCENT OFFSET OF THE COST OF DEPLOYING U.S. FORCES FROM OUR NATO CENTRAL REGION ALLIES

The bill recognizes the growing wealth of our major European allies, and their ability to increase their efforts to offset the cost of stationing United States forces in the central region of Europe, and that they already have assumed a major portion of the burden of their own defense. Belgium, France, the FRG, Luxembourg. The Netherlands, and United Kingdom now provide 25 percent of the worldwide active duty military manpower in the Western alliance, 30.1 percent of the active and reserve military and civilian manpower, 27 percent of the division equivalent firepower, 24 percent of the naval surface tonnage, and 30 percent of the tactical combat aircraft.

At the same time, the bill recognizes that the NATO countries on NATO's northern and southern flanks are far less able to provide such offset support than the central region states, and that the problem of seeking added offset support is complicated by the special status of France within the NATO alliance, and by the economic problems of several central region states. Accordingly, the offset goal is set as 50 percent, and is defined in a sufficiently flexible way to take account of the special economic strength of the Federal Republic of Germany.

SETTING AN ANNUAL GOAL OF 5-PERCENT INCREASES IN OFFSETS WITH A MAXIMUM REDUCTION IN THE ANNUAL COST OF DEPLOYED FORCES OF 5 PERCENT

It recognizes both the fact that the United States faces urgent financial and budgetary problems in reducing the cost of meeting those strategic commitments of critical benefit to allied states, and the fact that any efforts to seek increased offsets from Japan and our major European allies must be gradual, preserve the stability of our present strategic relationships, and be conducted in a way that does not interfere with our ongoing arms control talks.

The bill mandates a maximum of 5-percent annual reductions in the estimated cost of United States deployments in support of Japan or our central region allies, and then only if they do not increase their estimated offset by 5 percent. It provides well over a fiscal year in which to prepare for such reductions without perturbing the structure of U.S. forces, and allows the President to take account of any reductions made for other purposes, including arms control.

ESTABLISHING A BROADER BURDENSHARING POLICY TOWARD OTHER STATES WHERE THE UNITED STATES DEPLOYS MILITARY FORCES

The bill recognizes that many countries where we deploy forces—countries like Greece, Turkey, and the Philippines—cannot make major increases in their efforts to offset the cost of deploying U.S. forces for their protection and that of nearby states. At the same time, it recognizes that an explicit and public effort to track the cost of such U.S. deployments and the size of individual allied offsets will

have a powerful effect in persuading such states to do the most they can.

The bill also recognizes that some states are attempting to use the basing and support rights they grant to the United States as a means of obtaining a level of foreign aid and other support from the United States which is far greater than the value of the basing rights and facilities they provide. It establishes the kind of reporting requirements that make the cost of such efforts clear, and which will warn the Congress when it needs to give priority to an investment in power projection forces and/or funding alternative basing facilities in other countries.

COMBINING CONSISTENCY OF PURPOSE WITH FLEXIBILITY OF APPROACH

The bill recognizes that the United States can negotiate most successfully when it sets clear congressional goals for action, but provides the President with greater discretion for both negotiating and national security purposes. The President can delay action for up to an additional fiscal year for national security or arms control purposes.

No ceilings are set that would interfere with a military buildup in a crisis. The President has great flexibility in defining the costs and forces to be included, the method of reporting, and the value of allied payments and offsets. The bill combines consistency of purpose with flexibility of approach.

THE CASE FOR A NEW APPROACH TO BURDENSHARING

I realize that this bill is a major new departure from past approaches to burdensharing, and that many of its provisions are complicated. I should stress that it is based upon a careful analysis of the real issues in burdensharing, and of past legislation and studies affecting this issue. I have summarized the reasons behind my new approach in a recent article in the Armed Forces Journal, and which I am requesting be attached in full to my remarks.

We need to stop trivializing burdensharing, using it to act out our frustrations in dealing with given states, and to recognize the fact that we cannot make this country safe by cutting our first line of defense and the forces most important to deterrence unless our changing economic situation leaves us no other choice. The time has come to debate the kind of legislation that will establish a lasting framework for action on this issue. We need to focus on finding ways to maintain our vital strategic commitments that recognize the new economic strength of some of our allies, and the problems we face in the case of other less wealthy states.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and an article that I wrote on the subject be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1285

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

SECTION 1. STATEMENT OF POLICY AND FINDING.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to maintain its commitments to defend the nations of the free world while reducing, to the maximum extent practicable, the cost to the United States of stationing United States forces outside the United States;

(2) to ensure that the allies of the United States assume, commensurate with their respective sizes and economic strengths, their fair share of the total cost of deploying United States forces for the defense of those allies;

(3) to ensure that the Central Region nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) use their collective economic strength to offset at least 50 percent of the total cost of deploying United States forces for the defense of such nations;

(4) to ensure that Japan uses its economic strength to offset the total cost of deploying United States forces for the defense of Japan; and

(5) to closely monitor the cost of deploying United States forces outside the United States with a view to determining the extent to which each country in which those forces are deployed is making the maximum practicable contribution to offsetting such costs commensurate with the size of its own forces, the threats it faces, and the strength of its economy.

(b) FINDING.—Congress finds that the policies described in subsection (a) should be achieved, to the maximum extent practicable, by multilateral negotiations between the United States and its allies without impinging on any on-going negotiations for an arms control agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

SEC. 2. MULTILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS.

At the earliest practical date after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall—

(1) enter into negotiations with the European member nations of NATO for the purpose of achieving an agreement under which such nations agree to increase the value of their contributions toward meeting the cost of deploying United States forces in the Central Region of NATO to an amount equal to 50 percent of the total cost of deploying such forces in that region for the defense of that region; and

(2) enter into negotiations with Japan for the purpose of achieving an agreement under which Japan agrees to make contributions sufficient in value to meet the total cost of deploying United States forces in Japan for the defense of Japan.

SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT OF OFFSET POLICY.

(a) DETERMINATION OF NATO CONTRIBUTIONS; REDUCTION OF EXPENDITURES BY U.S.—(1) Not later than December 1 of each year, beginning in 1991, the President shall determine the total cost of deploying United States forces outside the United States for the protection of the Central Region of NATO during the fiscal year ending on September 30 of such year (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "preceding fiscal year") and the total value of contributions that were made during such fiscal year by member nations of NATO toward meeting that cost.

(2) If the President determines in any fiscal year that the total value of contributions made by member nations of NATO toward offsetting the cost of deploying United States forces outside the United States for the defense of the Central Region of NATO during the preceding fiscal year was less than 50 percent of the total cost of deploying such forces, the President shall take such action as may be necessary to ensure that the total cost to the United States of deploying United States forces outside the United States for the defense of that region in the next fiscal year does not exceed an amount equal to 5 percent less than the total cost to the United States of deploying such forces in such region in the preceding fiscal year, except that no action is required to be taken with respect to any year under this paragraph that will result in reducing the total cost to the United States to an amount less than 50 percent of the total cost of deploying such forces in that region in the next fiscal year.

(b) DETERMINATION OF JAPANESE CONTRIBUTIONS; REDUCTION OF EXPENDITURES BY U.S.—(1) Not later than December 1 of each year, beginning in 1991, the President shall determine the total cost of deploying United States forces outside the United States for the defense of Japan during the fiscal year ending on September 30 of such year (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "preceding fiscal year") and the total value of contributions that were made during such fiscal year by Japan toward meeting that cost.

(2) If the President determines in any fiscal year that the total value of contributions made by Japan toward offsetting the cost of deploying United States forces outside the United States for the defense of Japan during the preceding fiscal year was less than 100 percent of the total cost of deploying such forces for such purpose, the President shall take such action as may be necessary to ensure that the total cost to the United States of deploying United States forces for that purpose in the next fiscal year does not exceed an amount equal to 5 percent less than the total cost to the United States of deploying such forces for the defense of Japan in the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 4. SPECIAL AUTHORITY RELATING TO REDUCTIONS

(a) AUTHORITY TO DELAY REDUCTIONS.—(1) The President may waive for one fiscal year any reduction in expenditures required under subsection (a) or (b) of section 3 if the Secretary determines—

(A) that the waiver is necessary because of urgent national security reasons; or

(B) that the required reduction would have an adverse affect on on-going negotiations for an arms control agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

(2) The President shall promptly notify Congress of a waiver made under paragraph (1).

(b) COSTS THAT MAY BE INCLUDED IN COMPUTATION OF REDUCTION.—In computing any reduction required to be made under section 3 in any fiscal year, the President may include in such computation the value of any reductions made in such fiscal year in the cost of deploying United States forces outside the United States for the defense of the Central Region of NATO or Japan, as the

case may be, that were made for reasons other than the requirement of section 3.

SEC. 5. COMPUTATION OF DEPLOYMENT COSTS; COMPUTATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS BY ALLIES

(a) DEPLOYMENT COSTS.—In computing the costs of deploying United States forces outside the United States for the defense of any foreign country, the President shall include all direct and indirect costs of maintaining United States forces in that country and all direct and indirect costs of deploying United States forces on any lands or waters adjacent to or in the vicinity of that country if the primary mission of the deployment of such forces is the defense of that country. Such costs shall include all relevant manpower costs (other than pay and allowances), operations and maintenance costs, construction costs, transportation costs, and costs of physical facilities. Such costs shall also include all costs incurred to obtain basing or deployment rights in a foreign country. Such costs shall not include the cost of developing and procuring combat equipment and munitions.

(b) COMPUTATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—In computing the value of any contribution by a foreign country toward the costs of deployment of United States forces outside the United States in defense of that country, the President shall include all in-kind contributions made for that purpose as well as all financial contributions made for that purpose and may include both direct and indirect costs of providing such contributions.

SEC. 6. ANNUAL REPORT

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 1 of each year, the President shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains the following:

(1) A detailed analysis of the estimated cost of deploying United States forces overseas during the current fiscal year and the two preceding fiscal years, including, in the case of each foreign country in which United States forces are deployed, a statement of the cost of deploying such forces in such country in each of such fiscal years.

(2) A detailed analysis of the estimated value of any equipment and services made available to the United States and the amount of any financial payments made to the United States in each of the fiscal years referred to in paragraph (1) by each country in which United States forces were deployed in such fiscal years and which were made to meet the expense of deploying such forces in such country in such fiscal year.

(3) A statement of the progress made during the current fiscal year in obtaining increased contributions of equipment, services, and cash payments by such countries as a means of meeting the cost of deploying United States forces outside the United States for the defense of such countries.

(4) A description of any actions taken by the United States and its allies during the current fiscal year to decrease the cost to the United States of deploying United States forces in the Central Region of NATO and in Japan and a description of any actions proposed to be taken by the United States and its allies during the next fiscal year to decrease such cost to the United States.

(b) FIRST REPORT.—The first report required to be submitted under subsection (a) shall be submitted in 1992.

(c) SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—(1) Nothing in this section shall require the President to disclose any information in any report required by this section that the President determines would seriously—

(A) jeopardize the national security of the United States or any of its allies;

(B) undermine existing and effective efforts to meet the policy objectives specified in section 1; or

(C) compromises sensitive intelligence operations, the disclosure of which would likely result in grave damage to the national security of the United States or any of its allies.

(2) The President may submit the reports required by subsection (a) in classified and unclassified versions.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS

As used in this Act:

(1) The term "United States forces" means members of the Armed Forces of the United States and civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

(2) The terms "Central Region nations of NATO" and "Central Region of NATO" mean the countries of Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.

[From Armed Forces Journal International, June 1989]

SAVING OUR ALLIANCES: THE REAL ISSUE IN BURDEN-SHARING

(By Senator John McCain)

One way or another, Congress is certain to adopt new burden-sharing legislation this year. The issue is not whether such initiatives will take place; it is whether they will have the right goals and do more good than harm. There are good reasons to be concerned over how Congress approaches this issue.

In the past, Congressional legislation regarding burden-sharing has done little more than interfere with the efforts of the Executive branch. This has not been important when our alliances have been strong and stable. The end result has been an irritant, not a serious problem. This year, however, the wrong kind of burden-sharing legislation could have far more destructive effects. Unless we approach our allies in the right way and with the right goals, we might end up undermining our ties to NATO and Japan, our ability to reach secure and stable conventional arms reduction agreements with the U.S.S.R. and the Warsaw Pact, and our ability to make the kind of shifts in our force posture that will be needed to reflect changing strategic priorities and a lower level of defense resources.

Our burden-sharing efforts should have three major goals:

To reduce the cost of our military presence in Europe and to ease the economic strain of paying for Europe's defense until, and if, we can negotiate stable and secure arms reductions with the Warsaw Pact;

To reduce the cost of stationing our forces in Japan and South Korea, and have Japan assume the bulk of the cost of the economic aid necessary to assure the political stability of the less developed states that are critical to Western security;

To provide the additional allied support necessary to allow us to shift forces and resources to deal with other contingencies such as the defense of the West's oil imports and lines of communication and low-intensity combat.

BURDEN-SHARING GOALS FOR NATO AND WESTERN EUROPE

These goals may seem relatively straightforward, but they are actually considerably different from the goals that have been pursued in the past. To begin with, they emphasize finding the resources to maintain a stable U.S. presence in Europe rather than putting pressure on our allies to make major increases in their conventional forces.

The plain truth is that no amount of U.S. pressure on our allies is going to lead them to make the kind of massive increases in defense spending and manpower necessary to achieve a major shift in conventional warfighting capabilities. We ourselves are only going to fund about one-third to one-half the rate of force improvement we planned to fund five years ago. Regardless of how real *glasnost* may be, no NATO country is going to fund the increases in real defense spending necessary to do more than maintain its current level of conventional capability relative to the Warsaw Pact. Most will spend substantially less.

These facts have two major policy consequences. The first is the need for effective theater nuclear force modernization. Rather than press our allies for increases in conventional capability that they will never make, and treating this as a part of burden-sharing, we need to press them to maintain enough nuclear strength to maintain the current level of deterrence and to give the Warsaw Pact a meaningful incentive to negotiate acceptable reductions in its conventional and nuclear forces.

The second consequence is the need to maintain NATO's current strength, and the U.S. commitment, long enough to find out how real Gorbachev's interest in meaningful mutual arms reductions really is. We do not face an urgent risk of war in Europe. We do face an urgent risk of premature unilateral force reductions, and of sending the Warsaw Pact the kind of signals of division and weakness that would deprive it of the incentive to negotiate with NATO on a realistic basis.

Europe can expect us to have the patience to avoid rushing into reducing our forces in Europe. It cannot expect us to tolerate prolonged delays in the modernization of NATO theater nuclear forces and act as if Europe had not recovered enough economic strength to pay a larger share of the cost of its own defense and the defense of its oil, other raw materials, and trade routes.

BURDEN-SHARING GOALS FOR JAPAN AND SOUTH KOREA

The U.S. now has only a limited interest in asking Japan to spend more on defense. The expansion of the Japanese gross national product has reached the point where Japan is already spending some $30-billion a year on defense. This is roughly equivalent to the French or West German defense budgets, and compares with about $34-billion for the United Kingdom and $6-billion for South Korea. We may need to improve our arrangements for the roles and missions Japanese Self Defense Forces should play in order to expand Japan's role in defending the waters around it. We do not need more Japanese tanks, aircraft, or ships than Japan can afford if it increases its defense spending to levels around 1.5% of its gross national product (GNP).

Neither Japan nor the rest of Asia is ready for Japan to reemerge as a military superpower. The memories of World War II are too recent, and the external threats from the U.S.S.R., North Korea, and Viet-

nam too limited. American military power may not always be loved, but it is tolerated; and few nations in Asia show any sign of fearing any form of American neocolonialism.

What we do need is an effective Japanese foreign aid program that can use Japan's status as an economic superpower to help other Asian nations develop and achieve the internal stability needed for free and democratic government. The U.S. already has the forces necessary to help Asian nations protect their military security. What is needed is the kind of grant aid that will allow nations like the Philippines to break out of the trap of debt and poverty and offer their people the mix of hope and economic security that is essential for free governments to continue to function.

Similarly, we need the kind of direct offset for our defense expenditures that reflects the relative growth of Japanese economic power. We need both the cash offsets that reduce our direct costs, and the support in terms of manpower and facilities that free our forces to operate in other areas. Once again, if we are to continue to bear the burden of defending Japan's oil, other raw materials, and trade routes, Japan's burden-sharing efforts must reflect this.

South Korea has also reached the point where it can provide more support, if not added offset expenditures. South Korea still spends a high percentage of its GNP on defense—roughly the same percentage as the U.S. spends—but it is certainly capable of providing more manpower, services, and facilities.

INDIRECT ALLIED SUPPORT FOR U.S. GLOBAL ROLE

The U.S. cannot expect direct European or Japanese military support in performing out-of-area missions. Coalition defenses are difficult enough to agree upon and implement when direct national interests are at issue. The U.S. can, however, expect both its European allies and Japan to treat the offset of U.S. costs in Europe and Japan, and the provision of services to substitute for U.S. forces, in full context. The more that Europe and Japan provide by way of offsets of any kind, the more resources the U.S. has to perform out-of-area missions.

This kind of burden-sharing, however, requires very different measurements than data on defense spending as a percentage of GNP or national budget, or per capita. As long as our European and Japanese allies maintain their current level of defense effort, the criteria for burden-sharing become: (1) how large a percentage of the cost of deploying U.S. forces in each area is offset by Europe and Japan; (2) how many support, facility, and other services are provided to reduce the amount of manpower the U.S. must deploy in peacetime; and (3) how well Japanese economic aid meets the needs of other states in Asia.

It is interesting to note that the Department of Defense and the Executive branch do not now provide any of these statistics. DoD has long preferred to measure this kind of burden-sharing in generalities, and has sometimes even denied that such figures can be provided—although the issue is willingness and not capability. In fact, if the Department had provided such statistics, it would long ago have demonstrated that the U.S. is already receiving enough offset money and services from many European countries and Japan so that it is already cheaper to maintain our forces in West Germany and Japan than it is to deploy them in the United States.

Similarly, the U.S. government has shown only token interest in working on specific economic assistance plans with Japan. Organizations like the Agency for International Development (AID) have even failed to give enthusiastic support to Japan in developing as AID-like organization.

Accordingly, both Congress and the Executive branch need to work together to develop the proper understanding of the support our allies already provide, and to develop added burden-sharing measures that focus on the kind of support we really need. The present focus on the rate of allied defense expenditures, or rate of increase in allied forces, does not suit our current strategic goals, provides no basis for encouraging the kind of burden-sharing we really need, disguises the progress we have already made, and undermines our most important alliances.

UNDERSTANDING THE TRUE NATURE OF OUR OVERSEAS COMMITMENTS

We need to improve the realism of our thinking about burden-sharing in other ways. Far too much of our current rhetoric about our strategic burden and burden-sharing ignores the true nature of our current deployments. Worse, it tends to encourage both Congress and the American people to focus on cutting those forces which contribute most to deterrence and our contingency capability. We have created a statistical illusion that leads us to remove our teeth rather than trim our tail.

The current debate is based largely on false premises. One is that we could achieve meaningful savings by bringing our forces home from key forward locations like Germany and Japan. The second is that we are spending some 60-80% of our defense budget to defend our allies, and that we should cut our forward deployed forces as a result.

We do "commit" far more forces to NATO, Northeast Asia, and Southwest Asia than we can deploy within any reasonable amount of time. In fact, we commit virtually all our forces to some front somewhere in the world as part of our force-sizing exercises. The end result, however, is a situation where the most important contingencies are charged for virtually all of our manpower and equipment, although our actual force posture locates most of that manpower and equipment in the U.S. and to the area where they are "committed" in real-world contingencies. It is also a situation where many of our forces are designed largely to meet a given defense budget ceiling, not to perform a real-world mission, but our allies are charged in burden-sharing exercises with the cost of forces we cannot really deploy.

This commitment-versus-capability gap is particularly bad in the case of NATO, largely for historical reasons. We have artificially maximized our assigned and ear-marked forces over the years to: (1) push our allies to increase their forces; (2) make highly theoretical conventional options seem real; and (3) minimize the impact of running down our forces in Europe during the Vietnam War by committing added forces in the continental U.S. (CONUS) to NATO.

If we look at the actual situation, we get a very different picture. This situation is revealed by the manpower figures in the table below.

We deploy only 14% of our active military manpower to all of NATO, including substantial forces in the southern flank that are used for power projection outside NATO. We devote only 10% of our manpower to West Germany; and even if we include all of the Central Region, the total would rise to 281,090—or 13%.

The data for Asia show that unless we assume that the U.S. would abandon its fleet and forces in Hawaii, the U.S. stations only 5% more of its manpower in the region.

In short, the U.S. meets its two most important overseas commitments with about 20% of its manpower, for which it already receives massive offsets that generally make that manpower cheaper to deploy overseas than to keep in CONUS.

These figures would be substantially higher if we included all of our forces for a worst-case contingency based on overseas deployments at M-day+30. The total might well rise to about 35%, based on real-world readiness and lift constraints. In actual practice, however, the U.S. has had to draw down most of this manpower twice since WWII for third world contingencies—Korea and Vietnam. It is far from clear that our allies can really be charged for all of the cost of maintaining all the combat-ready units in CONUS.

It is even more unclear that if we totally abandoned all our overseas commitments, we could actually have a significantly reduced force structure. If anything, we might have to buy far more lift and pay additional costs that are now offset by our allies.

Given these facts, I would suggest that our goal in both defense planning and in seeking added allied support should be to keep our "teeth" intact; and that if we are to cut our forces in response to any failures on the part of our allies, we should cut our reinforcing forces—or "tail"—back in the United States.

This approach is far more practical in strategic terms, and is more cost-effective. There is no point in going on with the myth that we structure most of our forces for NATO. The fact is that approximately 80% of our total military forces are in CONUS or at sea, and are the price of remaining a world power with many contingency requirements that have nothing to do with our allies.

We need to change our approach to burden-sharing to stress allied output in terms of forces and security assistance, rather than total spending. We need to recognize that our defense spending is driven by very different factors than that of our major European allies and Japan. We have a near monopoly of strategic forces in the West. We are at least 6,000 miles from most contingencies; we do not want to pay the political and social costs of conscription; and we want highly flexible, all-purpose forces for a wide range of contingencies.

This is why we should focus on outputs rather than inputs: The issue is not the economics of what our allies spend but rather the level of force capability our allies maintain, the level of offset they provide to meet the cost of the US forces that aid their defense, and the level of foreign assistance they provide to the developing world.

NEW APPROACHES TO NATO BURDEN-SHARING

We need to accept the fact that burden-sharing is not a NATO issue; it is an issue that affects the Central Region and Italy. Canada is already making its contribution in North American air defense and by maintaining its forces in Germany. Iceland provides basing facilities. Norway lacks the resources to do more than maintain a reasonable deterrent against attacks on its soil. Greece, Portugal, and Turkey require aid from the other countries in NATO. Spain is at best going to continue to provide the

bases and facilities it now does, and make a largely symbolic military contribution.

This leave the Central Region and Italy, and even here it is critical to understand the limits of what any burden-sharing exercise can accomplish:

While Belgium has always done its best to support the alliance, it faces continuing economic problems and serious limitations on what it can do. There is little margin for additional Belgian action, at least in the near term.

There is little point in the United States making new attempt to put pressure on Denmark. Denmark's grossly underfunded forces already lack political support, and Denmark's continuing economic and budget problems ensure that there will be no real increases in defense spending. The United States needs to concentrate on preserving what Denmark already has, not on measures that could aid the political opponents of Denmark's contribution to NATO.

France has quietly improved its cooperation with NATO, the US, and other European states ever since de Gaulle's death; but it is politically committed to a degree of independence from NATO's command and infrastructure activities that ensure it will not join in any burden-sharing efforts. It also has some of the more ambitious force improvement programs of any European state, and contributes an important degree of nuclear deterrence. There is no chance that US burden-sharing activities will elicit any favorable response.

The Federal Republic of Germany is an increasingly divided nation which is progressively more interested in the potential benefits of glasnost. Even the traditionally conservative and pro-defense Christian Democratic union and Christian Social Union are increasingly uncertain about their commitment to maintaining NATO's theater nuclear capabilities, M-day conventional forces, and forward defense. The days in which the US could easily pressure the FRG into added burden-sharing actions are long over. Any US action must be carefully tailored if it is to produce a positive response rather than provide political ammunition to the opponents of NATO and strong FRG forces.

Italy has long been one of the strongest supporters of NATO and the US position in Europe. Its growing economic strength amy well give it the flexibility to make some increases in its infrastructure and supporting funding. There are, however, sharp limits on what Italy can be expected to do; and it already makes a major contribution in the form of bases and support facilities.

Luxembourg is too small to make any contribution beyond the ones it already makes in terms of forces and facilities.

Like Belgium and Italy, the Netherlands has always been a strong supporter of NATO and the US military role in Europe. Like Belgium, however, it also faces some structural economic problems. There are limits to what the US can expect in the form of additional support. The Netherlands already is having severe problems in funding the proper degree of readiness, modernization, and forward deployment. US pressure is unlikely to accomplish much in the foreseeable future.

The United Kingdom has been the strongest single supporter of the US position in Europe. The UK, however, now faces a major budget crisis of its own—and one whose politics ensure that no amount of US pressure can lead to productive results. The Royal Navy is underfunded to the point where it is losing much of its operational strength; the RAF lacks the funds for proper training and modernization; and the British Army lacks the funds for both modernization and sustainability. Undesirable as this situation may be, it is inconceivable that any British government could do more than that of Margaret Thatcher.

THE THREAT OF FORCE REDUCTIONS

It is one thing to talk about NATO or Europe, as if individual nations did not face driving political and economic pressures. It is quite another to deal with the real-world conditions that shape each country's behavior. We need to face the fact that if we press any allied country for major real increases in its forces and defense spending in the midst of glasnost and Warsaw Pact promises of force reductions, we are doing little more than pursuing a policy of illusion that will accelerate all the present tensions and divisions within the alliance.

Our approach to burden-sharing needs to change to fit changing conditions. We cannot treat burden-sharing as if the overt or tacit threat of force reductions would achieve our goals. The threat to take our ball and go home if the other kids won't play the game our way simply is no longer credible, if it ever was. A large part of Europe is now indifferent to such threats. A significant and hostile portion would welcome any US withdrawals, and our closest friends might have little choice except to express their regrets and wave goodby.

What we need are burden-sharing options that: (1) try to set a floor under NATO, (2) make increases in offsets of reduce US costs, and (3) help preserve enough theater nuclear strength to maintain the present level of deterrence. Fortunately, we still have several such options:

Percentage of offset

First, we can focus on linking the size of the US manpower deployed in a given country to the total host country and NATO offset of the costs involved, then set the trigger in terms of time and threshold to act as a strong incentive to increase or maintain burden-sharing. While this may produce only limited additional funding from most states, it may well help in the case of West Germany.

Offset is also the real issue for the 1990s. We do not really need major allied force increases at this point in time. What we need is relief from defense spending and our budget deficit, and a convincing political reason to stay forward deployed until—or if—we can get stable mutual force cuts.

We may get some initial complaints from DoD about generating the necessary statistics, but such calculations are perfectly feasible. We may not get perfect numbers, but we will get numbers as good as those we use for any other aspect of defense econometrics.

Nuclear modernization

Second, we may be able to get allied agreement to modernize NATO's theater nuclear weapons if we give this issue sufficient priority as part of the allied burden in maintaining the common defense and do not press for arbitrary deadlines. We also can probably get British and French agreements to modernize their nuclear forces and take up some of the burden. Our goal should not be impossible increases in conventional forces, but consensus on the limited amount of theater nulcear modernization needed to preserve the current level of deterrence.

Rate of force modernization

We can achieve limited savings at an acceptable risk by limiting US expenditures on modernization of its forces in the Central Region to the average European Central Region modernization rate of major equipment, based on some measure such as investment relative to total capital stock. Similarly, we can limit the modernization of US facilities to cases where our allies offset a fixed percentage of the cost. As long as we do not link this to impossible demands for improved allied performance, or go to the extreme of blocking critical improvements in US capabilities, we can quietly reduce our costs while encouraging the allies to do more.

Level of readiness

We can also place limits on US expenditures on readiness and sustainability to some measure of European activity such as average readiness, numbers of stocks in days, etc. This kind of limit, however, is a more dangerous game than placing limits on modernization. It hurts our forces more quickly, and may simply end up in a readiness run-down contest.

Cuts in commitments, not forward deployed forces

We can tie our burdensharing efforts to the threat of cuts in our total commitments to NATO in a way where we progressively free our forces in CONUS for reduction or other missions. This would work as a constant pressure on our allies by reducing the promise of US reinforcement; it would avoid cutting our key forward deployed deterrent, or interfering with balanced force reductions, and may be desirable in any case. There is no longer any reason to commit the bulk of our force structure in CONUS to NATO, even if such a commitment is largely a political act.

Cuts in forward deployed manpower, not units

We can tie our burden-sharing efforts to the threat of cuts in our manpower levels, or simply quietly carry out such cuts in order to reduce our costs and free manpower for other roles and missions. We survived quite nicely in the mid-1970s, in the face of a far more urgent threat, with only about 70% of our present manning levels. If we do play games with force cuts versus burden-sharing, let's make the key measure manpower. Such cuts can be safely tied to burden-sharing—they produce quick savings and involve only minimal risk.

TREATING JAPAN AS A SPECIAL CASE

We need to recognize from the outset that Japan is a special case. Japan differs from other states in three key respects: immense wealth, political and social barriers to major military forces, and our interest in not having Japan emerge as a regional military superpower.

I believe, therefore, that we should treat Japan specially in two ways. First, seek 100% offset of our stationing and deployment costs. Second, seek massive increases in untied foreign aid and security assistance that key, less-developed countries can use to buy from any country they want.

This might be accomplished in two ways. First, legislation can be drafted calling for Japan to reach a given goal in terms of offset and foreign aid and requiring the Administration to report quarterly on progress towards meeting this goal with no punitive legislation. In short, force a highly public exercise with the implied threat that consistent improvement would affect US attitudes on trade and other issues. This is close to what we proposed in the past, but forces the issue much more directly.

Second, tie the same goals to some kind of trade sanctions or barriers, with suitable smoke and mirrors and grace periods so that the Administration has plenty of leeway. I believe that some form of trade sanctions has to be legal—they certainly apply them to us—and that sanctions that threaten to cut our forces would simply play into hostile hands.

DEALING WITH THE REAL ISSUES

Congress has shown in the past that it can be a valuable asset to the Administration if it focuses on the right issues and limits its actions to the level where they create constructive pressure on our allies. It is also true that the normal give-and-take of maintaining good relations with our allies often leads a given Administration to underestimate what can really be accomplished outside the normal channels of diplomacy.

The success of the Mansfield Resolution and Nunn Amendments, however, is not an indication that Congress can accomplish anything by trying to micromanage the defense budgets of our allies or by indulging in "ally bashing." The Congress came perilously close to enacting a long list of such measures into law in 1988.

It is painfully clear that such measures have no place in today's strategic climate. It is also clear that the last thing we need to do—at a time when our long commitment to the defense of Europe and Northeast Asia is finally paying off in what seem to be basic changes in Soviet behavior—is to create the kind of pressures that simply end up weakening our alliances, particularly when a few years of patience may lead to the kind of balanced force reductions that will truly enhance our security. Fortunately, the preceding discussion has shown we do have options that can respond to our current strategic priorities and that deal with the real issues we face. If both Congress and the Administration recognize this, we can accomplish a great deal.

[NOTES.—Senator McCain, a former Navy aviator, is a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. He serves on its Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense, Manpower, and Personnel, and Projection Forces and Regional Defense, Subcommittees. A 1958 Naval Academy graduate, McCain served 22 years in the Navy. He was a prisoner of war in Vietnam for five and a half years. After attending the National War College in 1973, McCain served as the Director of the Navy's Senate Liaison Office until his retirement in 1981. After two terms as a member of the House of Representatives, McCain was elected Senator from Arizona in 1986. The New York Times recently said that as a member of the Senate, "McCain has established himself not only as a key voice on defense and foreign policy issues, but also as a rising star in the post-Reagan Republican Party."]

U.S. ACTIVE MILITARY MANPOWER DEPLOYED OVERSEAS

Command/country	Manpower	Percent of total
U.S. Foreign Command [1]	317,000	14
FRG only	245,000	10
Army	204,700	9
USAF	41,000	1
U.S. Pacific Command [2]	128,210	5
Korea	43,000	1
Japan (less Okinawa)	48,500	2
Okinawa	26,400	1
Philippines	16,400	1

[1] All U.S. NATO forces in Europe, including 20,100-man 6th Fleet afloat.
[2] Less 18,900 Army and other USAF Navy HQ personnel in Hawaii.
Source: Adapted from The Military Balance, 1988–89, in USS.

By Mr. KASTEN:

S. 1286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a maximum long-term capital gains rate of 15 percent and indexing of certain capital assets; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDING THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE WITH REGARD TO LONG-TERM CAPITAL GAINS RATES

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, just a few short weeks ago, the distinguished Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, indicated his willingness to consider a capital gains tax cut as part of this year's reconciliation bill. And despite his recent comments to the contrary, I believe a capital gains tax cut is still a live option.

For one thing, I believe President Bush remains firm on his campaign pledge to veto any new taxes. I will urge the President to veto any reconciliation bill that includes a tax increase and excludes a capital gains tax rate cut. And I am certain that the President will do so—because he was the architect of both the no new taxes pledge and the 15 percent capital gains proposal, the two major economic pillars of the 1988 Republican Party platform.

Mr. President, thanks in large measure to those policies, George Bush is our President today—and he's going to stand firm.

Furthermore, without the $5.3 billion in extra revenue mandated in the budget plan, the estimated fiscal year 1990 deficit will rise above the $110 billion, thus triggering the Gramm-Rudman across-the-board budget cuts. Furthermore, the tax-writing committees must raise revenues above and beyond $5.3 billion to finance other important tax changes such as the expansion of the earned income tax credit for the working poor, repeal of the burdensome section 89 regulation, and extension of the low-income housing credit.

Mr. President, a revenue raising cut in the capital gains tax is the only way out of this impasse. Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI's original plan was to cut the gains tax to 20 percent for 1 year and then index capital gains. Although his plan has some political appeal, it fails to meet the criteria for an effective progrowth capital gains tax cut. While indexing for inflation eliminates the unfair taxation of illusory gains, it does not address the severe tax bias against entrepreneurship and the high cost of capital in this country. Second, it does not significantly improve America's competitive position vis-a-vis many of our overseas competitors who do not tax capital gains at all. Third, a temporary cut in the capital gains tax is poor tax policy. While it satisfies short-term revenue requirements, it defeats the overriding purpose of encouraging long-term investment and expanding business horizons.

Today, I am introducing capital gains legislation that builds—and improves—upon Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI's original concept. My new legislation would cut the capital gains tax rate to 15 percent for both individuals and businesses. The tax cut would apply to all capital assets. The legislation would implement a trigger mechanism to eliminate the rate differential if tax revenues from capital gains are lower in 1995 than in 1989. Indexing capital gains would begin in 1995, regardless of what happens to the tax rate.

Mr. President, everyone now agrees that there will be short-term revenue gain from a cut in the gains tax. This is a tremendous leap forward from the late 1970's when Treasury Secretaries William Simon and Michael Blumenthal argued that a tax cut would result in an immediate loss of tax revenues. Today, we are assuming revenue gains—and debating whether or not those revenue gains will continue into the future.

History shows that cutting the capital gains tax is a proven revenue winner—and that the revenue gains will be permanent and repeating in the out years. When we cut capital gains tax rates in 1978 and again in 1981, tax revenues from capital gains rose each year for 7 consecutive years—from $9.1 billion in 1978 to $11.7 billion in 1979, $12.5 billion in 1980, $12.7 billion in 1981, $12.9 billion in 1982, $18.5 billion in 1983, a recession year, $21.5 billion in 1984, and $24.5 billion in 1985.

And recent academic research concludes that history will repeat itself if we bring down the current high tax rate. Harvard economist Lawrence Lindsay estimated that a flat 15-percent tax rate would raise $33 billion in new revenue over three years, or $11 billion a year. A just-released series of economic studies prepared for the National Venture Capital Association by Alan Auerbach of the University of Pennsylvania, Patric Hendershott of Ohio State University, and Joel Slemrod of the University of Michigan concluded that a reduced tax rate would increase capital gains realizations and tax revenues.

Let's give capital gains tax cuts a trial period. If history is wrong and tax revenues plummet, then capital gains should surely be taxed as ordinary income. My proposal would prevent a temporary tax cut from unnecessarily disrupting the financial markets. It would provide a useful compromise between those who fear a long-term revenue loss from a capital gains tax cut—and those who desire a tax policy oriented toward long-term investment.

Mr. President, besides the budget dilemma, there is another immediate—and perhaps more compelling—reason

to slash the capital gains tax: The U.S. economy needs an economic stimulus. The Fed's unyielding—and completely unreasonable—adherence to the discredited Phillips curve analysis has made a recession more than likely. As a consequence, key economic indicators such as housing starts, auto sales, factory orders, consumer spending, and industrial production have declined in recent months. Cutting the capital gains tax should be the centerpiece of a new antirecession drive. It would get the economy moving through investment, while a tax increase would throw our fragile economy into a tailspin.

A capital gains tax reduction is the right response to counteract the Fed's misguided policy, dampen inflationary pressures and stimulate the economy. I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal's June editorial on the economic need for a capital gains tax cut be entered at this point in the RECORD:

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 30, 1989]

BAD TIMING, DAN

An article on page A3 of this newspaper yesterday carried the headline, "Rostenkowski Won't Seek Cut in Gains Tax." Just opposite, on page A2, was another headline, "Leading Indicators Fell Sharply During May, Darkening Outlook."

What bad timing, for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to give up on cutting the capital gains rate just when the economy may need a boost. Dow Jones Industrials fell 46.47 yesterday, after a 21.63 drop the day before, and those two headlines in the Journal were no doubt a factor.

If the economy does start to slip badly, what medicine will we have to revive it? Inflation would be likely to remain sticky, limiting a big easing of monetary policy. And the deficit would grow, limiting a push of federal spending. A cut in the capital gains tax would boost incentives, and by now-common consent, without any loss of short-term revenues. Why rule out such potent medicine just when fears of recession are growing?

Now, we are in general admirers of Mr. Rostenkowski. His vital support for the 1986 tax reform gave the long-running economic recovery a new burst of vigor just when it was losing steam. He also responded in a cooperative way to President Bush's request for the capital gains cut. For a while it seemed things were going well.

Indeed, congressional researchers had agreed with the administration's estimate that the reduction would yield the government $15 billion in additional revenues in its first year as investors took advantage of the lower tax to realize their gains. While the history of the 1978 capital gains reduction suggested that the revenue boost would persist, these longer-term effects remained controversial. But that is not usually the worry in recessions, and with signs of a slowdown spreading, why did the chairman suddenly decide to abandon this well-tested recipe both for economic stimulus and revenue enhancement?

Because, he told Journal reporter Jeffrey H. Birnbaum, the reaction of some Democrats on his committee had been surprisingly negative. The capital gains cut was a larger boon to the wealthy than they could countenance. We wonder how those Democrats feel about recessions. Do they enjoy them? Do they think they help the poor? Or have they not given the matter serious thought?

The latter is no doubt the correct answer. Serious thought would tell you that $15 billion in additional federal revenues is not a "bonanza" for the rich, since that money is flowing not from Washington to investors but in the opposite direction. While the relatively small number of people in this country who can be considered wealthy would benefit from a reduced tax burden on investment gains, so would the middle class and so would the poor. Especially so if a timely cut heads off a recession.

By the usual statistical measures, the economy is clearly slowing, whether toward a recession or a "soft landing." It also probably is losing some of its efficiency, not least because of non-tax burdens Congress and the regulatory bureaucracy—the EPA in particular—are loading onto the productive sector. One symptom of slowdown is inflation, which hit 7% in May as measured by the CPI. If inflation is too much money chasing too few goods, the production of fewer goods doesn't help. This is why the 1970s gave us the word stagflation.

The proper public policy response to our current economic predicament is to remove burdens on the economy, not add new ones. As a substitute for cutting capital gains, Mr. Rostenkowski promises to search for taxes to raise. This will not be helpful. Nor will the new taxes that cash-short states are piling on. Nor will the new child-care bureaucracy liberal Democrats want.

Cutting the capital gains rate is precisely the right kind of policy for these times. In addition to its stimulus to investment, it would offset some of the revenue decline the federal Treasury will most likely experience if a full-scale slowdown develops. Mr. Rostenkowski could serve the country and the interests of Congress better if he would but tell the class warriors on his committee to go on with their sloganeering, but that the time does come for serious economic policy.

Mr. President, this bill is the sixth capital gains tax proposal that I have endorsed this year. Although these bills differ in terms of holding periods, assets covered, and the inflation-indexing component, the goal is the same: To create the kind of entrepreneurial environment that will advance America's economic competitiveness in the global marketplace. Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI has opened the door to a compromise on capital gains. My new bill is an attempt to broaden support for a permanent capital gains tax reduction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in its entirety:

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

S. 1286

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

SECTION 1. REDUCTION IN INDIVIDUAL CAPITAL GAINS RATE.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subsection (j) of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to maximum capital gains rate) is amended to read as follows:

"(j) MAXIMUM CAPITAL GAINS RATE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If a taxpayer has a net capital gain for any taxable year, then the tax imposed by this section shall not exceed the sum of—

"(A) a tax computed at the rates and in the same manner as if this subsection had not been enacted on the taxable income reduced by the net capital gain, plus

"(B) a tax of 15 percent of the net capital gain.

"(2) TRANSITIONAL RULE.—In the case of a taxable year in which the date of the enactment of this sentence occurs, the amount taken into account as the net capital gain under paragraph (1) and subsection (g)(1)(A) shall not exceed the net capital gain determined by only taking into account gains and losses properly taken into account for the portion of the taxable year after such date of enactment."

(b) PHASE-OUT OF 15-PERCENT RATE AND PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS NOT TO APPLY TO NET CAPITAL GAIN.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1(g)(1) of such Code (relating to phase-out of 15 percent rate and personal exemptions) is amended by inserting ", reduced by the net capital gain" after "taxable income".

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 170(e) of such Code is amended by striking "the amount of gain" in the material following subparagraph (B)(ii) and inserting "15/28 (15/34 in the case of a corporation) of the amount of gain".

(2)(A) The second sentence of section 7518(g)(6)(A) of such Code is amended by striking "28 percent (34 percent in the case of a corporation)" and inserting "15 percent".

(B) The second sentence of section 607(h)(6)(A) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended by striking "28 percent (34 percent in the case of a corporation)" and inserting "15 percent".

SEC. 2. REDUCTION IN CORPORATE CAPITAL GAINS RATE.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Section 1201 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to alternative tax for corporations) is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—If for any taxable year a corporation has a net capital gain, then, in lieu of the tax imposed by section 11, 511, or 831(a) (whichever applies), there is hereby imposed a tax (if such tax is less than the tax imposed by such section) which shall consist of the sum of—

"(1) a tax computed on the taxable income reduced by the net capital gain, at the same rates and in the same manner as if this subsection had not been enacted, plus

"(2) a tax of 15 percent of the net capital gain.

"(b) TRANSITIONAL RULE.—In the case of a taxable year in which the date of the enactment of this sentence occurs, the amount taken into account as the net capital gain under subsection (a) shall not exceed the net capital gain determined by only taking into account gains and losses properly taken into account for the portion of the taxable year after such date of enactment."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (iii) of section 852(b)(3)(D) of such Code is amended by striking "66 percent" and inserting "85 percent".

(2) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1445(e) of such Code are each amended by striking "34 percent" and inserting "15 percent".

SEC. 3. REDUCTION OF MINIMUM TAX RATE ON CAPITAL GAINS.

Subparagraph (A) of section 55(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to tentative minimum tax) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) the sum of—

"(i) 15 percent of the lesser of—

"(I) the net capital gain (determined with the adjustments provided in this part and (to the extent applicable) the limitations of sections 1(j)(2) and 1201(b)), or

"(II) so much of the alternative minimum taxable income for the taxable year as exceeds the exemption amount, plus

"(ii) 20 percent (21 percent in the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation) of the amount (if any) by which the excess referred to in clause (i)(I) exceeds the net capital gain (as so determined), reduced by".

SEC. 4. INDEXING OF CERTAIN ASSETS FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING GAIN OR LOSS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to basis rules of general application) is amended by inserting after section 1021 the following new section:

"SEC. 1022. INDEXING OF CERTAIN ASSETS FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING GAIN OR LOSS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—

"(1) INDEXED BASIS SUBSTITUTED FOR ADJUSTED BASIS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), if an indexed asset which has been held for more than 1 year is sold or otherwise disposed of, for purposes of this title the indexed basis of the asset shall be substituted for its adjusted basis.

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR DEPRECIATION, ETC.—The deduction for depreciation, depletion, and amortization shall be determined without regard to the application of paragraph (1) to the taxpayer or any other person.

"(b) INDEXED ASSET.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'indexed asset' means—

"(A) stock in a corporation, and

"(B) tangible property (or any interest therein), which is a capital asset of property used in the trade or business (as defined in section 1231(b)).

"(2) CERTAIN PROPERTY EXCLUDED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'indexed asset' does not include—

"(A) CREDITOR'S INTEREST.—Any interest in property which is in the nature of a creditor's interest.

"(B) OPTIONS.—Any option or other right to acquire an interest in property.

"(C) NET LEASE PROPERTY.—In the case of a lessor, net lease property (within the meaning of subsection (h)(1)).

"(D) CERTAIN PREFERRED STOCK.—Stock which is fixed and preferred as to dividends and does not participate in corporate growth to any significant extent.

"(E) STOCK IN CERTAIN CORPORATIONS.—Stock in—

"(i) an S corporation (within the meaning of section 1361),

"(ii) a personal holding company (as defined in section 542), and

"(iii) a foreign corporation.

"(3) EXCEPTION FOR STOCK IN FOREIGN CORPORATION WHICH IS REGULARLY TRADED ON NATIONAL OR REGIONAL EXCHANGE.—Clause (iii) of paragraph (2)(E) shall not apply to stock in a foreign corporation the stock of which is listed on the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange, or any domestic regional exchange for which quotations are published on a regular basis other than—

"(A) stock of a foreign investment company (within the meaning of section 1246(b)), and

"(B) stock in a foreign corporation held by a United States person who meets the requirements of section 1248(a)(2).

"(c) INDEXED BASIS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) INDEXED BASIS.—The indexed basis for any asset is—

"(A) the adjusted basis of the asset, multiplied by

"(B) the applicable inflation ratio.

"(2) APPLICABLE INFLATION RATIO.—The applicable inflation ratio for any asset is the percentage arrived at by dividing—

"(A) the gross national product deflator the calendar quarter in which the disposition takes place, by

"(B) the gross national product deflator for the calendar quarter in which the asset was acquired by the taxpayer (or, if later, the calendar quarter ending December 31, 1988).

The applicable inflation ratio shall not be taken into account unless it is greater than 1. The applicable inflation ratio for any asset shall be rounded to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent.

"(3) GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT DEFLATOR.—The gross national product deflator for any calendar quarter is the implicit price deflator for the gross national product for such quarter (as shown in the first revision thereof).

"(4) SECRETARY TO PUBLISH TABLES.—The Secretary shall publish tables specifying the applicable inflation ratios for each calendar quarter.

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) TREATMENT AS SEPARATE ASSET.—In the case of any asset, the following shall be treated as a separate asset:

"(A) a substantial improvement to property,

"(B) in the case of stock of a corporation, a substantial contribution to capital, and

"(C) any other portion of an asset to the extent that separate treatment of such portion is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(2) ASSETS WHICH ARE NOT INDEXED ASSETS THROUGHOUT HOLDING PERIOD.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The applicable inflation ratio shall be appropriately reduced for calendar months at any time during which the asset was not an indexed asset.

"(B) CERTAIN SHORT SALES.—For purposes of applying subparagraph (A), an asset shall be treated as not an indexed asset for any short sale period during which the taxpayer or the taxpayer's spouse sells short property substantially identical to the asset. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the short sale period begins on the day after the substantially identical property is sold and ends on the closing date for the sale.

"(3) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS.—A distribution with respect to stock in a corporation which is not a dividend shall be treated as a disposition.

"(4) SECTION CANNOT INCREASE ORDINARY LOSS.—To the extent that (but for this paragraph) this section would create or increase a net ordinary loss to which section 1231(a)(2) applies or an ordinary loss to which any other provision of this title applies, such provision shall not apply. The taxpayer shall be treated as having a long-term capital loss in an amount equal to the amount of the ordinary loss to which the preceding sentence applies.

"(5) ACQUISITION DATE WHERE THERE HAS BEEN PRIOR APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION (a)(1) WITH RESPECT TO THE TAXPAYER.—If there has been a prior application of subsection (a)(1) to an asset while such asset was held by the taxpayer, the date of acquisition of such asset by the taxpayer shall be treated as not earlier than the date of the most recent such prior application.

"(6) COLLAPSIBLE CORPORATIONS.—The application of section 341(a) (relating to collapsible corporations) shall be determined without regard to this section.

"(e) CERTAIN CONDUIT ENTITIES.—

"(1) REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES; REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS; COMMON TRUST FUNDS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Stock in a qualified investment entity shall be an indexed asset for any calendar month in the same ratio as the fair market value of the assets held by such entity at the close of such month which are indexed assets bears to the fair market value of all assets of such entity at the close of such month.

"(B) RATIO OF 90 PERCENT OR MORE.—If the ratio for any calendar month determined under subparagraph (A) would (but for this subparagraph) be 90 percent or more, such ratio for such month shall be 100 percent.

"(C) RATIO OF 10 PERCENT OR LESS.—If the ratio for any calendar month determined under subparagraph (A) would (but for this subparagraph) be 10 percent or less, such ratio for such month shall be zero.

"(D) VALUATION OF ASSETS IN CASE OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.—Nothing in this paragraph shall require a real estate investment trust to value its assets more frequently than once each 36 months (except where such trust ceases to exist). The ratio under subparagraph (A) for any calendar month for which there is no valuation shall be the trustee's good faith judgment as to such valuation.

"(E) QUALIFIED INVESTMENT ENTITY.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'qualified investment entity' means—

"(i) a regulated investment company (within the meaning of section 851),

"(ii) a real estate investment trust (within the meaning of section 856), and

"(iii) a common trust fund (within the meaning of section 584).

"(2) PARTNERSHIPS.—In the case of a partnership, the adjustment made under subsection (a) at the partnership level shall be passed through to the partners.

"(3) SUBCHAPTER S CORPORATIONS.—In the case of an electing small business corporation, the adjustment under subsection (a) at the corporate level shall be passed through to the shareholders.

"(f) DISPOSITIONS BETWEEN RELATED PERSONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to any sale or other disposition of property between related persons except to the extent that the basis of such property in the hands of the transferee is a substituted basis.

"(2) RELATED PERSONS DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'related persons' means—

"(A) persons bearing a relationship set forth in section 267(b), and

"(B) persons treated as single employer under subsection (b) or (c) of section 414.

"(g) TRANSFERS TO INCREASE INDEXING ADJUSTMENT OR DEPRECIATION ALLOWANCE.—If any person transfers cash, debt, or any other property to another person and the principal purpose of such transfer is—

"(1) to secure or increase an adjustment under subsection (a), or

"(2) to increase (by reason of an adjustment under subsection (a)) a deduction for depreciation, depletion, or amortization,

the Secretary may disallow part or all of such adjustment or increase.

"(h) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) NET LEASE PROPERTY DEFINED.—The term 'net lease property' means leased real property where—

"(A) the term of the lease (taking into account options to renew) was 50 percent or more of the useful life of the property, and

"(B) for the period of the lease, the sum of the deductions with respect to such property which are allowable to the lessor solely by reason of section 162 (other than rents and reimbursed amounts with respect to such property) is 15 percent or less of the rental income produced by such property.

"(2) STOCK INCLUDES INTEREST IN COMMON TRUST FUND.—The term 'stock in a corporation' includes any interest in a common trust fund (as defined in section 584(a)).

"(i) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part II of subchapter O of such chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1021 the following new item:

"Sec. 1022. Indexing of certain assets for purposes of determining gain or loss."

(c) ADJUSTMENT TO APPLY FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING EARNINGS AND PROFITS.—Subsection (f) of section 312 of such Code (relating to effect on earnings and profits of gain or loss and of receipt of tax-free distributions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) EFFECT ON EARNINGS AND PROFITS OF INDEXED BASIS.—

For substitution of indexed basis for adjusted basis in the case of the disposition of certain assets after December 31, 1988, see section 1022(a)(1)."

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) RATE REDUCTION.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by this Act shall apply to sales or exchanges occurring—

(A) after December 31, 1989, in taxable years ending after such date, and

(B) before the termination date described in paragraph (2).

(2) TERMINATION DATE.—If tax revenues attributable to the tax on capital gains, as measured according to the Internal Revenue Statistics of Income computed by the Office of Tax Analysis of the Department of the Treasury, in 1995 do not exceed such revenues in 1989, the termination date described in this paragraph shall be the first day of the calendar year following the date of the determination of such revenues for 1995.

(b) INDEXING.—The amendments made by section 4 of this Act shall apply to sales or exchanges occurring after December 31, 1994, in taxable years ending after such date.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. DECONCINI):

S. 1287. A bill to provide for adherence with the MacBride Principles by United States persons doing business in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Finance.

NORTHERN IRELAND FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to help correct a discriminatory injustice in another part of the world, Northern Ireland. I introduced similar legislation with Senators DECONCINI and HATCH in the 100th Congress, and also at the end of the 99th Congress.

Enactment of this legislation, entitled the Northern Ireland Fair Employment Practices Act, will deter efforts to use the work place as an arena of discrimination in Northern Ireland.

In 1986, Congress overrode President Reagan's veto on legislation applying additional sanctions on the Government of South Africa. Congress overwhelmingly decided to follow rhetoric with action by applying economic sanctions against a government that maintains a policy of rampant discrimination.

Today, we have the same opportunity to fight discrimination in Northern Ireland. The Northern Ireland Fair Employment Practices Act incorporates the McBride Principles, which are modeled after the famous Sullivan Principles, one of the initial efforts to apply U.S. pressure to change the system of apartheid in South Africa. The MacBride Principles are named in honor of the late Sean McBride, winner of the Nobel Peace prize and cofounder of Amnesty International.

This legislation does not call for disinvestment. It does, however, enlist the cooperation of United States companies active in Northern Ireland in the campaign to force the end of discrimination in the workplace. Specifically, this bill would incorporate the following principles:

First, eliminating religious discrimination in managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs and significantly increasing the representation in such jobs of individuals from underrepresented religious groups;

Second, providing adequate security for the protection of minority employees at the workplace;

Third, banning provocative sectarian and political emblems from the workplace;

Fourth, publicly advertising all job openings and undertaking special recruitment efforts to attract applicants from underrepresented religious groups, and establishing procedures to identify and recruit minority individuals with potential for further advancement, including managerial programs;

Fifth, establishing layoff, recall, and termination procedures which do not favor particular religious groupings;

Sixth, abolishing job reservations, apprenticeship restriction, and differential employment criteria which discriminate on the basis of religious or ethnic origin;

Seventh, developing and expanding upon existing training and educational programs that will prepare substantial numbers of minority employees for managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs; and

Eighth, appointing a senior management staff member to oversee the U.S. company's compliance with the principles described above.

One of the most prominent and painful means of perpetrating acts of discrimination is through employment. Therefore, it is at the workplace in Northern Ireland, which can be used to either foster or eliminate discrimination, where we should focus our efforts to break the back of this awful practice. The unemployment rate for the area is hovering around 20 percent, 50 percent in predominately Catholic neighborhoods. Improving the employment opportunities for those discriminated against will help factor out economic reasons for the current strife in Northern Ireland and, hopefully, will begin the process toward a peaceful resolution to the problems there.

The United States is Northern Ireland's largest single investor. There are over 20 United States companies operating in Northern Ireland, and only 5 of them operate in Catholic sections. Most of these United States companies now directly or indirectly support the systematic anti-Catholic discriminatory practices in Northern Ireland. My legislation will end this shameful record. It not only will enlist these companies in the effort to wipe out discrimination at the workplace in Northern Ireland, but it also will help enlighten other nations which do business in Northern Ireland.

Mr. President, I truly believe that this body must address this important issue in the near future. I plan to fight to have this legislation considered and have a bill passed during this Congress, and I look to my colleagues to join me in this worthy effort.

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

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

S. 1287

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 "Northern Ireland Fair Employment Practices Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

(1) Overall unemployment in Northern Ireland exceeds 20 per centum.

(2) Unemployment in some neighborhoods of Northern Ireland comprised of religious minorities has exceeded 50 per centum.

(3) In the past ten years 27 per centum of Northern Ireland's industrial jobs have disappeared.

(4) Economic conditions in Northern Ireland have contributed to the emigration in recent years of more than seven thousand people each year.

(5) The Industrial Development Organization for Northern Ireland lists twenty-five firms in Northern Ireland which are controlled by United States persons.

(6) Many of these firms have become de facto partners in discriminating against religious minorities in employment practices and conditions.

(7) A comprehensive study of the discriminatory practices of United States businesses in Northern Ireland by the Reverend Brian Brady, the former head of the religion department at Saint Joseph's College in Belfast, noted that in the average manufacturing company controlled by a United States person in Northern Ireland, 18.8 per centum of the employees are Catholic and 73.2 per centum are Protestant, a work force ratio that is disproportionate to the number of Catholics and Protestants in the general population of Northern Ireland, which is 38 per centum Catholic and 62 per centum Protestant.

(8) The religious minority population of Northern Ireland is frequently subject to discriminatory hiring practices by United States businesses which have resulted in a disproportionate number of minority individuals holding menial and low-paying jobs and alarmingly high layoffs of minority employees in times of recession.

(9) The MacBride Principles are a nine point set of guidelines for fair employment in Northern Ireland which establishes a corporate code of conduct to promote equal access to regional employment but does not require disinvestment or demand quotas on imports.

SEC. 3. RESTRICTION ON IMPORTS.

An article from Northern Ireland may not be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, in the customs territory of the United States unless there is presented at the time of entry to the customs officer concerned documentation indicating that the enterprise which manufactured or assembled such article was in compliance at the time of manufacture with the principles described in section 5.

SEC. 4. COMPLIANCE WITH FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRINCIPLES.

(a) COMPLIANCE.—Any United States person who—

(1) has a branch or office in Northern Ireland, or

(2) controls a corporation, partnership, or other enterprise in Northern Ireland,

in which more than twenty people are employed shall take the necessary steps to insure that, in operating such branch, office, corporation, partnership, or enterprise, those principles relating to employment practices set forth in section 5 are implemented and the Fair Employment Act of Northern Ireland is complied with.

(b) REPORT.—Each United States person referred to in subsection (a) shall submit to the Secretary—

(1) a detailed and fully documented annual report, signed under oath, showing compliance with the provisions of this Act; and

(2) such other information as the Secretary determines is necessary.

SEC. 5. MACBRIDE PRINCIPLES.

The principles referred to in section 4, which are based on the MacBride Principles, are as follows:

(1) Eliminating religious discrimination in managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs and significantly increasing the representation in such jobs of individuals from underrepresented religious groups.

(2) Providing adequate security for the protection of minority employees at the workplace.

(3) Banning provocative sectarian and political emblems from the workplace.

(4) Advertising publicly all job openings and undertaking special recruitment efforts to attract applicants from underrepresented religious groups, including—

(A) establishing procedures to assess, identify, and actively recruit minority individuals with potential for further advancement; and

(B) identifying those minority individuals who have high management potential and enrolling them in accelerated management programs.

(5) Establishing layoff, recall, and termination procedures which do not favor particular religious groupings.

(6) Providing equal employment for all employees, including implementing equal and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions of employment for all employees, and abolishing job reservations, apprenticeship restrictions, and differential employment criteria, which discriminate on the basis of religion or ethnic origin.

(7) Developing training programs that will prepare substantial numbers of minority employees for managerial, supervisory administrative, clerical, and technical jobs, including—

(A) expanding existing programs and forming new programs to train, upgrade, and improve the skills of all categories of minority employees;

(B) creating on-the-job training programs and facilities to assist minority employees to advance to higher paying jobs requiring greater skills; and

(C) establishing and expanding programs to enable minority employees to further their education and skills at recognized educational facilities.

(8) Appointing a senior management staff member to oversee the United States person's compliance with the principles described in this section.

SEC. 6. WAIVER OF PROVISIONS.

In any case in which the President determines that compliance by a United States person with the provisions of this Act would harm the national security of the United States, the President may waive those provisions with respect to that United States person. The President shall publish in the Federal Register each waiver granted under this section and shall submit to the Congress a justification for granting each such waiver. Any such waiver shall become effective at the end of ninety days after the date on which the justification is submitted to the Congress unless the Congress, within that ninety-day period, adopts a joint resolution disapproving the waiver. In the computation of such ninety-day period, there shall be excluded the days on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or because of an adjournment of the Congress sine die.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS.—

(1) Any resolution described in subsection (a) shall be considered in the Senate in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

(2) For the purpose of expediting the consideration and adoption of a resolution under subsection (a) in the House of Representatives, a motion to proceed to the consideration of such resolution after it has been reported by the appropriate committee shall be treated as highly privileged in the House of Representatives.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS AND PRESUMPTIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "United States person" means any United States resident or national and any domestic concern (including any permanent domestic establishment of any foreign concern);

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce;

(3) the term "Northern Ireland" includes the counties of Antrim, Armagh, Londonderry, Down, Tyrone, and Fermanagh; and

(b) PRESUMPTION.—A United States person shall be presumed to control a corporation, partnership, or other enterprise in Northern Ireland if—

(1) the United States person beneficially owns or controls (whether directly or indirectly) more than 50 per centum of the outstanding voting securities of the corporation, partnership, or enterprise;

(2) the United States person beneficially owns or controls (whether directly or indirectly) 25 per centum or more of the voting securities of the corporation, partnership, or enterprise, if no other person owns or controls (whether directly or indirectly) an equal or larger percentage;

(3) the corporation, partnership, or enterprise is operated by the United States person pursuant to the provisions of an exclusive management contract;

(4) a majority of the members of the board of directors of the corporation, partnership, or enterpirse are also members of the comparable governing body of the United States person;

(5) the United States person has authority to appoint the majority of the members of the board of directors of the corporation, partnership, or enterprise; or

(6) the United States person has authority to appoint the chief operating officer of the corporation, partnership, or enterprise.●

By Mr. DECONCINI:

S. 1288. A bill to provide for a temporary stay of deportation for nationals of the People's Republic of China, to provide authority to work during the temporary stay, and to provide a mechanism for adjustment to permanent residence status at the end of the temporary stay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHINESE NATIONAL'S CHOICE OF STATUS ACT

Mr. DECONCINI. I rise to introduce legislation to give the citizens of the People's Republic of China, who were lawfully in the United States at the time of the Tiananmen massacre, the ability to decide whether to stay in the United States permanently, and the time necessary to make such a deci-

sion, an informed and carefully thought-out one.

My legislation will suspend the deportation of nationals of the People's Republic of China for 2 years, and then at the end of the that time allow these individuals to choose to stay or to return to China.

It is important to note that the legislation also allows such Chinese nationals to work during the 2-year period while they are making this important decision and while things settle down, if they are going to settle down, and whether or not they can return safely.

We are all angered and dismayed by the conduct of the Chinese Government. We were all equally proud and impressive of those students and others who joined them, who stood up to that government. I have made my views on this subject clear on several occasions on the floor of this body, and at other areas, regarding my disgust with the Chinese Government. However, I believe that we must take immediate action to protect the Chinese students and others who found themselves legally in the United States at the time of the violence against Chinese citizens.

The Chinese students that I have talked to in my State—and there are several hundred there going to school—want the United States to stand tall on this issue. They are understandably reluctant to return to China at the present time, and I can understand that.

I congratulate President Bush for his prompt and timely action to defer their return. I believe it is appropriate for the United States to allow these Chinese nationals to stay in the United States for up to a 2-year period, in order for each individual to decide what is best for themselves.

It is also appropriate for these individuals to be allowed to make a living while they are here, so they are not a burden on society and their families and friends. I hope that Congress will address this problem quickly and give the Chinese nationals in the United States some small amount of reassurance, while they await the word from their families and their country on what their life at home and in their country really is going to be like.

What has happened to these people's lives is bad enough without the added pressure of being in a legal limbo in the United States or being pressured into making a permanent decision to abandon their homes and their families at this particular time.

I believe my approach to this problem is cautious and restrained, and yet provides the security necessary to those who are affected. I have asked for the support of my colleagues to look at this legislation. I hope it will receive serious consideration, for I think it is vitally needed.

I ask unanimous consent that the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1288

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

SECTION 1. That this Act may be cited as the "Chinese National's Choice of Status Act of 1989."

SEC. 2. The Attorney General shall not detain or deport aliens who are nationals of the People's Republic of China who, as of June 5, 1989, were present in the United States in the lawful status of a nonimmigrant from June 5, 1989, until June 6, 1991.

SEC. 3. Each alien receiving a stay of deportation under section 2 of this Act shall register with the Attorney General anytime beginning 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act and ending 180 days thereafter.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General shall grant each alien who registers under section 3 of this Act a work authorization document.

SEC. 5. Any alien who has registered under section 3 of this Act may apply with the Attorney General for permanent residence status in the United States beginning on March 6, 1991. Such status shall be granted by the Attorney General for all nationals of the People's Republic of China who registered under section 3 of this Act.

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. GORTON):

S. 1289. A bill to improve the management of forests and woodlands and the production of forest resources on Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

NATIONAL INDIAN FOREST AND WOODLAND ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill entitled "The National Indian Forest and Woodland Enhancement Act" to better define the Federal Government's role in the protection and managment of forest and woodland resources on Indian trust lands. I am pleased to be joined on this bill by Senators INOUYE, MURKOWSKI, COCHRAN, and GORTON.

It is my hope that this bill will serve as a focal point for discussion and to generate input from Indian tribes, native American organizations, Allottees, Alaska Natives, and others who have an interest in forest and woodland management on Indian lands. I plan to incorporate comments and recommendations into the language of the bill where appropriate and to pursue enactment of the bill as modified during the second session of this Congress.

Federal policy for the protection of most Indian natural resources is currently based upon a loose patchwork of varying and inconsistent laws and administrative practices. This has resulted in serious fluctuations in the levels of management provided to Indian forest lands and virtually no protection for Indian woodlands. Long-term planning and stable management are needed to protect the forest and woodland resources of the tribes. Unfortunately, the Congress has never established explicit standards for the management of these valuable resources. This bill is intended to establish those standards and to begin to correct problems stemming from past mismanagement.

There is a government-to-government relationship between Indian tribes and the United States that flows from treaties and the Constitution. This relationship has been defined by numerous acts of Congress, orders of the executive branch and the courts. Through treaties, tribes relinquished their claims to aboriginal title to most of their lands in exchange for reservation homelands and other considerations. Part of those considerations was the recognition of a Federal responsibility to protect, conserve, utilize and enhance the development of Indian resources. This bill will provide direction and stability in the exercise of the Federal trust responsibility over Indian forest and woodland resources.

There can be no doubt that tribal forest and woodland resources constitute an important economic and cultural asset.

Indian forests and woodlands comprise about 20 percent of the lands held in trust by the United States for Indians. Forest and woodland resources are among the most valuable resources of Indian tribes, not merely as a source of income and employment but to support their way of life. They furnish timber and wood products, fish and wildlife, subsistence uses, tourism, outdoor recreation, water, soil and air conservation, support cultural and religious uses, and contribute to the general health and welfare of the tribes.

Tribes generate in excess of $64 million in timber receipts annually and employ thousands of people in commercial forestry activities. The production of timber and other forest products is important, but not all encompassing. The forests are vital to traditional Indian cultural values because they provide places for religious ceremonies and for gathering native medicines and foods. Firewood, berries, mosses, pinyon nuts, acorns, syrups, herbs such as ginseng and wild rice harvested in tribal forests for personal consumption and sale. On some reservations sales of these commodities easily exceed the income derived from the sales of timber. Indian forests are multiple-use forests in the fullest sense. This bill is intended to ensure that these forests are managed in perpetuity on a sustained yield basis.

There are 4,500,000 commercial woodland acres. This compares to

5,600,000 commercial timberland acres. None of the woodland acres are currently addressed within Federal forest management plans. This bill will provide a statutory basis to begin to protect and manage the Indian woodland resource. Woodland inventory information is lacking throughout Indian country. Current harvesting and land management is generally without silvicultural direction or environmental clearance. The Bureau of Indian Affairs estimates that $38.8 million of benefits are realized from Indian woodlands each year. Despite the obvious value of this trust asset, little or nothing has been done to protect it. This bill will correct this neglect.

Another major purpose of this bill is to remedy the astonishing lack of Indian employees engaged in the management of Indian forests and woodlands. For several years the Federal Government has promoted a policy to increase the number of Indians employed in professional forestry positions for management of Indian forestry programs. This policy is consistent with the policy of tribal self-determination and tribal self-governance. However, of the 420 professional forester positions in Indian forestry programs, less than 11 percent are filled by Indians. This bill will provide an education assistance program which will attract Indian people into the forestry profession and increase the number of Indians in professional forestry positions.

Theft of timber is another continuing problem on Indian lands. This bill provides for an evaluation of the timber trespass problem by the Secretary of the Interior and authorizes the establishment of penalties for violations of trespass law.

Last, this bill addresses a longstanding and sometimes controversial administrative practice. For many years, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has made deductions from gross receipts generated from the sale of Indian timber and forest products; these fees are commonly referred to as administrative fee deductions. These deductions are actually tribal contributions to the management of Indian forest resources. This bill will establish a maximum limit on the administrative fee deduction of 10 percent of the gross sale receipts or the actual cost of forest management whichever is less. The tribes are authorized under the bill to be reimbursed from administrative fee deductions for expenditures made by them for certain forest management activities.

Mr. President, this bill does not address all of the issues and concerns raised by tribes and others concerning Indian forestry programs. Fractionalized land ownership patterns remain a problem. Land records are not adequately maintained; forest road networks are inadequate; timber sale contracts do not provide the flexibility desired; environmental requirements under the NEPA and NHPA are costly and burdensome and other serious forest management problems exist. While this bill does not meet all of the known needs, it does provide a framework for Indian forest and woodland management. Hopefully, it will also stimulate discussion which will result in constructive changes in the bill so that we may more fully meet the needs for an efficient and effective Indian forest and woodland management program. It is long past the time when Congress should provide the Department of the Interior with clear direction in the management of these valuable trust assets. By doing so we can prevent the reoccurrence of past management and ensure the future protection and productivity of Indian and Alaska Native forests and woodlands.

I look forward to receiving comments and recommendations on this bill during this session of the Congress so that we may move toward enactment of legislation in the second session. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill and the section-by-section summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

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

S. 1289

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "National Indian Forest and Woodland Enhancement Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Findings.
Sec. 102. Purposes.
Sec. 103. Definitions.

TITLE II—FOREST AND WOODLAND ENHANCEMENT

Sec. 201. Management of commercial forests and woodlands.
Sec. 202. Administrative fee withholding.
Sec. 203. Forest and woodland trespass.

TITLE III—INDIAN FORESTRY EDUCATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Sec. 301. Establishment of Indian Forestry Education Assistance Program.

TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 401. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE I—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

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

(1) the forests and woodlands of Indians—

(A) are among their most valuable resources;

(B) furnish timber and wood products, fish and wildlife, subsistence uses, tourism, outdoor recreation, and water;

(C) provide for soil and air conservation, minerals, cultural, religious, and traditional values; and

(D) contribute to the general health and welfare of Indian tribes;

(2) Indian forest lands encompass more than 15,700,000 acres, comprised of approximately 5,600,000 acres of commercial forest land and 4,500,000 acres of commercial woodland which constitutes a major economic resource of Indian tribes;

(3) Indian forests and woodlands are renewable, manageable resources;

(4) the United States has a trust responsibility to protect, conserve, utilize and enhance Indian forests and woodlands consistent with its fiduciary obligation and its unique relationship with Indian tribes;

(5) increased investment in intensive management of Indian forests and woodlands will produce increased economic returns to Indian tribes and the United States;

(6) increased productivity of Indian forests and woodlands will enhance Indian self-determination, promote employment opportunities, and improve the social and economic position of Indian and surrounding communities;

(7) enhancing and ensuring further Federal and tribal investment in Indian forests and woodlands will improve the economic and social development of Indian tribes and provide substantial benefits to tribal and national economies;

(8) Federal investments in and management of Indian forests and woodlands are substantially below the level of investments in and management of the National Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management forests and woodlands and private forests and woodlands;

(9) existing Federal statutes do not sufficiently assure the adequate and necessary trust management of Indian forests and woodlands;

(10) of approximately 420 professional forester positions in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and tribal forestry programs, only 11 percent are held by Indians; and

(11) in the last 10 years more than 7,000,000 board feet of forest and woodland products have been removed illegally from Indian forest lands and woodlands.

SEC. 102. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) safeguard the investments made in Indian forest and woodland management and provide additional assurances of adequate, stable, and secure funding for the protection, conservation, utilization, and enhancement of Indian forest and woodland resources;

(2) meet the trust responsibility and fiduciary obligation of the United States to ensure that the management of Indian forest lands and woodlands and related renewable resources will be managed in a manner consistent with sustained yield principles and serve the needs of Indians and other citizens of the United States for the many products, benefits and services obtained from Indian forest lands and woodlands;

(3) increase the number of professional Indian foresters employed in tribal and Federal forestry programs on Indian lands and provide for improved management of Indian forest and woodland resources;

(4) promote tribal self-determination and self-sufficiency; and

(5) provide the Secretary the authority necessary to curb the occurrence of trespass in Indian forest lands and woodlands.

SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "commercial forest land" means Indian land that is forest land capable of bearing merchantable forest products, currently or prospectively accessible, and not withdrawn from such use;

(2) the term "commercial forest land and woodland" means commercial forest land and commercial woodland;

(3) the term "commercial woodland" means Indian land that is woodland capable of bearing merchantable woodland products, currently or prospectively accessible, not withdrawn from such use, and not included in the commercial or noncommercial timberland base;

(4) the term "forest or woodland management activities" means all activities, including all aspects of program administration such as budgeting, performance appraisal, reporting, personnel matters, bookkeeping and time and attendance, done in support of the management of forest land or woodland, including—

(A) preparation of forest and woodland inventory and management plans, including aerial photography, mapping, field forest and woodland management inventories, reinventories, growth studies, allowable annual cut calculations, and all aspects of the development, preparation, and revision of multiple-use forest and woodland management plans, including inventory analysis, environmental assessment, and forest history;

(B) forest and woodland development, including reforestation and the use of silvicultural treatments to restore or increase growth and yield to the full productive capacity of the forest or woodland environment;

(C) protection against fire, including acquisition and maintenance of fire fighting equipment and fire detection systems, construction of firebreaks, hazard reduction, and performance of cooperative fire protection agreements;

(D) protection against insects and diseases, including all aspects of detection and evaluation, preparation of project proposals to secure funding (including project description, environmental assessments and statements, and cost-benefit analysis), field suppression operations, and reporting;

(E) assessment of damage caused by trespass or fire, including field examination and survey, damage appraisal, preparation of reports, assisting in investigations, writing demand letters, and giving testimony;

(F) administration and supervision of timber sales, including all aspects of sale and contract preparation such as cruising, silvicultural prescriptions, appraisal, advertising, executing and supervising contracts, marking and scaling timber, and collecting, recording, and distributing stumpage receipts;

(G) issuance of forest and woodland product permits, including cruising, product marking, stumpage appraisal, permit preparation, and harvest supervision for both paid and free use permits to harvest sawlogs, firewood, house logs, posts and poles, Christmas trees and other products;

(H) consultation with Indian enterprises in forest land and woodland management and in the primary and secondary processing of forest products and woodland products, including stumpage appraisal, sale negotiation, contract supervision, disputes and appeals, economic analysis of potential enterprises, product marketing and business development activities; and

(I) provision of financial assistance for education of Indians enrolled in accredited programs of post-secondary forestry and forestry-related fields of study, including the giving of scholarships, internships, relocation assistance and other forms of assistance to cover educational expenses;

(5) the term "forest and woodland resources" means all the benefits derived from commercial forest land and commercial woodland, including forest products, woodland products, soil productivity, water, fisheries, wildlife, recreation, aesthetic and other traditional values of forest lands and woodlands;

(6) the term "forest and woodland trespass" means the act of removing forest products or woodland products illegally from commercial forest land or commercial woodland;

(7) the term "forest land" means land that is considered chiefly valuable for the production of forest products or to maintain watershed or other land values enhanced by a forest cover, regardless whether a formal inspection and land classification action has been taken;

(8) the term "forest product" means—

(A) timber;

(B) a timber product, including lumber, lath, crating, ties, bolts, logs, pulpwood, fuelwood, posts, and split products;

(C) bark;

(D) a Christmas tree;

(E) other marketable material authorized for removal; and

(F) gravel which is extracted from and utilized on forests or woodlands;

means forest products and woodland products;

(9) the term "forest and woodland products" means forest products and woodland products;

(10) the term "Indian" means a member of an Indian tribe;

(11) the term "Indian land" means land that is—

(A) held in trust by the United States for an Indian or Indian tribe; or

(B) owned by an Indian or Indian tribe and is subject to restrictions against alienation;

(12) the term "Indian tribe" means—

(A) an Indian tribe, band, nation, rancheria, pueblo, colony, or community; and

(B) an Alaska Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in, or established pursuant to, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601-1629e),

that is recognized by the United States as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the Secretary to Indians or Alaska Natives because of their status as Indians or Alaska Natives;

(13) the term "Indian enterprise" means an enterprise—

(A) which—

(i) is engaged in construction (within the meaning of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), and is entirely owned by Indians, or Indian tribes, that receive 100 percent of the profits of the enterprise, or

(ii) is engaged in any business other than construction and at least 51 percent of the enterprise is owned by Indians, or Indian tribes, that receive not less than 51 percent of the profits of the enterprise; or

(B) which—

(i) is entirely owned by an Indian tribe, or

(ii) has an Indian owner who—

(I) acts as the chief executive officer of the enterprise, and

(II) has the experience and training to manage, and does in fact manage, the day-to-day activities of the enterprise;

(14) the term "landowner" means, with respect to Indian land on which a forest product or woodland product is produced, the Indian or Indian tribe that—

(A) owns such land, or

(B) is the beneficiary of the trust under which such land is held by the United States;

(15) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary's delegate;

(16) the term "woodland" means—

(A) a plant community in which trees, often small and characteristically short-boled relative to their depth of crown, are present but form only an open canopy, the intervening areas being occupied by lower vegetation, commonly grass; and

(B) moderate-to-densely stocked pinyon-juniper; and

(17) the term "woodland product" means firewood, posts, poles, Christmas trees, stays, branches, berries, mosses, pinyon nuts, acorns, syrups, wild rice, herbs and other marketable materials authorized for removal.

TITLE II—FOREST AND WOODLAND ENHANCEMENT

SEC. 201. MANAGEMENT OF COMMERCIAL FORESTS AND WOODLANDS.

The Secretary shall manage commercial forest lands and woodlands, either directly or through self-determination contracts and grants under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450-458e), with the following objectives:

(1) development, maintenance, and enhancement of commercial forest lands and woodlands in a perpetually productive state by providing effective management and protection through the application of sound silvicultural and economic principles to the reforestation, growth, and harvesting of forest and woodland products, including adequate provision for new forest and woodland growth as old growth is removed;

(2) regulation of commercial forest lands and woodlands through the establishment and development of forest and woodland product marketing programs supported by—

(A) written tribal objectives; and

(B) long-range multiple-use plans that incorporate sound forest and woodland management practices;

(3) regulation of commercial forest lands and commercial woodlands in a manner that will ensure the use of good method and order in harvesting the tree capital, so as to make possible continuous production and perpetual forest and woodland business;

(4) development of commercial forest lands and woodlands by Indians to promote self-sustaining communities, so that Indians may receive from their property not only the stumpage value, but also the benefit of all of the labor and profit the property is capable of yielding;

(5) sale of forest and woodland products on the open market when and only when the quantity of such products available for harvest exceeds the quantity harvested by the landowner;

(6) preservation of commercial forest lands and woodlands in their natural state when authorized Indian representatives determine that the recreational, cultural, aesthetic, or traditional values of the forests or

woodlands represent the highest and best use of the land to the Indians;

(7) management and protection of forest and woodland resources to retain the beneficial effects to Indian trust lands of regulating water runoff and minimizing soil erosion; and

(8) management and protection of commercial forest lands and woodlands to maintain and improve timber productivity, grazing, wildlife, fisheries, recreation, and aesthetic, cultural, and other traditional values.

SEC. 202. ADMINISTRATIVE FEE DEDUCTION.

Notwithstanding the provisions of 25 U.S.C. 413, the Secretary shall withhold a reasonable deduction from the gross proceeds of sales of Indian forest and woodland products to cover in whole or in part the cost of timber sale administration or forest regeneration. Such deduction shall not exceed the lesser amount of 10% or the percentage of gross proceeds currently collected as forest management deductions by the Secretary on sales of Indian forest and woodland products, unless the recognized tribal government consents to an increase in the deduction. Such deductions shall be fully expended by the Secretary in forest or woodland management activities in the reservation from which such deductions are withheld. The full amount of administrative deductions collected by the Secretary for a reservation shall be made available to that reservation's recognized tribal government by contract or agreement for the purpose of performing the forest or woodland management activities under this Act. Such deductions are not intended to cover the costs that are paid from funds appropriated specifically for fire suppression or pest control.

SEC. 203. FOREST AND WOODLAND TRESPASS.

(a) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations that—

(1) establish penalties for the commission of forest and woodland trespass, which provide for—

(i) collection of the value of the products illegally removed plus a penalty of double their value; and

(ii) collection of the costs associated with damage to the forest or woodland caused by the act of trespass.

(2) designate the agency officials who will be responsible for detecting forest and woodland trespass and assessing and collecting penalties; and

(3) set forth procedures for the assessment and collection of such penalties.

(b) RESTITUTION TO LANDOWNER.—The proceeds of penalties collected under subsection (a) shall be treated as proceeds from the sale of forest and woodland products.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report that—

(1) describes and evaluates the nature and extent of forest and woodland trespass that is occurring; and

(2) describes any legal or practical impediments to the curbing of forest and woodland trespass and the enforcement of the regulations issued to subsection (a).

TITLE III—INDIAN FORESTRY EDUCATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. ESTABLISHMENT OF INDIAN FORESTRY EDUCATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) FORESTER INTERN PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary shall establish and maintain in the Bureau of Indian Affairs at least 10 salaried forester intern positions for Indian students.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term "forester intern" means an Indian who—

(A) is pursuing a bachelor's degree or postgraduate degree in forestry or a forestry-related field, and

(B) is appointed to one of the positions established under paragraph (1).

(3) The Secretary shall pay all costs for tuition, books, fees and living expenses incurred by a forester intern while attending an approved post-secondary school in a full-time forestry-related curriculum.

(4) A forester intern shall be required to enter into an obligated service agreement to serve as a professional forester with either the Bureau of Indian Affairs or a tribal government for 2 years for each year of education for which the Secretary pays the intern's educational costs under paragraph (3).

(5) A forester intern shall be required to report for service with the Bureau of Indian Affairs during any break in attendance at school of more than 3 weeks' duration. Time spent in such service shall be counted toward satisfaction of the intern's obligated service agreement.

(b) COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary shall maintain, through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, a cooperative education program for the purpose of recruiting promising Indian students who are enrolled in secondary or post-secondary schools for employment as a professional forester in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

(2) The cooperative educational program that is to be maintained under paragraph (1) shall be modeled on, and shall have essentially the same features of, the program operated on the date of enactment of this Act pursuant to chapter 308 of the Federal Personnel Manual issued by the Office of Personnel Management.

(3) Under the cooperative agreement program that is to be maintained under paragraph (1), the Secretary, shall pay all costs for tuition, books, and fees of a student who—

(A) is enrolled in a course of study at an educational institution with which the Secretary has entered into a cooperative agreement; and

(B) is interested in a career with the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the management of commercial forest land and woodland.

(4) Financial need shall not be a requirement to receive assistance under the cooperative agreement program that is to be maintained under subsection (a).

(c) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary is authorized to grant forestry scholarships to Indians enrolled as full-time students in schools with accredited programs for post-secondary forestry and forestry-related programs of study.

(2) A recipient of a scholarship under paragraph (1) shall be required to enter into an obligated service agreement with the Secretary in which the recipient agrees to accept employment, following completion of the recipient's course of study, with—

(A) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(B) a forestry program conducted under a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement entered into under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450-450n); or

(C) an Indian enterprise engaged in a forestry or forestry-related business.

(3) The Secretary shall not deny scholarship assistance under this subsection solely on the basis of an applicant's scholastic achievement if the applicant has been admitted to and remains in good standing in an accredited institution.

(d) ADEQUACY OF PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall administer the programs described in this section until a sufficient number of Indians are trained to ensure that there is an adequate number of qualified, professional Indian foresters to manage the Bureau of Indian Affairs forestry programs and forestry programs maintained by or for Indian tribes.

TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1990 and each fiscal year thereafter such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Section 1 provides that the Act be cited as the "National Indian Forest and Woodland Enhancement Act."

Section 101 sets forth the findings of the Congress.

Section 102 sets forth the purposes of the Act.

Section 103 provides the definition of terms as used in the Act.

Section 201 requires the Secretary of Interior to conduct a forest and woodland management program on Indian lands in a manner which will protect, conserve, utilize and enhance forest and woodland resources in accordance with tribal goals and objectives. The Secretary must assure that specific forest management objectives are met. Those objectives are listed individually in the Act.

Section 202 limits administrative fee deductions from the gross proceeds of the sale of timber and other forest products to 10% or actual costs of administration, whichever is less.

The authorized uses of administrative fee deducation proceeds are listed in the Act. Typical forest and woodland management activities which would normally be a part of an intensive forest management program are authorized.

Section 203 directs the Secretary to conduct an evaluation of the extent of forest trespass and related illegal activities on Indian forest lands and prepare a report to Congress within 180 days of enactment describing the findings of that evaluation.

The Secretary is also directed to establish a penalty or fine schedule for trespass activities which occur on Indian lands and develop regulations for enforcement of such trespass.

Section 301 establishes a National Indian and Alaska Native Forestry Education Assistance program. This program will provide financial assistance for the post-secondary education of Indian students who are pursuing a Bachelors or Graduate degree in forestry or a forestry-related field. The financial assistance program must be adequate to fund eligible applicants until a sufficient number of Indians are trained to ensure that there is an adequate number of qualified professional foresters to manage Bureau of Indian Affairs forestry programs and forestry programs maintained by or for Indian tribes.

The Act requires that a minimum of 10 positions be filled each year in the Forester Intern Program. The Forester Intern Program provides permanent positions within the Bureau of Indian Affairs in which the

incumbent enters into an obligated service agreement with the United States in exchange for costs incurred for salary, school tuition, books, and living expenses while attending an approved post-secondary, professional school in a full-time forestry related curriculum. The obligated service agreement will require two years of service by the incumbent within the BIA or tribal forestry departments for each one year of training funded by the government.

The Act requires that career-ladder positions for Indians be established and filled each year in a Cooperative Education Program. The purpose of this program is to attract promising high school and college students to the Federal Service and provide the Secretary the opportunity to utilize nonrestrictive, innovative procedures in recruiting and retraining talented Indian students. This program is established in accordance with the U.S. Office of Personnel Management's Federal Personnel Manual, Chapter 308.

The Act also authorizes a Scholarship Program to grant forestry scholarships to Indians enrolled in accredited post-secondary forestry programs of study. Obligated service agreements may be required in exchange for the assistance received from the government.

By Mr. SIMON:

S. 1290. A bill to guarantee a work opportunity for all Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

GUARANTEED JOB OPPORTUNITY ACT

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Guaranteed Job Opportunity Act, a bill I originally introduced in the 100th Congress. I am reintroducing this bill in the 101st Congress because I am committed to putting America back to work.

In my home State of Illinois well over 300,000 Illinoians are jobless. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 6.4 million Americans are currently unemployed. Significantly, these estimates do not include the millions of part-time workers who would like to have full-time work or the so-called discouraged workers, the people who have given up, who are no longer looking for a job. Millions of citizens who are eager to work and contribute to our country, are for various reasons—language barriers, lack of basic and occupational skills, layoffs—simply unable to find a job. Our Nation need not tolerate this massive waste of our human resources.

In 1946, under the leadership of President Truman, Congress passed the Full Employment Act, making a commitment in words to provide employment opportunities to all Americans. At that time there were about 1 million people unemployed. Forty-three years later, with 6.4 million people unemployed, the hope and the promises of that dream remain unfulfilled. Even worse, the burden of unemployment is being borne disproportionately by groups who have been the subject of historic discrimination. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates the May 1989 unemployment rate for whites at 4.4 percent; the rate for blacks is over twice as high—11 percent (32.4 percent for black teenagers); and the rate for Hispanics is 7.9 percent. Some other unemployment estimates are staggering. According to the Census Bureau's Current Population Study for 1988, 68.4 percent of people with work disabilities are not in the labor force, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs estimates that as many as 48 percent of American Indians are out of work. Mr. President, something must be done to address this problem.

As I've consistently said throughout my fight to eliminate unemployment, since we are not going to let people in America starve, we have two options—to pay people for doing nothing or to pay them for doing something. It makes infinitely more sense to pay people to work.

The legislation I am introducing today would establish a Guaranteed Job Opportunity Program [GJOP] to ensure that every American has an opportunity to work productively at a job. In each community, a local board composed of equal numbers of business, labor, and public sector representatives would develop employment projects, and those who have been unemployed for at least 5 weeks would be afforded the opportunity to work on the projects.

At a maximum of 32 hours per week a participant would work on a project in the local area. These projects could include repairing sidewalks, tearing down condemned buildings, tutoring the illiterate or non-English speaking people, assisting day care centers for children so unemployed single parents can seek and accept employment, and tutoring grade school and high school students who need special help.

Many who criticize job programs, such as the Works Progress Administration under President Roosevelt's New Deal, picture people leaning up against shovels and digging ditches. But the fact is that the Guaranteed Job Opportunity Act, like the WPA, would turn unemployed, hopeless people into happier, productive people. And an opportunity to work gives people self-esteem, something we all need.

For those who ask how much does it cost and insist on the bottom line for the budget, a preliminary cost estimate suggests that, if fully implemented, GJOP would cost about $8 billion. How much is that? From 1985 to 1987 we appropriated exactly $8.2 billion for the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]. I am confident that we can spend that much to fully develop our human resources.

In fact, much of the costs of the GJOP would be offset by the savings in programs that assist the unemployed.

In May 1989, the unemployment rate in Illinois stood at 5.7 percent. Our national unemployment rate stood at 5.2 percent. What exactly does an unemployment rate of 5.2 percent or a total of 6.4 million unemployed citizens mean?

A conservative estimate is that the Federal expenditure for food stamps, welfare, unemployment compensation, Medicaid, and a host of other expenditures, plus loss of revenue, amounts to $25 billion or each 1 million unemployed. Six million, four hundred thousand people unemployed amounts to a loss of $160 billion annually. Unemployment, an inexcusable waste of humanity, is slowly but certainly eroding our economic future.

Furthermore, the costs of unemployment extend throughout our economy. All businesses are harmed by unemployment. Obviously, people who do not work cannot buy as many cars or air conditioners or suits. Tax incentives to stimulate business investment sometimes can be effective, but creating an economic climate in which people are working and buying always stimulates the economy.

The Guaranteed Job Opportunity Act would provide assistance and training to people with limited job, English, and reading and writing skills. It would allow millions of Americans presently confined within the constraints of the welfare system to contribute to our country and lift themselves out of poverty. Mostly, it would turn unemployed and often, hopeless people, into happier, productive workers.

While there are some who say we can't afford to make the investments it takes to eliminate unemployment and poverty, I say, once again, we can't afford not to.

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. 1290

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Guaranteed Job Opportunity Act".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the relationship between a strong educational system, practical and realistic training and retraining programs and a healthy national economy is inseparable in an era in which economic growth is dependent on technology and is imperiled by unemployment, increasing numbers of unskilled, ill-trained and undereducated individuals in the workforce or seeking employment;

(2) restoring the competitiveness and enhancing the productivity of the United States will require that all workers possess basic educational skills, and job experience; and

(3) our Nation must recognize the substantial impact that an investment in human capital will have on increasing productivity.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is therefore the purpose of this Act to establish a national program designed—

(1) to improve our productivity and competitive position by investing in human capital; and

(2) to assist youth and adults to become productive workers in a competitive economy by authorizing a job opportunity program.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Governor" means the chief executive of any State;

(2) "participant" means an individual who is determined to be eligible under section 5;

(3) "project" means the definable task or group of tasks which—

(A) will be carried out by a public agency, a private nonprofit organization, or a private contractor,

(B) will meet the requirements of section 8(f),

(C) will result in a specific product or accomplishment, and

(D) would not otherwise be conducted with existing funds;

(4) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor; and

(5) "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM

SEC. 4. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 15 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall make grants to District Executive Councils established in accordance with section 5 for the purpose of assisting local job projects which meet the requirements of this Act.

DISTRICT EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

SEC. 5. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF DISTRICT EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.—(1) Any eligible area which desires to receive funds under this Act shall establish a District Executive Council. The council shall be composed of at least 13 members—

(A) four of whom shall be appointed by the Governor of the State within which the eligible area is located;

(B) four of whom shall be appointed by the mayor or chief executive of the largest municipality located in the eligible area; and

(C) five of whom shall be appointed by the chief executives of governmental units comprising or located in the eligible area.

(2) The members shall serve for a term of 3 years.

(3)(A) Not more than 2 members of the council appointed under paragraph (1)(A) and not more than 2 members of the council appointed under paragraph (1)(B) may be members of the same political party.

(B) Not more than 3 members of the council appointed under paragraph (1)(C) shall be members of the same political party.

(4) The members of the council appointed under paragraph (1) shall, in the aggregate, include—

(A) at least 4 representatives of the business community in the eligible area;

(B) at least 4 representatives of labor organizations in the eligible area; and

(C) at least 1 member representing the education community of the eligible area.

(5) In any eligible area which is substantially the same as a service delivery area under title I of the Job Training Partnership Act, the private industry council for such area may, upon a two-thirds vote of the members of the council, petition the Governor to be designated as the District Executive Council for that area. Upon receiving such a petition, the Governor shall appoint members pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection and make arrangement to assure that the membership of the private industry council, for the purpose of this Act, substantially meets the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection. The private industry council so reconstituted shall be the District Executive Council, for the purpose of this Act, for the appropriate eligible area.

(b) FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL.—Each District Executive Council shall—

(1) select the projects to be assisted under this Act pursuant to criteria prescribed by the Secretary;

(2) prepare and submit a plan for the conduct of projects to be assisted under this Act; and

(3) prepare and submit an annual report to the Secretary on the activities of the District Executive Council.

(c) PERSONNEL.—Each District Executive Council shall—

(1) employ an Administrator and sufficient support personnel, including at least one counselor, sufficient to carry out the functions of the council under this Act; and

(2) select a manager for each job project assisted under this Act, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary.

(d) LIMITATIONS ON ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 10 percent of the amount available to the District Executive Council of each eligible area may be used for administrative expenses.

(e) ESTABLISHMENT OF ELIGIBLE AREA.—For the purpose of this Act, an "eligible area" is a county or comparable unit of general local government as designated by the Secretary after consultation with effected officials in each State. No area may have a population in excess of 300,000 individuals, unless the Secretary waives the requirement of this subsection.

PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY

SEC. 6. (a) GENERAL RULE.—For the purpose of this Act, an individual is eligible to participate in the job projects assisted under this Act, if the individual—

(1)(A) has a high school diploma or its equivalent; or

(B) is at least 18 years of age;

(2) has resided in the eligible area for at least 30 days;

(3) has been unemployed for 35 days prior to the determination of employment for job projects assisted under this Act; and

(4) is a citizen of the United States, is a national of the United States, is a lawfully admitted permanent resident alien, is a lawfully admitted refugee and parolee, or is otherwise authorized by the Attorney General to work in the United States.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—(1) Not more than 2 individuals who reside in any household may be eligible for a job assisted under this Act.

(2) No individual—

(A) whose earned income for the year preceding the year in which the determination of employment under this Act is made is equal to or more than $17,000; or

(B) who has a family income in the year in which the determination of employment under this Act is made which is paid for the month prior to such determination at a rate of $17,000 a year,

may be eligible for a job assisted under this Act.

(3) Each individual participating in the job opportunity project assisted under this Act, may not work in any compensated job other than the job assisted under this Act for more than 16 hours per week.

(4) Each individual participating in the job project assisted under this Act shall demonstrate, to the project manager of the job project assisted under this Act, that the individual sought employment in the private sector during the 35 days prior to making application for employment under this Act and will continue to seek employment during the period of employment assisted under this Act.

(5) Any individual eligible for retirement benefits under the Social Security Act, under any retirement system for Federal Government employees, under the railroad retirement system, under the military retirement system, or any private pension program is not eligible to receive a job under a job project assisted under this Act.

TESTING AND EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 7. (a) TESTING.—Each participant shall be tested for basic reading and writing competence by the District Executive Council prior to employment by a job project assisted under this Act.

(b) EDUCATION REQUIREMENT.—(1) Each participant who fails to complete satisfactorily the basic competency test required by subsection (a) of this section shall be furnished counseling and instruction.

(2) Each participant in a job project assisted under this Act shall, in order to continue such employment, maintain satisfactory progress toward and receive a secondary school diploma or its equivalent.

(3) Each participant with limited English speaking ability may be furnished such instruction as the District Executive Council deems appropriate.

LOCAL JOB PROJECTS

SEC. 8. (a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Each District Executive Council shall select job projects to be assisted under this Act. Each such job project selected for assistance shall provide employment to eligible participants.

(b) PROJECT OBJECTION.—No project may be selected under this section if an objection to the project is filed by 2 representatives appointed under paragraph (3)(A) of section 5(a) or by 2 representatives appointed under paragraph (3)(B) of such section.

(c) POLITICAL AFFILIATION PROHIBITED.—No manager and no other officer or employee of a District Executive Council or of the job project assisted under this Act may apply a political affiliation test in selecting eligible participation for employment in such project.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—(1) Not more than 10 percent of the total expenses in any fiscal year of the job project may be used for transportation and equipment.

(2) Not more than one-tenth of the individuals employed in any job project assisted under this Act may be employed to supervise such project. Individuals selected for supervision may be selected without regard to the provisions of section 6 and may receive wages in excess of the rate determined under section 9. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to in any case in which, pursuant to objective criteria prescribed by the Secretary, more supervision of eligible participants will contribute to carrying out the objectives of this Act.

(e) MAXIMUM HOURS PER WEEK EMPLOYED.—Each eligible participant employed

in a job project assisted under this Act may not be employed on such project for more than 32 hours per week.

(f) PROJECT DURATION.—Each job project assisted under this Act and selected under this section shall be capable of completion within 18 months.

(g) PROJECT PROGRESS REPORTS.—Each project manager shall prepare and submit to the District Executive Council monthly progress reports on the job project assisted under this Act.

BENEFITS; SUPPORTIVE SERVICES; JOB CLUBS

SEC. 9. (a) WAGES.—Each eligible participant who is employed in job projects assisted under this Act shall receive wages equal to the higher of—

(1) the minimum wage under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938,

(2) the minimum wage under the applicable minimum wage law, or

(3) the amount which the eligible participant received in welfare benefits pursuant to the State plan approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act or in the form of unemployment compensation, if applicable, plus 10 percent of such amount,

whichever is higher.

(b) BENEFITS.—Each eligible participant who is employed in projects assisted under this Act shall be furnished benefits and employment conditions comparable to the benefits and conditions provided to other employees employed in similar occupations by a comparable employer but no such participant shall be eligible for unemployment compensation during or on the basis of employment in such a project.

(c) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—Each eligible participant who is employed in projects assisted under this Act shall be eligible for supportive services, which may include transportation, health care, special services and materials for the handicapped, child care and other services which are necessary to enable the individual to participate.

(d) JOB CLUBS.—Each District Executive Council shall establish for the eligible area job clubs to assist eligible participants with the preparation of resumes, the development of interviewing techniques, and evaluation of individual job search activities.

LABOR STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO JOB PROJECTS

SEC. 10. (a) CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT.—(1) Conditions of employment and training shall be appropriate and reasonable in light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant.

(2) Health and safety standards established under State and Federal law, otherwise applicable to working conditions of employees, shall be equally applicable to working conditions of participants. With respect to any participant in a job project conducted under this Act who is engaged in activities which are not covered by health and safety standards under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, the Secretary shall prescribe, by regulation, such standards as may be necessary to protect the health and safety of such participant.

(3) No funds available under this Act may be used for contributions on behalf of any participant to retirement systems or plans.

(b) DISPLACEMENT RULES.—(1) No currently employed worker shall be displaced by any participant (including partial displacement such as a reduction in the hours of nonovertime work, wages, or employment benefits).

(2) No job project shall impair existing contracts for services or collective bargaining agreements, except that no job project under this Act which would be inconsistent with the terms of a collective bargaining agreement shall be undertaken without the written concurrence of the labor organization and employer concerned.

(3) No participant shall be employed or job opening filled (A) when any other individual is on layoff from the same or any substantially equivalent job, or (B) when the employer has terminated the employment of any regular employee or otherwise reduced its workforce with the intention of filling the vacancy so created by hiring a participant whose wages are subsidized under this Act.

(4) No jobs shall be created in a promotional line that will infringe in any way upon the promotional opportunities of currently employed individuals.

(c) SPECIAL LIMITATIONS.—Where a labor organization represents a substantial number of employees who are engaged in similar work or training in the same area as that proposed to be funded under this Act, an opportunity shall be provided, at least 30 days before the project is approved, for such organization to submit comments with respect to such proposal.

(d) SPECIAL WAGE RULE.—(1) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in any construction, alteration, or repair, including painting and decorating, of projects, buildings, and works which are federally assisted under this Act, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1921 (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a-5), popularly known as the Davis-Bacon Act. The Secretary shall have, with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267) and section 2 of the Act of June 1, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

(2) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to an eligible participant in a project assisted under this Act.

NONDISCRIMINATION

SEC. 11. (a) GENERAL RULE.—(1) For the purpose of applying the prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of age under the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, on the basis of handicap under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, on the basis of sex under title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, or on the basis of race, color, or national origin under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, projects and activities funded or otherwise financially assisted in whole or in part under this Act are considered to be programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance.

(2) No individual shall be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, subjected to discrimination under, or denied employment in the administration of or in connection with any such project because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap, or political affiliation or belief.

(3) No participant shall be employed on the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship.

(4) With respect to terms and conditions affecting, or rights provided to, individuals who are participants in activities supported by funds provided under this Act, such individuals shall not be discriminated against solely because of their status as such participants.

(b) FAILURE TO COMPLY RULES.—Whenever the Secretary finds that a recipient has failed to comply with a provision of law referred to in subsection (a)(1), with paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a), or with an applicable regulation prescribed to carry out such paragraphs, the Secretary shall notify such recipient and shall request it to comply. If within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed 60 days, the recipient fails or refuses to comply, the Secretary may—

(1) refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted;

(2) exercise the powers and functions provided by title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, or section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, as may be applicable; or

(3) take such other action as may be provided by law.

(c) REFERRAL TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—When a matter is referred to the Attorney General pursuant to subsection (b)(1), or whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that a recipient is engaged in a pattern or practice in violation of a provision or law referred to in subsection (a)(1) or in violation of paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a), the Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate district court of the United States for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

EVALUATION

SEC. 12. Each District Executive Council shall establish and maintain an evaluation file for each individual employed in a project assisted under this Act. The evaluation file shall be made available to the participant monthly which shall not be available to any other person without the consent of the employee. In carrying out the provisions of this section, each such Council shall assure that the participant will be afforded the opportunity to discuss any matter contained in, or omitted from, the file.

ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION

SEC. 13. (a) ALLOTMENT.—The Secretary shall allot the amount available in each fiscal year under section 15 to each State so that—

(1) 33⅓ percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of unemployed individuals residing in areas of substantial unemployment in each State as compared to the total number of such unemployed individuals in all such areas of substantial unemployment in all States;

(2) 33⅓ percent shall be allotted on the basis of the number of workers displaced by plant closings or mass layoffs in such State in the most recent period for which satisfactory data are available under section 462(e) of the Job Training Partnership Act compared to the total number of such workers in all States; and

(3) 33⅓ percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of individuals receiving public assistance under State and local laws and the number of individuals receiving assistance under a State plan approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act within the State compared to the total number of such individuals in all States.

(b) SUBSTATE ALLOCATION.—(1) The Governor shall allocate 100 percent of the allot-

ment to the State for each fiscal year among the District Executive Councils within the State in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) Of the amount allocated under this subsection—

(A) 33⅓ percent shall be allocated on the basis of the relative number of unemployed individuals residing in each eligible area as compared to the total number of such unemployed individuals in all such eligible areas in the State;

(B) 33⅓ percent shall be allocated on the basis of the number of workers displaced by plant closings or mass layoffs in eligible areas in the most recent period for which satisfactory data are available under section 462(e) of the Job Training Partnership Act as compared to the total of such workers in all eligible areas in the State; and

(C) 33⅓ percent shall be allocated on the basis of the relative number of individuals receiving public assistance under State and local laws and the number of individuals receiving assistance under a State plan approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act in an eligible area within the State compared to the total number of such individuals in all eligible areas in the State.

(c) REALLOTMENT.—(1) The Secretary shall, beginning after September 30, 1990, reallot amounts appropriated and allotted to any State which is equal to the unexpended balance of the allotment of the State at the end of the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year for which the determination is made if the unexpended balance exceeds 20 percent of the State's allotment for that fiscal year.

(2) The State shall reallot the amounts available under paragraph (1) of this subsection to any State which demonstrates that the State is making progress toward achieving the stated objectives in carrying out the provisions of this Act and that the State required additional funds in order to accomplish the objectives.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 14. (a) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may, in accordance with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, prescribe such rules and regulations (including performance standards) as the Secretary deems necessary. Such rules and regulations may include adjustments authorized by section 204 of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968. All such rules and regulations shall be published in the Federal Register at least 30 days prior to their effective date. Copies of all such rules and regulations shall be transmitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress at the same time and shall contain, with respect to each material provision of such rules and regulations, citations to the particular substantive section of law which is the basis therefor.

(b) ACCEPTING PROPERTY FOR USE UNDER THIS ACT.—The Secretary is authorized, in carrying out this Act, to accept, purchase, or lease in the name of the department, and employ or dispose of in furtherance of the purpose of this Act, any money or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, received by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise, and to accept voluntary and uncompensated services notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

(c) GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may make such grants, contracts, or agreements, establish such procedures and make such payments, in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, or otherwise allocate or expend funds under this Act as necessary to carry out this Act, including (without regard to the provisions of section 4774(d) of title 10, United States Code) expenditures for construction, repairs, and capital improvements, and including necessary adjustments in payments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

(d) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may waive—

(1) the testing requirement for individuals with handicaps;

(2) the education requirement in section 7(b)(2); and

(3) subject to a ⅔ vote of each District Executive Council, the requirement relating to a 32-hour work week under section 8(e) for unusual circumstances.

(e) REPORT.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress an annual report of the administration of this Act. The Secretary shall include in such report—

(1) a summary of the achievements, failures, and problems of the programs authorized in this Act in meeting the objective of this Act; and

(2) such recommendations, including recommendations for legislative or administrative action, as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(f) AUDIT.—The Comptroller General of the United States, and any authorized representatives of the General Accounting Office, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records, of any recipient under this Act that are pertinent to the amounts received and disbursed under this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 15. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act, $5,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1990, $8,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1991, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1992 and each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to October 1, 1995.●

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DODD, Mr. SIMON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. GLENN):

S. 1291. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today, on behalf of Senators KASSEBAUM, MATSUNAGA, COCHRAN, DODD, SIMON, JEFFORDS, KENNEDY, HOLLINGS, and GLENN, I am very pleased to introduce the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1989.

The Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities held a joint hearing with the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education on April 11, 1989, at which testimony was received from a broad cross-section of individuals from the public library field. The support for reauthorizing LSCA was broad and enthusiastic. This act, which was first signed into law in 1956, by President Eisenhower, continues to be the single most significant source of Federal funds for our Nation's public libraries. The importance of libraries to an educated American citizenry is undeniable and it is crucial that these institutions—be they urban or rural, large or small—be kept strong, viable, and growing.

The LSCA has successfully provided much-needed Federal support to the States through a system of formula grants. While the total amount is a small percentage of all library aid, these moneys have been targeted toward particularly critical areas. These areas include services to the physically handicapped and the elderly and to communities with little or no access to a public library.

In more recent years, the LSCA has been expanded to provide a set-aside to support library services to American Indians and native Hawaiians and to address the specific needs of illiterate and multilingual populations. In addition, the problems in providing adequate library services to urban populations have been acknowledged to be just as profound as those of providing services to rural populations.

It is the intent of these 1989 amendments to ensure the continuity of these important library services by reauthorizing the LSCA for another 5 years. While some of the testimony received by the subcommittees suggested minor adjustments in the program, the consensus was to await the outcome of the upcoming White House Conference on Library and Information Services before proceeding to make any truly substantive changes in the LSCA.

The White House Conference, authorized in the last Congress, is to be held not later than September 1991. Preliminary conferences in the States will occur at which major issues currently facing the library community will be discussed at length. It makes sense to wait for the recommendations generated by this conference so that they can be part of any future congressional discussion on changes to the LSCA.

The modifications then in this reauthorization bill are largely technical in nature and have been incorporated in response to requests from the Department of Education and the national public library community. However, the two areas of technology and preservation do receive increased emphasis in the bill because the projected needs in these areas are not adequately provided for in current law. The States are given greater latitude in using LSCA funds for purchasing and maintaining technological equipment and they are given the option of using title III funds for developing programs to address preservation needs. The added emphasis on preservation programs will hopefully encourage libraries to protect endangered materials and preserve them for future generations.

I commend these Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1989 to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1291

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1989".

(b) REFERENCES.—References in this Act to "the Act" are references to the Library Services and Construction Act (20 U.S.C. 351 et seq.).

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 of the Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "and initial equipment" and inserting "and for the purchase, lease, and installation of equipment";

(B) by striking "to conserve energy" and inserting "to ensure safe working environments and to conserve energy"; and

(C) by striking "includes machinery" and inserting "includes information and building technologies, video and telecommunications equipment, machinery"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(17) The term 'handicapped individual' means an individual who is physically or mentally impaired, visually impaired, or hearing impaired.

"(18) The term 'network' means any local, statewide, regional, or interstate cooperative association of library entities which provide for the systematic and effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic, and special libraries and information centers for improved supplementary services for the clientele served by each type of library entity.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 4(a) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated—

"(1) for the purpose of making grants as provided in title I, $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years;

"(2) for the purpose of making grants as provided in title II, $55,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years;

"(3) for the purpose of making grants as provided in title III, $35,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years;

"(4) for the purpose of making grants as provided in title V, $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years;

"(5) for the purpose of making grants as provided in title VI, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years; and

"(6) for the purpose of activities as provided in title VII, $500,000 for fiscal year 1990, and such sums as may be necessary each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

There shall be available for the purpose of making grants under title IV for each of the fiscal years 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994, 1.5 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to each of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for each such fiscal year. There shall be available for the purpose of making grants under section 5(d) for such fiscal years 0.5 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to each of such paragraphs for each such fiscal year.".

(b) CARRYOVER OF FUNDS.—Section 4(b) of the Act is amended by striking "and for the next succeeding fiscal year" and inserting "and is authorized to remain available until expended".

SEC. 4. ALLOCATIONS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 5(c) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) From one-half of the sums available pursuant to the second sentence of section 4(a) for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot an equal amount to each Indian tribe that submits an approved application under section 403.

"(2) From the remaining one-half of the sums available pursuant to such second sentence, the Secretary shall make allocations to Indian tribes that (A) are receiving an allocation under paragraph (1) of this subsection for such fiscal year; and (B) have submitted approved applications under section 404.

"(3) In making allocations under paragraph (2)—

"(A) no funds shall be allocated to an Indian tribe unless such funds will be administered by a librarian; and

"(B) the Secretary shall take into account the needs of Indian tribes for such allocations to carry out the activities described in section 402(b).

"(4) In making allocations under this subsection, the Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to prevent an allocation from being received to serve the same population by any two or more of the following entities as defined in, or established pursuant to, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act:

"(A) an Alaskan native village,

"(B) a regional corporation, or

"(C) a village corporation.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6(g)(2) of the Act is amended by inserting after "section 5(c)(2)" the following: "in the same fiscal year in which it has received an allocation under section 5(c)(1)".

SEC. 5. RESOURCE SHARING COORDINATION.

Section 6 of the Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1), by striking "and construction" and inserting ", construction, and interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) The Secretary shall coordinate programs under titles V and VI of this Act with the programs assisted by titles I, II, and III of this Act, and shall provide to the head of the State library administrative agency the opportunity to comment on any application for a grant under title V or VI of this Act prior to the awarding of the grant, in order to assure that such grants from the Secretary are for purposes consistent with the long-range program required under subsection (d) of this section.".

SEC. 6. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.

Section 7 of this Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) In fiscal year 1990, and every fifth fiscal year thereafter, each State library agency may review its expenditures in the second fiscal year preceding fiscal year for which the determination is made under the programs from State and local sources and file with the Secretary a statement to establish a current, revised expenditure level to be used for measuring the maintenance of effort required under subsections (a)(1)(B) and (a)(2).".

SEC. 7. INTERGENERATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICES.

Section 101 of the Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) for assisting libraries in developing intergenerational library programs that will match older adult volunteers with libraries interested in developing after school literacy and reading skills programs for unsupervised school children during afterschool hours;".

SEC. 8. CHILDCARE LIBRARY OUTREACH.

Section 101 of the Act is further amended by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) for assisting libraries in providing mobile library services and programs to licensed or certified child-care providers or child-care centers;".

SEC. 9. LIBRARY LITERACY CENTERS.

Section 101 of the Act is further amended by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

"(7) to establish and support model library literacy centers, coordinated by the State library administrative agency with other interested State agencies and nonprofit organizations to reduce the number of functionally illiterate individuals and to help them reach full employment;".

SEC. 10. USE OF TITLE I FUNDS.

Section 102(a) of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In carrying out its program to accomplish the purposes of this title, a State may make subgrants to library systems or networks which include libraries other than public libraries, if the purpose of the subgrant is to improve services for public library patrons".

SEC. 11. RATABLE REDUCTIONS OF MAJOR URBAN RESOURCE LIBRARIES.

Section 102(c) of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) No State shall, in carrying out the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection, reduce the amount paid to any major urban resource library below the amount that such library received in the year preceding the year for which the determination is made under such paragraph (2), except that such amount shall be ratably reduced to the extent that the total Federal allocations to the State under section 5 for purposes of this title for the applicable fiscal year are reduced or that the 1990 Census shows the population of the city served by such library has decreased.".

SEC. 12. STATE ANNUAL PROGRAM.

Section 103 of the Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking "and institutionalized individuals";

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking "(A)"; and

(B) by striking everything following "elderly" the first place it appears and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

"(5) describe the uses of funds to make library services and programs more accessible to handicapped individuals.".

SEC. 13. TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENT.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 3 of the Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(19) The term 'technology enhancement' means the acquisition, installation, maintenance, or replacement, of substantial technological equipment (including library bibliographic automation equipment) necessary to provide access to information in electronic and other formats made possible by new information and communications technologies.".

(b) USE OF TITLE I FUNDS.—Section 101 of the Act is further amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (8) (as redesignated by section 7(1));

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (9) (as redesignated by section 7(1)) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) for assisting public libraries in making effective use of technology to improve library and information services.".

(c) USE OF TITLE II FUNDS.—Title II of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "AND TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENT" after "CONSTRUCTION" in the heading of such title;

(2) by inserting "AND LIBRARY AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENT" after "CONSTRUCTION" in the head of section 201;

(3) by inserting "and technology enhancement" after "construction" each place it appears in sections 201, 202(a), 202(b), 203(1), 203(2), and 203(3);

(4) by striking "section 3(2)" in section 202(a) and inserting "sections 3(2) and 3(19), respectively"; and

(5) by inserting "AND TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENT" after "CONSTRUCTION" in the heading of section 203.

(d) USE OF TITLE III FUNDS.—Section 302(a) of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1); and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of paragraph (2) the following: "; and (3) developing the technological capacity of libraries for interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing".

SEC. 14. PRESERVATION OBJECTIVES IN CONSTRUCTION.

Section 203 of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting "; and"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) follow policies and procedures in the construction of public libraries that will promote the preservation of library and information resources to be utilized in the facilities.".

SEC. 15. RESOURCE SHARING.

Sections 301 and 304(a) of the Act are amended by striking "eventual" and inserting "attaining".

SEC. 16. PRESERVATION COOPERATION.

Title III of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PRESERVATION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 305. (a) The long-range program and annual program of each State under this title may—

(1) include a statewide preservation cooperation plan that complies with this section; and

(2) identify the preservation objectives to be achieved during the period covered by the long-range plans required by section 6.

(b) A statewide preservation cooperation plan complies with this section if—

(1) such plan specifies the methods by which the State library administrative agency will work with libraries, archives, historical societies, scholarly organizations, and other agencies, within or outside the State, in planning, education and training, coordinating, outreach and public information, and service programs to ensure that endangered library and information resources are preserved systematically; and

"(2) such preservation plan is developed in consultation with such parties and agencies as the State archives, historical societies, libraries, scholarly organizations, and other interested parties.

"(c) A State that has a statewide preservation cooperation plan that complies with this section may use funds under this title to carry out such plan.

"(d) The State library administrative agency may contract part or all of the preservation program under this section to other agencies or institutions.".

SEC. 17. LIBRARY LITERACY GRANTS.

Section 601(e) of the Act is amended by striking "$25,000" and inserting "$35,000".

SEC. 18. EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT.

(a) AMENDMENT.—The Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VII—EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT

"PROGRAM AUTHORITY

"SEC. 701. The Secretary is authorized to carry out a program for the purpose of evaluation and assessment (directly or by grants or contracts) of programs authorized under this Act.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5(a) of the Act is amended by striking out paragraph (5).

SEC. 19. PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES.

(a) TITLE I HEADING.—The heading of title I of the Act is amended by inserting "PUBLIC" before "LIBRARY".

(b) SECTION 101 HEADING.—The heading of section 101 is amended by inserting "PUBLIC" before "LIBRARY".

SEC. 20. EFFECTIVE DATE PROVISION.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1989.●

● Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished chairman, Senator PELL, in introducing this legislation which reauthorizes programs that provide library services to individuals across the country.

The Library Services and Construction Act, or LSCA, has given an important boost in making library services available to rural America. I cannot underscore the importance of this act and the gifts it has brought to Kansas and others alike.

Libraries allow people the opportunity to open their minds and their hearts to knowledge and to dreams—two precious gifts I don't believe anyone can live without. J.M. Clark once observed that "knowledge is the only instrument of production that is not subject to diminishing returns."

Being an avid reader, I find it difficult to imagine a life without books and libraries. The initial purpose of LSCA was to give everyone the opportunity to open their minds with books. It created a public fund which helped communities establish free, public libraries. The bill that we are introducing today builds upon this initial purpose and attempts to continue this tradition of providing services while encouraging innovation and preservation of resources. The Department of Education estimates that 96 percent of our Nation's population has access to public library services. I believe that is a laudable figure and one that I personally would like to see maintained, if not grow a little.

The bill we are introducing today has seven titles. The first title strengthens State library administrative agencies and major urban resource libraries. The second title, Public Library Construction, is a popular program which provides funds for the construction of public libraries. Title III provides funds for the development of interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing programs which would permit individuals even greater access to resources currently available to them.

Title IV strengthens the programs available to native Americans and title V provides funds for libraries to purchase materials in foreign languages. Title VI addresses the problem of illiteracy now facing our Nation by designating funds for the development of literacy programs.

The last title is title VII which allows for the evaluation and assessment of library programs. Since the Library Services and Construction Act receives a relatively small share of Federal funds, I think it is important that we account for how those dollars are spent.

I believe that, for the most part, LSCA is operating well. The changes that were made are to fortify this legislation. The focus of the act as it stands today is to encourage innovation and to reach out to groups such as the disadvantaged, elderly, and handicapped—who might not otherwise be able to enjoy the treasures to be found on library shelves. As Thomas Carlyle so wisely noted, "All that mankind has done, thought, gained, or been: it is lying as in magic preservation in the pages of books."●

● Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, since its enactment in 1956, Library Services and Construction Act funds have been used to provide access to the resources of public libraries for all library patrons across the country. Today, LSCA remains the largest Fed-

eral program of direct assistance to libraries.

I rise today to ensure that the programs operated under LSCA continue for another 5 years. I join my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities, in introducing the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1989. This legislative package represents several months of work among subcommittee members in an effort to design a reauthorization package which reflects the needs of our Nation's libraries, both urban and rural.

In preparing this bill, we were told by libraries across the country that the present law is a good one and only needed a few improvements. I am pleased that some of those improvements come in the form of an increased commitment to title VI, the Library Literacy Programs. Under the proposed bill, the amount of individual grants would be raised from $25,000 to $35,000 with an overall authorization increase for title VI to be raised from $5 million to $10 million. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I will be working to see that this commitment is carried through in the appropriations process.

I am also pleased that title I, the Public Library Services Title, has been expanded to authorize the establishment of library literacy centers. Federal moneys could be used to establish such centers within an existing library and in conjunction with public television stations in the State. I thank the chairman of the Education Subcommittee, Senator PELL, and the ranking member, Senator KASSEBAUM, for their cooperation in adding this language to title I.

Mr. President, the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1989 represents a concerted effort by both House and Senate Members to design a reauthorization measure which will improve an already effective law. I hope that the Labor and Human Resources Committee will move quickly in sending the bill to the Senate for its final approval.●

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1292. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on tefluthrin; to the Committee on Finance.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON TEFLUTHRIN

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am introducing a duty suspension bill for tefluthrin.

Tefluthrin is a phyrethroid, a novel class of insecticide which evolved from pyrethrum, a natural insecticide found in certain chrysanthemum plants. This product is unique in that it is the only soil active pyrethroid developed specifically for use on corn soil insects. It is the most advanced granular corn soil insecticide developed because it makes available a new chemical class for critical, early control of corn soil insects in any soil environment.

There is currently no domestic source for this product, nor the likelihood of a domestic source in the foreseeable future. The imposition of the duty on this product has significantly increased the cost of bringing this new product to the market and to the American farmer.

It is for these reasons that I introduced this bill and hope that both the Finance Committee and the Senate will see fit to add favorably upon it.●

By Mr. HEINZ:

S. 1293. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to clarify that such act applies to benefits, to authorize employers to employ older individuals while permitting such employers to provide unequal benefits to such older individuals in certain instances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

● Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, it has been almost 4 years since this body last dealt with the problem of age discrimination. In 1985, I introduced S. 1054, a bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to remove the maximum age limitation for employees covered under the act. By eliminating the use of mandatory retirement ages, we gave force to a senior citizens' rights to remain contributors in the American economy. Unfortunately, Mr. President, 2½ weeks ago the U.S. Supreme Court regressed in the 20-year battle that we have been waging against age discrimination.

In Public Employee Retirement System of Ohio versus Betts, the Court held that employers were free to discriminate against their older employees in the area of benefit plans. Health, disability, retirement, and other insurance plans are now easy prey for baseless discriminatory practices. The most remarkable aspect of this decision is that an employer doesn't even have to justify his discrimination in terms of costs, which is what the former Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC] regulations provided. For 20 years since the enactment of the ADEA, businesses have been comfortably operating under these regulations. Now it is time to rebuild the wall of protection from unjustified discrimination that the Court has torn down.

The legislation that I am introducing today would simply restore the previous regulations under which businesses have been operating for 20 years. While this is a simple change in the law, it will make an enormous difference in the lives of those who will soon face the devastating effects of age discrimination in employee benefits. The same argument that I used in 1986 against mandatory retirement ages holds true today in the area of employee benefits. People who are subjected to discriminatory benefit programs are deprived of these benefits not on the basis of who they are and what they can do, but solely on the basis of their age. This seems to me the rankest form of discrimination, and we should not tolerate it in Federal law. Like mandatory retirement, discrimination in employee benefits plans coerce workers into early resignation and retirement. By cutting off benefits when an employee reaches 60, an employer eliminates the free, rational choice of an aged employee to keep on working and contributing to the business.

In essence, by passing this legislation, we will be delivering the message to present and future older workers: You are to receive the full benefits of the employment relationship on the basis of your capability, not on the basis of your birthdate. A baseless discriminatory benefit plan is both morally unsupportable and contrary to the economic interests of employers, employees, and the American public. It is bad for workers, bad for business, and bad for the economy. Incalculable human talent and spirit has been wasted as able workers have been forced to premature idleness. Eliminating this type of discrimination will signal our recognition of the value of older workers in the workplace and will signal our intention to reject all barriers to their full participation.●

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 1294. A bill to encourage the transfer of national defense energy technology from the Department of Energy's defense program contractors to the private sector for commercialization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL DEFENSE ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACT

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the National Defense Energy Technology Transfer Act of 1989.

Technological advancement is a key component in the growth of the U.S. industrial economy and a strong industrial base is also an essential element of U.S. national security. Studies sponsored by industry and academia report convincing evidence of declining U.S. competitiveness in both domestic and international markets, despite America's lead in technology innovation. Yet our national laboratories which are primarily devoted to atomic energy defense activities—the DOE DP laboratories of the Department of Energy—constitute a multidiscipline capability in general science, energy science, and defense related technology development with incomparable research and

computer facilities with research and support staffs of demonstrated international expertise.

An opportunity exists to use those resources residing in the DOE laboratory facilities to promote technology commercialization while, at the same time, enhancing their primary national security mission. We need to improve commercial sector utilization of Federal R&D resources to increase our appreciation of industry's technology requirements and to forge new linkage so that technology flows in two directions: from the labs to industry and from industry to the labs. The crossfertilization will increase the laboratories exposure to external technology which can actually accelerate innovation and increase efficiencies within the DOE DP laboratory facilities themselves.

Certainly, the DOE DP laboratories have demonstrated successes in technology transfer into the private sector. I know personally of several outstanding examples in which the Los Alamos National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratory in my own State of New Mexico have played leading roles. But officials at Los Alamos and Sandia would agree that the effectiveness of this effort can be significantly enhanced if: First, industry is made more aware of the DOE DP laboratory research and development capabilities and activities; second, commercialization of technologies developed in connection with the DOE DP laboratories' research, experimental, and development activities, through technology transfer is established as a significant element of the mission of the DOE DP laboratories; third, the DOE DP laboratories are made more aware of industry market requirements; and fourth, industry becomes more involved with the activities of DOE DP laboratories at an early enough time in the research and development process to provide guidance on the development of commercially viable products. All of this can be accomplished while nuclear weapons design, development, production, and maintenance still remains the primary mission of the Department of Energy nuclear weapons complex.

The National Defense Energy Technology Transfer Act of 1989 would accomplish these objectives in several ways. First, it would make technology transfer and commercialization a specified mission of our national laboratories. Second, it would establish a framework for the DOE DP laboratories' entering into cooperative research and development agreements with universities, industry, and other third parties. And third, it would clarify and streamline the transfer of certain rights in inventions and computer software which are developing by the laboratories or pursuant to these research and development agreements. In all events, the provisions of the act are designed so that the enhancements of the laboratories' technology transfer mission is complementary to and supportive of the laboratories' national security mission.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 15

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 15, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve emergency medical services and trauma care, and for other purposes.

S. 16

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to require the executive branch to gather and disseminate information regarding, and to promote techniques to eliminate, discriminatory wage-setting practices and discriminatory wage disparities which are based on sex, race, or national origin.

S. 23

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 23, a bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to permit family planning projects to offer adoption services.

S. 43

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 43, a bill to restore the Medicare and Medicaid law to the provisions in effect before the enactment of the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988 and to establish a Presidential Commission on the Medicare Program.

S. 100

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 100, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to coverage of, and payment for, services of psychologists under part B of Medicare.

S. 120

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 120, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize adolescent family life demonstration projects and for other purposes.

S. 121

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 121, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that psychologist services furnished by, or under arrangements made by, a hospice program are covered under Medicare.

S. 135

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 135, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore to Federal civilian employees their right to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes.

S. 148

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] were added as cosponsors of S. 148, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Golden Anniversary of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial.

S. 216

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], was added as a cosponsor of S. 216, a bill to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency, which shall be headed by a Social Security Board, and which shall be responsible for the administration of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act and the supplemental security income program under title XVI of such act.

S. 253

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], was added as a cosponsor of S. 253, a bill to establish a coordinated National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Program, and a comprehensive plan for the assessment of the nutritional and dietary status of the U.S. population and the nutritional quality of goods consumed in the United States, with the provision for the conduct of scientific research and development in support of such program and plan.

S. 277

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 277, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide child adoption benefits for Federal Government employees.

S. 278

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the names of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] were added as cosponsors of S. 278, a bill to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Defense to reimburse members of the Armed Forces for certain ex-

penses incurred in the adoption of children.

S. 279

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 279, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income employee adoption assistance provided by the employer.

S. 326

At the request of Mr. BYRD, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 326, a bill, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to repeal a provision allowing use of excess contributions.

S. 342

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 342, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that certain credits will not be subject to the passive activity rules, and for other purposes.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. SYMMS, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] were added as cosponsors of S. 357, a bill to provide that the Secretary of Transportation may not issue regulations reclassifying anhydrous ammonia under the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act.

S. 419

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 419, a bill to provide for the collection of data about crimes motivated by race, religion, ethnicity, or sexual orientation.

S. 435

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] were added as cosponsors of S. 435, a bill to amend section 118 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for certain exceptions from certain rules determining contributions in aid of construction.

S. 494

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 494, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 5 years, and increase the amount of, the deduction for health insurance for self-employed individuals.

S. 507

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 507, a bill to prohibit investments in, and certain other activities with respect to, South Africa, and for other purposes.

S. 511

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] were added as cosponsors of S. 511, a bill to recognize the organization known as the National Academies of Practice.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. SYMMS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] were added as cosponsors of S. 659, a bill to repeal the estate tax inclusion related to valuation freezes.

S. 670

At the request of Mr. ARMSTRONG, the name of the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 670, a bill to recognize the organization known as the Retired Enlisted Association, Inc.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend chapter 33 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the unauthorized use of the names "Visiting Nurse Association," "Visiting Nurse Service," "VNA", "VNS", or "VNAA", or the unauthorized use of the name or insignia of the Visiting Nurse Association of America.

S. 685

At the request of Mr. METZENBAUM, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 685, a bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the applicability of rules relating to fiduciary duties in relation to plan assets of terminated pensions plans and to provide for an explicit exception to such rules for employer reversions meeting certain requirements.

S. 704

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to increase the authorization under title XX of the Social Security Act for block grants to States for social services.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the targeted jobs credit, and for other purposes.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide protection to animal research facilities from illegal acts.

S. 741

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 741, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to identify labor shortages and develop a plan to reduce such shortages, and for other purposes.

S. 785

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 785, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States the option of providing quality home and community care to the elderly under their Medicaid Program.

S. 859

At the request of Mr. WILSON, the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 859, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a drug utilization review system to prevent adverse drug reactions, and for other purposes.

S. 875

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] were added as cosponsors of S. 875, a bill to prohibit U.S. contributions to the United Nations or any of its affiliated organizations if full membership as a state is granted to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood.

S. 893

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] was added as cosponsor of S. 893, a bill to establish certain categories of Soviet and Vietnamese nationals presumed to be subject to persecution and to provide for adjustment to refugee status of certain Soviet and Vietnamese parolees.

S. 962

At the request of Mr. FOWLER, the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] were added as cosponsors of S. 962, a bill to provide for the establishment of a coordinated program of promotion and research designed to strengthen the position of the pecan industry in the marketplace, to maintain and expand foreign and domestic markets, and uses for improved and native pecans and pecan products, and for other purposes.

S. 970

At the request of Mr. FOWLER, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 970, a bill to promote low-input agriculture production systems, to maintain farm profitability, to encourage land, resource, and wildlife stewardship in connection with Federal farm programs, and for other purposes.

S. 979

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] were added as cosponsors of S. 979, a bill to provide grants for designating rural hospitals as medical assistance facilities.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. FOWLER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE] were added as cosponsors of S. 980, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the effectiveness of the low income housing credit.

S. 1019

At the request of Mr. FOWLER, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as cosponsor of S. 1019, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to establish a nationwide rural star school program to improve education opportunities in rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1036

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] was added as cosponsor of S. 1036, a bill to improve the economic, community, and educational well-being of rural America, and for other purposes.

S. 1041

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1041, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for farmers who realize capital gain on the transfer of farm property to satisfy an indebtedness, and for other purposes.

S. 1045

At the request of Mr. SYMMS, the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. ADAMS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1045, a bill to establish a national environmental policy on the participation of the United States in international financing.

S. 1091

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. GARN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] were added as cosponsors of S. 1091, a bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the U.S. Coast Guard.

S. 1107

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] were added as cosponsors of S. 1107, a bill to provide education, training, employment, and related services to displaced homemakers, and for other purposes.

S. 1115

At the request of Mr. EXON, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1115, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to permit the prepayment and refinancing of Federal Financing Bank loans made to rural electrification and telephone systems, and for other purposes.

S. 1127

At the request of Mr. WILSON, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1127, a bill to provide for fair and reasonable payment for services related to the insertion of intraocular lenses.

S. 1150

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1150, a bill to provide for the payment by the Secretary of the Interior of undedicated receipts into the Refuge Revenue Sharing Fund.

S. 1163

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] were added as cosponsors of S. 1163, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Code to limit the length of time for which an individual may be incarcerated for civil contempt in a child custody case in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia and to provide for expedited appeal procedures to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals of individuals found in civil contempt in such case.

S. 1171

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1171, a bill entitled the "ESOP Reform Act of 1989."

S. 1193

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1193, a bill to establish a comprehensive program for the rehabilitation of drug dependent Federal offenders.

S. 1213

At the request of Mr. COHEN, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1213, a bill to establish a presumption of eligibility for asylum in the United States for certain natives of the People's Republic of China.

S. 1216

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1216, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to give employers and performers in the live performing arts, rights given by section 8(e) of such act to employers and employees in similarily situated industries, to give to such employers and performers the same rights given by section 8(f) of such act to employers and employees in the construction industry, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 16

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 16, a joint resolution designating the month of November 1989 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 57

At the request of Mr. PELL, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from California [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 57, a joint resolution to establish a national policy on permanent papers.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 80

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 80, a joint resolution disapproving the recommendations of the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 86

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 86, a joint res-

olution designating November 17, 1989, as "National Philanthropy Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 127

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 127, a joint resolution designating Labor Day weekend, September 2-4, 1989, as "National Drive for Life Weekend."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 132

At the request of Mr. SASSER, the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 132, a joint resolution designating September 1 through 30, 1989, as "National Alcohol and Drug Treatment Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 140

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ] and the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 140, a joint resolution designating November 19-25, 1989, as "National Family Caregivers Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 165

At the request of Mr. WILSON, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 165, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the flag of the United States.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 167

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 167, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the desecration of the flag.

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 167, supra.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, a concurrent resolution establishing procedures for expedited consideration by the Congress of certain bills and joint resolutions submitted by the President.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41

At the request of Mr. WILSON, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 41, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the human rights conditions of Jews in Ethiopia.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 47

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 47, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress on multilateral sanctions against South Africa.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 49

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 49, a concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the States should retain authority to regulate alcohol beverages.

SENATE RESOLUTION 99

At the request of Mr. BOSCHWITZ, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 99, a resolution requiring the Architect of the Capitol to establish and implement a voluntary program for recycling paper disposed of in the operation of the Senate.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1989

SHELBY AMENDMENT NO. 237

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. SHELBY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 358) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to change the level, and preference system for admission, of immigrants to the United States, and to provide for administrative naturalization, and for other purposes, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new title:

TITLE —CENSUS

SEC. . PREVENTION OF CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT DISTORTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) in recent years millions of aliens have entered the United States in violation of immigration laws and are now residing in the United States in an illegal status and are subject to deportation;

(2) the established policy of the Bureau of the Census is to make a concerted effort to count such aliens during the 1990 census without making a separate computation for such illegal aliens; and

(3) by including the millions of illegal aliens in the reapportionment base for the House of Representatives, many States will lose congressional representation which such States would not have otherwise lost, thereby violating the constitutional principle of "one man, one vote".

(b) SECRETARIAL ADJUSTMENTS TO PREVENT DISTORTIONS.—Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subection (h), and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"(g) The Secretary shall make such adjustments in total population figures as may be necessary, using such methods and procedures as the Secretary determines appropriate, in order that aliens in the United States in violation of the immigration laws shall not be counted in tabulating population for purposes of subsection (b) of this section.".

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 22(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a(a)), is amended by striking out "as ascertained under the seventeenth and each subsequent decennial census of the population" and inserting in lieu thereof "as ascertained and reported under section 141 of title 13, United States Code, for each decennial census of population".

HATCH (AND DECONCINI) AMENDMENT NO. 238

Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. DECONCINI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill S. 358, supra, as follows:

On page 77, strike lines 15 through 19, and insert in lieu thereof:

"(A)(i) 480,000, minus

"(ii) the number computed under paragraph (2), plus

"(iii) the number (if any) computed under paragraph (3); or

"(B) 216,000,

"whichever is greater."

On page 79, line 21, beginning with "number", strike through the second "in" in line 22 and insert in lieu thereof "numbers specified in subsection (c)(1)(A)(i), subsection (c)(1)(B), or".

On page 80, line 9, strike "number specified in subsection (c)(1)(A) or the number

specified in" and insert in lieu thereof "numbers specified in subsection (c)(1)(A)(i), subsection (c)(1)(B), or".

On page 80, line 21, strike "(c)(1)(A)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)(1)(A)(i), (c)(1)(B),".

On page 80, line 22, strike "(c)(1)(A)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)(1)(A)(i), subsection (c)(1)(B),".

On page 81, line 23, strike "subsection (c)(1)(A)" and insert in lieu thereof "subsections (c)(1)(A)(i), (c)(1)(B),".

On page 83, line 20, strike "subsection (c)(1)(A)" and insert in lieu thereof "subsections (c)(1)(A)(i), (c)(1)(B),".

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to submit an amendment, on behalf of Senator DECONCINI and myself, to S. 358, the Immigration Act of 1989. We intend to call up this amendment during consideration of the bill.

MITCHELL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 239

Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PELL, Mr. REID, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. KOHL, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. GORE, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment, which was subsequently modified, to the bill S. 358, supra, as follows:

TITLE III—STATUS OF STUDENTS FROM THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989".

SEC. 302. ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIONALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

The Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after section 245A the following new section:

"ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIONALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

"SEC. 245B. (a) WAIVER OF FOREIGN RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT FOR "J" NONIMMIGRANTS.—Nothwithstanding the provisions of section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, persons who are nationals of the People's Republic of China may apply for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence or for a change to another nonimmigrant status if such national—

"(1) was admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(J) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 US.C. 1101(a)(15)(J)), and

"(2) has been continuously resident in the United States since June 5, 1989.

"(b) PRESUMPTION OF CONTINUOUS RESIDENCE FOR CERTAIN PRC NATIONALS.—(1) for purposes of adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225), and change of status under section 248 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1228), in the case of any alien who is a national of the People's Republic of China and is present in the United States under section 101(a)(15) (F), (J), and (M), as well as their immediate family.

"(1) who, as of June 5, 1989, was present in the United States in the lawful status of a nonimmigrant, or

"(2) who was present in the United States before June 5, 1989, but who, as of that date was not present in the United States because of a brief, casual, and innocent trip abroad,

such an alien shall be considered as having continued to maintain lawful status as such a nonimmigrant (and to have maintained continuously a lawful status) for the period described in subsection (e).

"(c) AUTHORIZATION OF TRAVEL ABROAD.—The Attorney General shall, in accordance with existing regulations, permit an alien described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) to return to the United States after such brief and casual trips abroad as reflect an intention on the part of the alien to continue residence in the United States.

"(d) EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION.—Any national of the People's Republic of China who applies for adjustment of status or change of nonimmigrant status under the terms of this section shall be granted authorization to engage in employment in the United States and shall be provided with an employment authorization document or other appropriate work permit.

"(e) DURATION OF STATUS.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), nationals of the People's Republic of China described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) shall have their departure from the United States deferred until June 5, 1992, or until there has been an adjustment or change of status under subsection (a) or (b).

"(2) On or after June 5, 1990, the Attorney General may terminate the status accorded under this subsection 60 days following the date that the President determines and so certifies to the Congress that conditions in the People's Republic of China permit such aliens to return to that country in safety."

HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 240

Mr. HELMS proposed an amendment to the bill S. 358, supra, as follows:

In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

TITLE I—IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1989

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES IN TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Immigration Reform Act of 1989".

(b) REFERENCES IN ACT.—Except as specifically provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed as an amendment to, or repeal of a provision, the reference shall be deemed to be made to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 102. NATIONAL LEVEL OF IMMIGRATION.

(a) WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF IMMIGRATION.—(1) Section 201 (8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended to read as follows:

"WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF IMMIGRATION

"SEC. 201. (a) IN GENERAL.—Exclusive of aliens described in subsection (b), aliens born in a foreign state or dependent area who may be issued immigrant visas or who may otherwise acquire the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence are limited to—

"(1) family connection immigrants described in section 203(a) (or who are admitted under section 211(a) on the basis of a prior issuance of a visa to their accompanying parent under section 203(a)) in a number not to exceed in any fiscal year the number specified in subsection (c) for that year, and not to exceed in any of the first 3 quarters of any fiscal year 27 percent of the worldwide level under such subsection for all of such fiscal year;

"(2) independent immigrants described in section 203(b) (or who are admitted under section 211(a) on the basis of a prior issuance of a visa to their accompanying parent under section 203(b)), in a number not to exceed in any fiscal year the number specified in subsection (d) for that year, and not to exceed in any of the first 3 quarters of any fiscal year 27 percent of the worldwide level under such subsection for all of such fiscal year; and

"(3) for fiscal years 1991, 1992, or 1993, qualified backlog immigrants as described in section 203(a)(4)(B), not to exceed 20,000 in any fiscal year.

"(b) ALIENS NOT SUBJECT TO DIRECT NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—The following aliens are not subject to the worldwide levels or numerical limitations of subsection (a):

"(1)(A) Special immigrants described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 101(a)(27).

"(B) Aliens who are admitted under section 207(c) pursuant to a numerical limitation established under section 207(b).

"(C) Aliens whose status is adjusted to permanent residence under section 210, 210A, or 245A.

"(D) Aliens provided permanent resident status under section 249.

"(2)(A)(i) Aliens who are immediate relatives. For purposes of this clause, the term 'immediate relatives' means the children, spouses, and parents of a citizen of the United States, except that, in the case of parents, such citizens shall be at least 21 years of age.

"(ii) Aliens admitted under section 211(a) on the basis of a prior issuance of a visa to their accompanying parent who is such an immediate relative.

"(B) Aliens born to an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence during a temporary visit abroad.

"(C) Aliens who are admitted under section 207(c) pursuant to a numerical limitation established under section 207(a) and aliens who are granted asylum under section 208.

"(c) WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF FAMILY CONNECTION IMMIGRANTS.—(1) The worldwide level of family connection immigrants under this subsection for a fiscal year is equal to—

"(A) 440,000, minus

"(B) the number computed under paragraph (2), plus

"(C) the number (if any) computed under paragraph (3).

"(2) The number computed under this paragraph for a fiscal year is the sum of the number of aliens described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(2) who were issued immigrant visas or otherwise acquired the status of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence in the previous fiscal year.

"(3) The number computed under this paragraph for a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 1992) is the difference (if any) between the maximum number of visas which may be issued under subsection (a)(2) (relating to independent immigrants) during the previous fiscal year and the number of visas issued under that subsection during that year.

"(d) WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF INDEPENDENT IMMIGRANTS.—(1) The worldwide level on independent immigrants under this subsection for a fiscal year is equal to—

"(A) 160,000, minus

"(B) for each of fiscal years 1991, 1992, and 1993, 20,000, plus

"(C) the number computed under paragraph (2).

"(2) The number computed under this paragraph for a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 1992) is the difference (if any) between the maximum number of visas which may be issued under subsection (a)(1) (relating to family connection immigrants) during the previous fiscal year and the number of visas issued under that subsection during that year.

"(e) REPORT ON, AND REVISION OF, WORLDWIDE LEVEL OF IMMIGRATION.—In January before the beginning of fiscal year 1994 (and before each succeeding fiscal year thereafter), the Attorney General and the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, shall prepare and transmit to the President and to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives a report discussing the effect of immigration on the United States. The report shall consider—

"(A) the requirements of citizens of the United States and of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence to be joined in the United States by immediate family members;

"(B) the impact of immigration on labor needs, employment, and other economic and domestic conditions in the United States;

"(C) the impact of immigration with respect to demographic and fertility rates and resources and environmental factors; and

"(D) the impact of immigration on the foreign policy and national security interests of the United States.

The report for fiscal year 1994 (and each third fiscal year thereafter) shall include a discussion, based upon such considerations, of the need (if any) to revise the number specified in subsection (c)(1)(A) or the number specified in subsection (d)(1)(A) for the 3-fiscal year period beginning with the first fiscal year following transmittal of the report. Beginning with fiscal year 1994, and every three fiscal years thereafter, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives shall hold hearings on the findings of the latest such report.".

(2) The item in the table of contents relating to section 201 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. Worldwide level of immigration.".

(b) PER COUNTRY IMMIGRATION LEVELS.—Section 202 (8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "(a) No person" and inserting "(a)(1) Except as specifically provided in paragraph (2) and in section 101(a)(27), 201(b)(2)(A)(i), and 203, no person",

(B) by striking ", except as specifically" and all that follows through "following fiscal year", and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the total number of immigrant visas made available to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area under subsection (c) of section 201 (relating to family connection immigrants) in any fiscal year may not exceed 7 percent (in the case of a single foreign state) or 2 percent (in the case of a dependent area) of the total number of such visas made available under such subsection in that fiscal year.

"(B) If for fiscal year 1991 or a succeeding fiscal year the number of aliens described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 201(b)(2) (relating to immediate relatives and similar individuals) who are natives of a particular foreign state or dependent area and who are issued immigrant visas or otherwise acquired the status of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence in the fiscal year exceeds the greater of—

"(i) the numerical level computed under subparagraph (A) for that state for that fiscal year, or

"(ii) the level of such immigration of natives of that foreign state in fiscal year 1989 or fiscal year 1990 (whichever is greater),

then the numerical level applicable to that foreign state or dependent area in the following fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall be reduced by the amount of such excess; except that such reduction shall not exceed one-half of the numerical level otherwise provided without regard to this subparagraph.

"(C) If, because of the application of subparagraph (A) with respect to one or more foreign states, the number of visas available under section 201(c) for a calendar quarter exceeds the number of qualified immigrants who otherwise may be issued such a visa, subparagraph (A) shall not apply to visas made available to such states or areas during the remainder of such calendar quarter.

"(3)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the total number of immigrant visas made available to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area under subsection (d) of section 201 (relating to independent immigrants) in any fiscal year may not exceed 7 percent (in the case of a single foreign state) or 2 percent (in the case of a dependent area) of the total number of such visas made available under such subsection in the fiscal year.

"(B) If, because of the application of subparagraph (A) with respect to one or more foreign states or dependent areas, the number of visas available under section 201(d) for a calendar quarter exceeds the number of qualified immigrants who otherwise may be issued such a visa, subparagraph (A) shall not apply to visas made available to such states or areas during the remainder of such calendar quarter.";

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section" each place it appears and inserting "a numerical level established under subsection (a)";

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "other than" and all that follows through "section 201(b)" and inserting "other than a special immigrant, as defined in section 101(a)(27), or an alien described in section 201(b)(2)(A)(i)", and

(B) by striking "section 202(a)" and all that follows through the end and inserting "subsection (a)(1), to the foreign state"; and

(4) Section 202(e) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Whenever the maximum number of visas have been made available under subsection (a)(2) to natives of any single foreign state or to any dependent area, then in the next following fiscal year a number of visas, not to exceed the number specified in subsection (a)(2) for a foreign state or a dependent area, as the case may be, shall be made available and allocated for such state or such area for the same classes of aliens described in, and the same percentages specified in, paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 203(a).".

SEC. 103. PREFERENCE SYSTEM FOR ADMISSION OF IMMIGRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 203 (8 U.S.C. 1153) is amended to read as follows:

"ALLOCATION OF IMMIGRANT VISAS

"SEC. 203. (a) PREFERENCE ALLOCATION FOR FAMILY CONNECTION IMMIGRANTS.—Aliens subject to the worldwide level specified in section 201(c) for family connection immigrants shall be allotted visas as follows:

"(1) UNMARRIED SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF CITIZENS.—Qualified immigrants who are the unmarried sons or daughters of citizens of the United States shall be allocated visas in a number not to exceed 6 percent of such worldwide level, plus any visas not required for the class specified in paragraph (4).

"(2) SPOUSES AND UNMARRIED SONS AND UNMARRIED DAUGHTERS OF PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS.—Qualified immigrants who are—

"(A) the spouses of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or

"(B) the unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if the sons or daughters—

"(i) are under 26 years of age, or

"(ii)(I) as of the date of the enactment of the Immigration Act of 1989, had a petition filed on their behalf for preference status under section 203(a)(2) (as in effect on such date) by reason of such relationship and such petition was subsequently approved, and

"(II) continue to qualify under the terms of this Act as in effect on the day before such date,

shall be allocated visas in a number not to exceed 69 percent of such worldwide level, plus any visas not required for the class specified in paragraph (1).

"(3) MARRIED SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF CITIZENS.—Qualified immigrants who are the married sons or married daughters of citizens of the United States shall be allocated visas in a number not to exceed 10 percent of such worldwide level, plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) and (2).

"(4) NEVER MARRIED BROTHERS AND SISTERS OF CITIZENS AND PREVIOUS FIFTH PREFERENCE.—Qualified immigrants— .

"(A) who are the never married brothers or sisters of citizens of the United States, if such citizens are at least 21 years of age, and

"(B) who—

"(i) as of the date of enactment of the Immigration Act of 1989 had a petition filed on their behalf for preference status by reason of the relationship described in paragraph (5) of section 203(a) of this Act as in effect on the day before such date and such petition was subsequently approved, and

"(ii) continue to qualify under the terms of this Act as in effect on the day before such date,

shall be allocated visas, in addition to visas otherwise allocated under section 201(a)(3), in a number not to exceed 20 percent of such worldwide level, plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (3). For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'never married', with respect to an individual, means an individual who has never been married or whose marriage was annulled or otherwise legally determined never to have had effect.

"(b) PREFERENCE ALLOCATION FOR INDEPENDENT IMMIGRANTS.—Aliens subject to the

worldwide level specified in section 201(d) for independent immigrants in a fiscal year shall be allocated visas as follows:

"(1) SPECIAL IMMIGRANTS.—Visas shall be made available, in a number not to exceed 3 percent of such worldwide level, to qualified special immigrants described in section 101(a)(27) (other than those described in subparagraph (A) or (B) thereof).

"(2) ALIENS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE PROFESSIONS OR ALIENS OF EXCEPTIONAL ABILITY.—(A) Visas shall be made available next, in a number not to exceed 33 percent of such worldwide level to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, education, or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are sought by an employer in the United States.

"(B) The Attorney General may, when he deems it to be in the national interest, waive the requirement of subparagraph (A) that an alien's services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business be sought by an employer in the United States.

"(C) In determining under subparagraph (A) whether an immigrant has exceptional ability, the possession of a degree, diploma, certificate, or similar award from a college, university, school, or other institution of learning or a license to practice or certification for a particular profession or occupation shall not by itself be considered sufficient evidence of such exceptional ability.

"(3) SKILLED WORKERS.—(A) Visas shall be made available next, in a number not to exceed 33 percent of such worldwide level, plus any visas not required for the class specified in paragraph (2), to the following two classes of aliens:

"(i) Qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least 2 years training or experience), not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

"(ii) Qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and who are members of the professions.

"(B) An immigrant visa may not be issued to an immigrant under subparagraph (A) until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(14).

"(4) EMPLOYMENT CREATION.—Visas shall be made available next, in a number not to exceed 2 percent of such worldwide level or 2,800, whichever is greater, to any qualified immigrant who is seeking to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in a new commercial enterprise which the alien has established and in which such alien has invested or, is actively in the process of investing, capital, in an amount not less than $1,000,000, and which will benefit the United States economy and create full-time employment for not fewer than 10 United States citizens or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence (other than the spouse, sons, or daughters of such immigrant). The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of State, may prescribe regulations increasing the dollar amount of the investment necessary for the issuance of a visa under this paragraph.

"(5) SELECTED IMMIGRANTS.—(A) Visas authorized in any fiscal year under section 201(d), less those required for issuance to the classes specified in paragraphs (1), (3), and (4), shall be made available to qualified immigrants who attain a score of not less than 50 points, based on the point assessment system described in subparagraph (B).

"(B) The point assessment system referred to in subparagraph (A) shall accord points based on criteria as follows:

"(i) AGE (10 POINTS).—For an alien who (as of the date of filing a petition) is—

"(I) at least 21 years of age but has not attained 36 years of age, 10 points; or

"(II) at least 36 years of age, but has not attained 45 years of age, 5 points.

"(ii) EDUCATION (25 POINTS).—For an alien who (as of the date of filing a petition)—

"(I) has completed successfully grade school through high school or its educational equivalent (as determined by the Secretary of Education), 10 points;

"(II) has been awarded a bachelors' degree or its equivalent (as determined by the Secretary of Education), 10 additional points; and

"(III) has been awarded a graduate degree, an additional number of points (up to 5 additional points) to be determined by the Secretary of Education based on the level of the degree.

"(iii) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ABILITY (20 POINTS).—For an alien who certifies, upon the date of filing a petition, subject to verification by examination after the date of selection, that he has an understanding of the English language and the ability to communicate in such language, 20 points.

"(iv) OCCUPATIONAL DEMAND (20 POINTS).—For an alien who is in an occupation for which the Secretary of Labor determines (before the fiscal year involved)—

"(I) there will be increased demand in the United States for individuals in the occupation in the fiscal year, 10 points, and

"(II) there is a present or there will be a future shortage of individuals in the United States to meet the need in the occupation in the United States in the fiscal year, 5 or 10 points.

"(v) OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING AND WORK EXPERIENCE (20 POINTS).—To the extent the alien has additional training, work experience, or both, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, in the occupation described in clause (iv), 10 or 20 points, such points multiplied by the number of points awarded under clause (iv) divided by 20.

"(C) The point assessment system described in subparagraph (B) shall be established by regulation by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Education.

"(c) TREATMENT OF FAMILY MEMBERS.—A spouse or child as defined in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of section 101(b)(1) shall, if not otherwise entitled to an immigrant status and the immediate issuance of a visa under subsection (a) or (b) (except for subsection (b)(5)) be entitled to the same status, and the same order of consideration provided in the respective subsection, if accompanying or following to join, his spouse or parent.

"(d) ORDER OF CONSIDERATION.—(1) Immigrant visas made available under subsection (a) or (b) (other than paragraph (5)) or under section 201(a)(3) shall be issued to eligible immigrants in the order in which a petition in behalf of each such immigrant is filed with the Attorney General (or in the case of special immigrants under section 101(a)(27)(D), with the Secretary of State) as provided in section 204(a).

"(2) Of the immigrant visa numbers made available under subsection (b)(5) (relating to selected immigrants) in a fiscal year—

"(A) 20 percent of such numbers shall be issued to eligible qualified immigrants who attain a score of at least 80 points on the assessment system described in subsection (b)(5)(B) with respect to petitions filed for the fiscal year involved, to be chosen in the random order described in clause (B); and

"(B) 80 percent of such numbers shall be issued to eligible qualified immigrants with a qualifying score on such system strictly in a random order established by the Secretary of State for the fiscal year involved.

"(3) Waiting lists of applicants for visas under this section shall be maintained in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State.

"(e) PRESUMPTION.—Every immigrant shall be presumed not to be described in subsection (a) or (b) of this section, section 101(a)(27), or section 201(b)(2), until the immigrant establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer and the immigration officer that the immigrant is so described. In the case of any alien claiming in his application for an immigrant visa to be described in section 201(b)(1) or in subsection (a) or (b) of this subsection, the consular officer shall not grant such status until he has been authorized to do so as provided by section 204.

"(f) LISTS.—For purposes of carrying out his responsibilities in the orderly administration of this section, the Secretary of State may make reasonable estimates of the anticipated numbers of visas to be issued during any quarter of any fiscal year within each of the categories under subsections (a) and (b), and to rely upon such estimates in authorizing the issuance of visas. The Secretary of State shall terminate the registration of any alien who fails to apply for an immigrant visa within one year following notification to him of the availability of such visa, but the Secretary shall reinstate the registration of any such alien who establishes within 2 years following the date of notification of the availability of such visa that such failure to apply was due to circumstances beyond his control.".

(2) Nothing in this subsection may be construed as continuing the availability of visas under section 203(a)(7), as in effect before the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CHANGES IN PETITIONING PROCEDURE.—Section 204(a) (8 U.S.C. 1154(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3), and

(2) by striking "(a)(1)" and all that follows through the end of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

"(a)(1)(A) Any citizen of the United States claiming that an alien is entitled to classification by reason of a relationship described in paragraph (1), (3), or (4) of section 203(a) or to an immediate relative status under section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification.

"(B) Any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that an alien is entitled to a classification by reason of the relationship described in section 203(a)(2) may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification. An alien may be classified as an alien described in paragraphs (2), (3), or (4) of section 203(a) with respect to a specific fiscal year on the basis of a petition filed in a previous fiscal year only if the alien has filed with the Attorney General a notice of continuing intent to be admitted to the United States as an immi-

grant under such section within the 2 fiscal years immediately previous to the specific fiscal year involved.

"(C)(i) Any alien (other than a special immigrant under section 101(a)(27)(D)) desiring to be classified under section 203(b)(1) (or any person on behalf of such an alien) (relating to special immigrants) may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification.

"(ii) Aliens claiming status as a special immigrant under section 101(a)(27)(D) may file a petition only with the Secretary of State and only after notification by the Secretary that such status has been recommended and approved pursuant to such section.

"(D) Any alien desiring to be classified under section 203(b)(2) (or any person on behalf of such an alien) (relating to professionals) may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification.

"(E) Any person desiring and intending to employ within the United States an alien entitled to classification under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 203(b) (relating to professionals and skilled workers) may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification.

"(F) Any alien desiring to be classified under section 203(b)(4) (relating to employment creation) may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification.

"(G)(i) Any alien desiring to be provided an immigrant visa under section 203(b)(5) (relating to selected immigrants) may file a petition at the place and time determined by the Secretary of State by regulation. While the place of filing may be designated inside the United States, the petitioner shall be physically outside the United States when submitting the petition. Only one such petition may be filed by an alien with respect to any petitioning period established. If more than one petition is submitted all such petitions submitted for such period by the alien shall be voided.

"(ii)(I) The Secretary of State may designate a period for the filing of petitions with respect to visas which may be issued under section 203(b)(5) during either of the next two fiscal years beginning after the close of such period.

"(II) Aliens who qualify, through random selection, for a visa under section 203(b)(5) shall remain eligible to receive such visa only through the end of the specific fiscal year for which they were selected.

"(III) The Secretary of State shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this clause.

"(iii) A petition or registration under this subparagraph shall be in such form as the Secretary of State may by regulation prescribe and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Secretary of State may require.

"(iv) The petition under this subparagraph shall include a certification in writing at the time of filing a petition that all information contained within the petition is true and correct to the best of the petitioner's knowledge, and any willful misrepresentation of the facts or statements included in the petition shall be deemed a violation of section 212(a)(19).

"(2) On or after October 1, 1990, an alien who—

"(A) previous to being admitted as, or otherwise provided the status of, an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence was married to an individual, and

"(B) is so admitted, or provided such status, as a child or as the unmarried son or unmarried daughter of a citizen of the United States or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence,

may not file a petition under this section on behalf of any alien to whom the alien was married previous to being so admitted or provided such status.".

(c) REVISION OF LABOR CERTIFICATION.—(1) Paragraph (14) of section 212(a) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(14) Aliens seeking to enter the United States to perform skilled labor unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General that (A) there are not sufficient qualified workers (or equally qualified workers in the case of aliens who are members of the teaching profession or who have exceptional ability in the sciences or arts) available in the United States in the positions in which the aliens will be employed; and (B) the employment of aliens in such positions will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States. The Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion, substitute for the determination and certification described in clause (A) of the preceding sentence a determination and certification that there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified (or equally qualified in the case of aliens who are members of the teaching profession or who have exceptional ability in the sciences or the arts), and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform such skilled labor. In making either determination under this paragraph, the Secretary of Labor may use labor market information without regard to the specific job opportunity for which certification is requested, but if such determination is adverse, the Secretary of Labor shall make a certification with regard to the specific job opportunity if the employer submits evidence that such specific certification would result in a different determination. An alien on behalf of whom a certification is sought must have an offer of employment from an employer in the United States. The exclusion of aliens under this paragraph shall only apply to immigrants seeking admission under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 203(b), except that this paragraph shall not apply to any alien for whom a waiver has been made under section 203(b)(2)(B);".

(2) The Secretary of Labor shall conduct a comprehensive study to determine whether the process of obtaining an immigrant labor certification under section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by this title, has been simplified or otherwise expedited. In conducting this study, the Secretary shall hold public hearings. Not later than March 31, 1993, the Secretary of Labor shall prepare and transmit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report containing the findings of such study and including any recommendations of other relevant agencies of the Federal Government with respect to such findings.

SEC. 104. DETERRING IMMIGRATION-RELATED ENTREPRENEURSHIP FRAUD.

(a) CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS BASED ON ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISES.—Chapter 2 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR CERTAIN ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS, SPOUSES, AND CHILDREN

"SEC. 218. (a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR STATUS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, an alien entrepreneur (as defined in subsection (f)(1)), spouse, and child (as defined in subsection (f)(2)) shall be considered, at the time of obtaining the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, to have obtained such status on a conditional basis subject to the provisions of this section.

"(2) NOTICE OF REQUIREMENTS.—

"(A) AT TIME OF OBTAINING PERMANENT RESIDENCE.—At the time an alien entrepreneur, spouse, or child obtains permanent resident status on a conditional basis under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall provide for notice to such an entrepreneur, spouse, or child respecting the provisions of this section and the requirements of subsection (c)(1) to have the conditional basis of such status removed.

"(B) AT TIME OF REQUIRED PETITION.—In addition, the Attorney General shall attempt to provide notice to such an entrepreneur, spouse, or child, at or about the beginning of the 90-day period described in subsection (d)(2)(A), of the requirements of subsection (c)(1).

"(C) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE.—The failure of the Attorney General to provide a notice under this paragraph shall not affect the enforcement of the provisions of this section with respect to such an entrepreneur, spouse, or child.

"(b) TERMINATION OF STATUS IF FINDING THAT QUALIFYING ENTREPRENEURSHIP IMPROPER.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an alien with permanent resident status on a conditional basis under subsection (a), if the Attorney General determines, before the second anniversary of the alien's obtaining the status of lawful admission for permanent residence, that—

"(A) the establishment of the commercial enterprise was intended solely as a means of evading the immigration laws of the United States, or

"(B)(i) a commercial enterprise was not established by the alien;

"(ii) the alien did not invest or was not actively in the process of investing the requisite capital; or

"(iii) the alien was not sustaining the actions described in clause (A) or (B) throughout the period of the alien's residence in the United States,

then the Attorney General shall so notify the alien involved and, subject to paragraph (2), shall terminate the permanent resident status of the alien involved as of the date of the determination.

"(2) HEARING IN DEPORTATION PROCEEDING.—Any alien whose permanent resident status is terminated under paragraph (1) may request a review of such determination in a proceeding to deport the alien. In such proceeding, the burden of proof shall be on the Attorney General to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that a condition described in paragraph (1) is met.

"(c) REQUIREMENTS OF TIMELY PETITION AND INTERVIEW FOR REMOVAL OF CONDITION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In order for the conditional basis established under subsection (a) for an alien entrepreneur, spouse, or child to be removed—

"(A) the alien entrepreneur must submit to the Attorney General, during the period described in subsection (d)(2), a petition which requests the removal of such conditional basis and which states, under penalty of perjury, the facts and information described in subsection (d)(1), and

"(B) in accordance with subsection (d)(3), the alien entrepreneur must appear for a personal interview before an officer or employee of the Service respecting the facts and information described in subsection (d)(1).

"(2) TERMINATION OF PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR FAILURE TO FILE PETITION OR HAVE PERSONAL INTERVIEW.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an alien with permanent resident status on a conditional basis under subsection (a), if—

"(i) no petition is filed with respect to the alien in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1)(A), or

"(ii) unless there is good cause shown, the alien entrepreneur fails to appear at the interview described in paragraph (1)(B),

the Attorney General shall terminate the permanent resident status of the alien as of the second anniversary of the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence.

"(B) HEARING IN DEPORTATION PROCEEDING.—In any deportation proceeding with respect to an alien whose permanent resident status is terminated under subparagraph (A), the burden of proof shall be on the alien to establish compliance with the conditions of paragraphs (1)(A) and (1)(B).

"(3) DETERMINATION AFTER PETITION AND INTERVIEW.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If—

"(i) a petition is filed in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1)(A), and

"(ii) the alien entrepreneur appears at the interview described in paragraph (1)(B),

the Attorney General shall make a determination, within 90 days of the date of the interview, as to whether the facts and information described in subsection (d)(1) and alleged in the petition are true with respect to the qualifying commercial enterprise.

"(B) REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS IF FAVORABLE DETERMINATION.—If the Attorney General determines that such facts and information are true, the Attorney General shall so notify the alien involved and shall remove the conditional basis of the alien's status effective as of the second anniversary of the alien's obtaining the status of lawful admission for permanent residence.

"(C) TERMINATION IF ADVERSE DETERMINATION.—If the Attorney General determines that such facts and information are not true, the Attorney General shall so notify the alien involved and, subject to subparagraph (D), shall terminate the permanent resident status of an alien entrepreneur, spouse, or child as of the date of the determination.

"(D) HEARING IN DEPORTATION PROCEEDING.—Any alien whose permanent resident status is terminated under subparagraph (C) may request a review of such determination in a proceeding to deport the alien. In such proceeding, the burden of proof shall be on the Attorney General to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the facts and information described in subsection (d)(1) and alleged in the petition are not true with respect to the qualifying commercial enterprise.

"(d) DETAILS OF PETITION AND INTERVIEW.—

"(1) CONTENTS OF PETITION.—Each petition under subsection (c)(1)(A) shall contain facts and information demonstrating that—

"(A) a commercial enterprise was established by the alien;

"(B) the alien invested or was actively in the process of investing the requisite capital; and

"(C) the alien sustained the actions described in clauses (A) and (B) throughout the period of the alien's residence in the United States.

"(2) PERIOD FOR FILING PETITION.—

"(A) 90-DAY PERIOD BEFORE SECOND ANNIVERSARY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the petition under subsection (c)(1)(A) must be filed during the 90-day period before the second anniversary of the alien's obtaining the status of lawful admission for permanent residence.

"(B) DATE PETITIONS FOR GOOD CAUSE.—Such a petition may be considered if filed after such date, but only if the alien establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General good cause and extenuating circumstances for failure to file the petition during the period described in subparagraph (A).

"(C) FILING OF PETITIONS DURING DEPORTATION.—In the case of an alien who is the subject of deportation hearings as a result of failure to file a petition on a timely basis in accordance with subparagraph (A), the Attorney General may stay such deportation proceedings against an alien pending the filing of the petition under subparagraph (B).

"(3) PERSONAL INTERVIEW.—The interview under subsection (c)(1)(B) shall be conducted within 90 days after the date of submitting a petition under subsection (c)(1)(A) and at a local office of the Service, designated by the Attorney General, which is convenient to the parties involved. The Attorney General, in the Attorney General's discretion, may waive the deadline for such an interview or the requirement for such an interview in such cases as may be appropriate.

"(e) TREATMENT OF PERIOD FOR PURPOSES OF NATURALIZATION.—For purposes of title III, in the case of an alien who is in the United States as a lawful permanent resident on a conditional basis under this section, the alien shall be considered to have been admitted as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence and to be in the United States as an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) The term 'alien entrepreneur' means an alien who obtains the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence (whether on a conditional basis or otherwise) under section 203(b)(4).

"(2) The term 'spouse' and the term 'child' mean an alien who obtains the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence (whether on a conditional basis or otherwise) by virtue of being the spouse or child, respectively, of an alien entrepreneur.".

(b) ADDITIONAL GROUND FOR DEPORTATION.—Section 241(a)(9) (8 U.S.C. 1251(a)(9)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", or (C) is an alien with permanent resident status on a conditional basis under section 218 and has such status terminated under such section".

(c) CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR IMMIGRATION-RELATED ENTREPRENEURSHIP FRAUD.—Section 275 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1325) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Any individual who knowingly establishes a commercial enterprise for the purpose of evading any provision of the immigration laws shall be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or fined not more than $250,000, or both.".

(d) LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—Section 245 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) The Attorney General may not adjust, under subsection (a), the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on a conditional basis under section 218.".

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 217 the following new item:

"Sec. 218. Conditional permanent resident status for certain alien entrepreneurs, spouses, and children.".

SEC. 105. MISCELLANEOUS CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL CHANGES.

(a) Sections 101(b)(1)(F), 202(a), 202(c), 204(b), 204(e), 216(g)(1)(A), 222(a), 244(d), 245(c)(2), and 245(c)(5) (8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(1)(F), 1152(a), 1152(c), 1154(a)(1), 1154(b), 1154(e), 1186a(g)(1)(A), 1202(a), 1254(d), 1255(c)(2), 1255(c)(5)) are each amended by striking "201(b)" each place it appears and inserting "201(b)(2)(A)(i)".

(b) Section 204 (8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking "section 203(a) (3) or (6)" and inserting "section 203(b)(3)",

(B) by striking "section 201(b)" and inserting "section 201(b)(2)(A)(i)",

(C) by striking "a preference status under section 203(a)" and inserting "preference under subsection (a) or (b) of section 203",

(D) by inserting "(and, in the case described in section 203(b)(5), specify the point score on the assessment system)" after "approve the petition", and

(E) by striking "The Secretary of State" and inserting "Subject to section 203(b)(5), the Secretary of State";

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking "preference immigrant under section 203(a)" and inserting "immigrant under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 203", and

(B) by striking "section 201(b)" and inserting "section 201(f)";

(3) by striking subsection (f);

(4) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as (f) and (g), respectively;

(5) in subsection (f)(1), as redesignated by paragraph (4), by inserting "(as in effect before the date of the enactment of the Immigration Act of 1989)" after "203(a)(4)"; and

(6) in subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (4), by striking "preference status" and inserting "status under section 203(a)(2)".

(c) Section 212(a)(32) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(32)) is amended by striking "203(a)(3) and (6) and to nonpreference immigrant aliens described in section 203(a)(7)" and inserting "203(b)(2), (3), and (5)".

(d) Section 244(d) (8 U.S.C. 1254(d)) is amended by striking "201(a) or 202(a)" and inserting "201(c) or 202(a)(2)(A)".

(e) Section 245 (8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking "203(a)" and inserting "203", and

(2) in subsection (c), by redesignating clause (5) as clause (4) and by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", or (5) an alien who is applying for adjust-

ment of status to preference status under section 203(b)(5)".

(f)(1) Section 3304(a)(14)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "section 203(a)(7) or".

(2) Section 1614(a)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking "section 203(a)(7) or".

(g) Section 2(c)(4) of the Virgin Islands Nonimmigrant Alien Adjustment Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-271) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "(as in effect before October 1, 1990) or by reason of the relationship described in section 203(a)(2)(B), 203(a)(3), or 201(b)(2)(A)(i), respectively, of such Act (as in effect on or after such date)".

SEC. 106. USER FEES.

Section 286 (8 U.S.C. 1356) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(m) VISA FEES FOR IMMIGRANTS.—The Secretary of State shall provide for a schedule of fees to be charged for the filing of a petition for any and all immigrant categories under sections 201(a)(3), 201(b)(2)(A)(i), and 203 (a) and (b). The fees established under this subsection shall be sufficient to cover administrative and other expenses incurred in connection with the processing of petitions for any and all immigrant categories filed under sections 201(a)(3), 201(b)(2)(A)(i), and 203 (a) and (b).

"(n) CREDITABLE FEES.—Notwithstanding sections 1 and 2 of the Act of June 4, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 750; 22 U.S.C. 214) or any other provision of law, up to $20,000,000 in fees collected by consular officers for issuance of visas and for execution of applications for visas shall be credited to a Department of State account which shall be available only for the payment of the expenses of research, development, equipment, and automation of visa and passport functions, including related software. Each fiscal year thereafter additional amounts of such consular fees may be credited to such account, except that not more than $20,000,000 of such fees may be available for such purposes in any one fiscal year.".

SEC. 107. REPORT ON CUBAN ENTRY INTO UNITED STATES.

(a) Congress recognizes that resumption of the 1984 Mariel Agreement between the United States and Cuba will have a disproportionate impact on particular regions of the United States, notably south Florida. In anticipation of this impact and the increase in demand for certain services, Congress directs the Attorney General, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, to prepare and transmit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report detailing the number of Cubans granted preference visas.

(b) STUDY AND REPORT.—The Attorney General and the Secretary of State shall—

(1) prepare and transmit a detailed projection of the number of Cubans who have applied or have been granted preference immigration visas for entry into the United States; and

(2) such information including the age, occupation, number of dependents, and special medical needs of those Cubans who have applied or have been granted preference immigration visas for entry into the United States.

(c)(1) REPORT DATE.—The Attorney General, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, shall submit the report—

(A) during the first quarter of the fiscal year following enactment of this Act; and

(B) thereafter on a quarterly basis.

(2) In preparing these quarterly reports, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State shall cooperate and consult with State and local officials. Such cooperation should include—

(A) adequate notice as to the number of Cubans who have applied or have been granted preference immigration visas; and

(B) the relevant information required in the quarterly reports which would permit State and local entities to prepare for the increased demand for certain services.

SEC. 108. EFFECTIVE DATES AND TRANSITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 1990, and shall apply to immigrant visa numbers issued for fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1991; except that the amendments made by section 3(b) (relating to immigrant visa petitioning process) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply to immigrant visa numbers issued for fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1991.

(b) GENERAL TRANSITION.—In the case of a petition filed under section 204(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act before October 1, 1990, for preference status under section 203(a)(3) or section 203(a)(6) of such Act (as in effect before such date), such petition shall be deemed as of October 1, 1990, to be a petition for the status described in section 203(b)(2) or 203(b)(3) of such Act (as amended by this title), as elected by the petitioner, and the priority date for such petition shall remain in effect, except that petitions filed before such date for preference status on the basis of unskilled labor under section 203(a)(6) of such Act (as in effect before such date) shall be deemed as of such date to be petitions for the status described in section 203(b)(3) of such Act (as amended by this title).

(c) ADMISSIBILITY STANDARDS.—When an immigrant, in possession of an unexpired immigrant visa issued before October 1, 1990, makes application for admission, the immigrant's admissibility under paragraphs (20) and (21) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be determined under the provisions of law in effect on the date of the issuance of such visa.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed as affecting the provisions of section 19 of Public Law 97-116, section 2(c)(1) of Public Law 97-271, or section 202(e) of Public Law 99-603.

TITLE II—STATUS OF STUDENTS FROM THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989".

SEC. 202. ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIONALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after section 245A the following new section:

"ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIONALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

"SEC. 245B. (a) WAIVER OF FOREIGN RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT FOR "J" NONIMMIGRANTS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, persons who are nationals of the People's Republic of China may apply for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence or for a change to another nonmmigrant status if such national—

"(1) was admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(J) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(J)), and

"(2) has been continuously resident in the United States since June 5, 1989.

"(b) PRESUMPTION OF CONTINUOUS RESIDENCE FOR CERTAIN PRC NATIONALS.—(1) For purposes of adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) and change of status under section 248 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1228), in the case of any alien who is a national of the People's Republic of China and is present in the United States under section 101(a)(15)(F), (J), and (M), as well as their immediate family.

"(1) who, as of June 5, 1989, was present in the United States in the lawful status of a nonimmigrant, or

"(2) who was present in the United States before June 5, 1989, but who, as of that date was not present in the United States because of a brief, casual, and innocent trip abroad, such an alien shall be considered as having continued to maintain lawful status as such a nonimmigrant (and to have maintained continuously a lawful status) for the period described in subsection (e).

"(c) AUTHORIZATION OF TRAVEL ABROAD.—The Attorney General shall, in accordance with existing regulations, permit an alien described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) to return to the United States after such brief and casual trips abroad as reflect an intention on the part of the alien to continue residence in the United States.

"(d) EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION.—Any national of the People's Republic of China who applies for adjustment of status or change of nonimmigrant status under the terms of this section shall be granted authorization to engage in employment in the United States and shall be provided with an employment authorization document or other appropriate work permit.

"(e) DURATION OF STATUS.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), nationals of the People's Republic of China described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) shall have their departure from the United States deferred until June 5, 1992 or until there has been an adjustment or change of status under subsection (a) or (b).

"(2) On or after June 5, 1990, the Attorney General may terminate the status accorded under this subsection 60 days following the date that the President determines and so certifies to the Congress that conditions in the People's Republic of China permit such aliens to return to that country in safety."

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a nomination hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Wednesday, July 12 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to consider the Department of the Interior nominations of Martin Allday, Solicitor; Lou Gallegos, Assistant Secretary for Policy, Budget and Administration; Stella Guerra, Assistant Secretary for Territorial and International Affairs;

and Constance Harriman, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

For further information, please contact Nancy Blush at (202) 224-3606.

Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a nomination hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Tuesday, July 18 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to consider the nominations of Department of Energy nominees: Steven Wakefield to be general counsel; Jacqueline Brown to be Assistant Secretary, Congressional, Intergovernmental and Public Affairs; John Easton to be Assistant Secretary, International Affairs and Energy Emergencies; and Michael Davis to be Assistant Secretary, Conservation and Renewable Energy.

For further information, please contact Nancy Blush at (202) 224-3606.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that the Senate Special Committee on Aging has scheduled a hearing to discuss rising prescription drug prices and the impact of this phenomenon on the elderly.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, July 18, 1989, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

For further information, please contact Portia Mittelman, staff director at (202) 224-5364.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, NATIONAL PARKS AND FORESTS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that two hearings have been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The first hearing will begin at 1 p.m. on July 27. The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on two measures currently pending before the subcommittee. The measures are:

S. 286, a bill to establish the Petroglyph National Monument in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; and

S. 798, to amend title V of the Act of December 19, 1980, designating the Chaco culture archaeological protection sites, and for other purposes.

The second hearing will begin at 2 p.m. on August 1. The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 974, a bill to designate certain lands in the State of Nevada as wilderness, and for other purposes.

Both hearings will be held in room SD-364 of the Senate Dirksen Office Buildings in Washington, DC. Because of the limited time available for each hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, anyone wishing to submit written testimony to be included in the hearing record is welcome to do so. Those wishing to submit written testimony should send two copies to the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests, SD-364, Washington, DC 20510.

For further information regarding the the July 27 hearing, please contact David Brooks at (202) 224-9863, or for the August 1 hearing, contact Beth Norcross of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224-7933.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 1989, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on proposals to address duplicate coverage under the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Program and to consider making the program voluntary as originally approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 1989, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on the Federal Government's collection of information on foreign direct investment in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES AND NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Tuesday, July 11, 1989, at 2 p.m. in executive session to mark up strategic forces and nuclear deterrence programs of S. 1085, the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal years 1990-91.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROJECTION FORCES AND REGIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Projection Forces and Regional Defense of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Tuesday, July 11, 1989, at 10:30 a.m. in executive session to mark up projection forces and regional defense programs of S. 1085, the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal years 1990-91.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONVENTIONAL FORCES AND ALLIANCE DEFENSE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcomittee on Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Tuesday, July 11, 1989, at 8:30 a.m. in executive session to mark up conventional forces and alliance defense programs of S. 1085, the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal years 1990-91.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate July 11, 2:30 p.m. to receive testimony on the Department of Energy's recent activities in the area of fossil energy research and development and the clean coal technology program; the Department of Energy's fiscal 1990 budget request for the fossil energy program; and relevant provisions in S. 964, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian energy programs for fiscal years 1990 and 1991.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate Tuesday, July 11, 1989, at 10 a.m. to conduct an oversight hearing on the defense Production Act and competitiveness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate July 11, 9:30 a.m. to receive testimony from the administration on S. 710, S. 711, and S. 712, legislation to provide for a referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MELFORD O. CLEVELAND ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of pride that I rise today to pay tribute to a man who has recently been elected to the prestigious position of president of the National Association of Administrative Law Judges—Melford O. Cleveland. This position is the most recent honor in a career that is highlighted by numerous outstanding contributions to the legal profession.

Mr. President, Judge Cleveland made his mark early in his studies at the University of Alabama School of Law where he served as editor-in-chief of the Alabama Law Review and graduated first in the class of 1949. On the heels of this triumph, Melford was off to Yale Law School, the recipient of a prestigious Sterling fellowship.

Completing his academic training, Melford began his legal career in the Office of Legal Advisor, U.S. Department of State in 1951. At various points in his career Melford Cleveland served as a law clerk to Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black, 1952; trial attorney at the U.S. Department of Justice under Warren E. Burger, 1954; and most recently as an administrative law judge, since 1970. Judge Cleveland's career has been marked by commitment to the law and service to his community and peers.

On a more personal note, Judge Cleveland lives on a farm in Shelby County, AL, that has been in his family since 1907. Judge Cleveland shares this farm with his own family, his mother, Frances Cleveland, and his aunts, Carrie T. Head and Sarah J. Head. Judge Cleveland's wife, Belle Stoddard Cleveland shares his passion for the law and works as a staff attorney for Alabama Supreme Court Justice Janie L. Shores. Judge Cleveland's daughter Sarah will conclude her studies as a Rhodes scholar at Oxford in July and plans to follow in her father's footsteps at Yale Law School. Grover Cleveland, the judge's son, is also pursuing the law, as he prepares to enter the St. Louis University Law School in August. Finally, daughter Belle recently received the Dick scholarship at the College of Charleston. This scholarship is awarded to qualified junior history majors who are planning to pursue careers in law.

Mr. President, Judge Melford Cleveland's dedication and commitment to the law are as apparent in his many career accomplishments as they are in the lives and pursuits of his family. His work has made Alabama a better place to live and I am proud to serve as his representative in Washington.●

LAWYERS VOLUNTEERING IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in my capacity as a U.S. Senator and as a fellow member of the Washington State Bar, I would like to extend my sincere thanks and congratulations to Joe Pemberton of Bellingham, who has been awarded the American Bar Association's Pro Bono Publico Award for his commitment to volunteer legal service.

Joe Pemberton created the Whatcom County Volunteer Lawyer Program, which provides representation of the legal rights of the poor and disadvantaged in his community. Remarkably, this program now has the participation of 60 percent of the Whatcom County Bar Association. The volunteer tradition of the legal profession is one of the highest callings to public service for a lawyer. I am happy to acknowledge Joe Pemberton, who exemplifies true public service and encourages all attorneys to meet their volunteer obligations. I know he will continue his model of excellence and service to the legal profession and the community.●

RETIREMENT OF LT. COL. ROBERT "BO" BLUDWORTH, USA

● Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment today to recognize the military service of Lt. Col. Robert S. "Bo" Bludworth. After 22 years of service, Lieutenant Colonel Bludworth recently retired from the U.S. Army.

Like almost all the Members of the Senate, I often had the chance to work with Bo during his 5-year assignment as an Army Senate liaison officer. Bo was totally involved in the activities of his office from planning and coordinating trips to providing Senate offices with timely information about the many aspects of the Army.

Before his last assignment as a liaison officer to the Senate, Bo held a wide variety of key assignments in the Army. This service included a tour of duty in Vietnam as a helicopter and ground platoon leader; command of armor units and personnel staff positions in the United States and Germany; an assignment as a division training officer and chief of protocol in Hawaii; and a military science teaching position at the University of West Florida.

In recognition of his achievements during his Army career, Bo has received several awards and decorations. These include the Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross (two awards), Bronze Star, Air Medal, Army Commendation Medal for Valor, and the Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Mr. President, on the occasion of Lieutenant Colonel Bludworth's retirement from the U.S. Army, I would like to thank him for the tremendous service that he provided to me, my staff, and the Senate as a whole. Most of all, I thank Bo for the dedicated and effective service that he performed for our Nation as an officer of the U.S. Army. Our country is fortunate to have leaders like Lieutenant Colonel Bludworth.

I wish Bo and his family all the best as he begins a new career in the private sector.●

THE MOST GENEROUS OPTION

● Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, adoption is the most generous option for a pregnant woman who feels she cannot parent her child. It is generous because the birth mother sacrifices. She carries the child for 9 months and then parts with him, not an easy thing. But in return for this magnanimity the child gets life and a loving adoptive family. The adoptive parents get a child to love. These are good and kind results.

The birth mother's selflessness, like all acts of love, ultimately is generous to her as well since the memory of this kindness and the life it preserves is superior to the pall of surgical violation and death, and sometimes better than struggling by herself to raise the child. The Battelle Human Affairs Research Center has recently completed a study that compares outcomes for birth mothers who choose adoption versus birth mothers who choose parenting. The former are as well adjusted and no more troubled by their choice than are the latter. But the birth mothers who chose adoption are more likely to delay a subsequent pregnancy, to marry later, to finish vocational training, and to become better off financially.

I commend Senators to a piece on adoption by Phyllis Schlafly which appeared in the Washington Times on June 6.

Mrs. Schlafly notes that there are millions of childless couples in America who often cannot have children without adoption. These families are a national resource that is now virtually unused. Women contemplating an unwanted pregnancy should know about these families, know what a child would mean to them, and know what they can give a child.

Mrs. Schlafly's agenda for promoting adoption is a good one. She correctly stresses accurate information, help with adoption costs, and rationality and integrity in the adoption process. There are a number of measures before Congress that address this agenda. S. 23 includes adoption referral services in title 10 family planning programs. S. 278 continues a program to reimburse members of the armed services for adoption expenses. S. 277 extends this benefit to all Federal employees. S. 279 provides a tax exclu-

sion for employer-provided adoption benefits. S. 479, sponsored by Senator HATCH, and H.R. 1205, sponsored by Representative LEHMAN, allow a tax deduction for adoption expenses. S. 1192, sponsored by Senator BENTSEN, gives adopted children the same Social Security benefits that natural children receive. The Senate should pass these bills.

The article also touches on two problems that should be rectified. Mrs. Schlafly correctly notes that confusion over the biological fathers' rights has needlessly complicated adoption. This confusion has too often caused unconscionable delays in completing adoptions, and on several occasions, has caused tragic disruptions in adoptions that were thought to be finalized. State legislatures and the courts should clarify these rights and the procedures for meeting them. New York's "putative father registry" is a good idea. In New York, a biological father can register with the State his desire to be party to a decision concerning the adoption of his child. If the father decides not to register, the adoption can proceed unencumbered.

Mrs. Schlafly ends with a problem that has just been graphically illustrated by the search for and public disclosure of "Jane Roe's" birth child. Jane Doe, as everyone knows, is the "Roe" in Roe versus Wade. The fact that Texas would not allow her to abort her child was the object of the case. Thanks to the Texas law that this case overturned, the child was carried to term and subsequently adopted by a couple. Recently because of the notoriety of the Webster case, the National Enquirer decided it would provide good copy to violate this confidential adoption by tracking down the child and her adoptive parents so that the public could ogle them. The paper paid a professional searcher to do the deed. The searcher succeeded, and by all accounts, the child, who is now a teenager, was upset by this wanton invasion of her privacy.

Mrs. Schlafly insists that the confidentiality of traditional adoptions be respected. She is absolutely right about this. Open adoptions are an option in which all the parties are known to each other. However, when the adult parties to an adoption agree to remain anonymous to each other, and agree that the adoption records be sealed, these agreements should be upheld, unless all the parties subsequently agree to forgo confidentiality, or the grown child and birth parents accede to contact.

Certainly, no third party investigator for hire should be allowed to violate the adoption agreement by hunting the birth parents, the adoptive parents or the child; nor should the officials of the agencies entrusted with the records be allowed with impunity to disclose confidential information. There should be stiff penalties for such privateering.

We must be mindful that the primary purpose of adoption is provide a child with a permanent, loving family. The adoptive family is the child's family in every sense. Anything that compromises that debases adoption and harms the child.

Mr. President, Mrs. Schlafly's article is both thoughtful and timely. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE MOST GENEROUS OPTION

Now that the Supreme Court has tossed the abortion issue back to the legislatures, it's time to promote the adoption option. This will enable us to demonstrate that what is often called an "unwanted child" can be really twice loved.

Texas Monthly, a magazine without any particular editorial bias, recently assigned an investigative reporter to write a factual article on what goes on inside and outside of a Dallas abortion clinic. Nestled among other articles on Texas desserts, Indians in Chihuahua, and modern music, I discovered a factual article on the daily routine in this clinic.

"As patients rest in recovery," the reporter wrote, "counselors push the wheeled aspirators into a small pathology lab. There the contents of each abortion are dumped into a collander and the excess blood rinsed away in a sink. The remains are placed in a dish on a light table; it's a technician's job to be sure the doctor emptied the uterus entirely."

How does the technician do it? "Poking at the bloody mass on the disk with gloved hands, the technician searches for a cord and sac; in a pregnancy over nine weeks, she checks for the presence of two feet and two hands. When she finds them, she holds the tiny fetal parts against a ruler to be sure that their size jibes with sonogram measurements estimating the age of the pregnancy. That work done, the remains are disposed of as medical waste."

What kind of a person could do this job, over and over again, day after day, week after week? There must be a better way to deal with the problem of unwanted pregnancies than by assigning technicians to dispose of dozens of tiny feet and hands as "medical waste."

When George Bush talked about adoption during his presidential campaign last year in response to a question about abortion, I first thought he was straying to the periphery of the issue. It was only when I saw the NBC docu-drama this spring on the Roe vs. Wade case that I realized that the pro-abortion lobby is passionately anti-adoption.

"Jane Roe," the woman who started the case by challenging the Texas law against abortion, did in fact give up her baby for adoption (since the case could not be decided within nine months). The NBC script, however, had Jane Roe and her lawyer make a vicious attack on adoption as something worse than abortion.

In fact, the adoption option is the kindest, most loving, most humane option. It gives the baby the chance to be twice loved in a home where a child is wanted more than anything else in the world.

Yet adoption is the least chosen option when a woman has an unwanted pregnancy (which is definitely not the same thing as an unwanted child). Only about 3 percent of women who give birth out of wedlock give up their babies for adoption.

Ninety-five percent choose to keep their babies, even though this clearly means the baby will be disadvantaged by being raised without a father, and even though the mother often doesn't have a job or other means of support and will fall back on welfare for daily necessities.

Meanwhile, there are 2 million childless couples on agency waiting lists or at fertility clinics who want to adopt the 50,000 babies who become available for adoption—40 couples competing for every adoption. This is a conservative estimate, because thousands of couples have given up or use private or foreign sources, and the number of infertile couples is rising because of social or medical reasons.

Many steps need to be taken to assure that adoption is a viable alternative, both psychologically and financially. We should make sure that so-called "non-directive" counseling of pregnant women is no longer just abortion referral, but includes complete and fair information that adoption is an honorable alternative which will enable them to give their babies the gift of life in a home with two parents who love that child very much.

We should rectify the present ridiculous situation that an unwed pregnant woman can abort her baby without the father's consent but not give the baby for adoption without his consent. We should terminate the rules that allow biological fathers to tie up adoption proceedings for years.

Adoptive parents should have the same tax status for adoptions that parents now have for natural births. Adoptive parents should be allowed tax deductibility for all adoption expenses including the birthmother's medical bills.

The mother who wants to get her problem pregnancy behind her and is generous enough to give her baby to a couple who will give it a loving home should have the absolute right to know that adoption records will be permanently sealed and the adoption is a final act that cannot be reopened. She should not be left with the threat that someday that baby can walk back into her life.●

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SYNAGOGUE YOUTH

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, many members of the Senate have visited Jerusalem and have had the pleasure of meeting with Teddy Kollek, that city's dynamic mayor. Mayor Kollek is properly proud of his achievements in securing support throughout the world for worthy projects that have enhanced the beauty of Jerusalem.

On such project is the Orthodox Union National Conference of Synagogue Youth [NCSY] Israel Center at 10 Strauss Street in downtown Jerusalem. This center is a major program of the New York based Union of Orthodox Jewish congregations of America and its renowned youth movement, the National Conference of Synagogue Youth. The Center's founding chairman is George Falk, a distinguished New York City communal leader. Thousands of visiting young Ameri-

cans have benefited from the services of the Israel Center since it opened in 1979.

Mayor Kollek recently wrote a warm letter to George Falk expressing his appreciation for the Falk family's role in establishing the center. I would like to share Major Kollek's letter with the members of the Senate and accordingly ask that the letter placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

MARCH 5, 1989.

Mr. GEORGE FALK,
New York, NY.

DEAR GEORGE: You are aware, I know, of the great efforts and achievements we have had in beautifying and developing Jerusalem. In these efforts we were fortunate to have the partnership of our friends from all over the world.

You are prominent among these friends. The Israel Center which you created in memory of your late parents has become an important cultural and social cornerstone of Jerusalem. Indeed, the attention you and your family have paid to making the Israel Center a beautiful institution, truly a compliment to modern Orthodox Jewry, brings me to my next point.

The Israel Center is located in a unique building of special architectural design, situated at one of Jerusalem's main intersections. As it is highly visible, our municipal department of environmental planning is recommending that the stone facade of the building be cleaned, that the balconies, windows and doors of the Israel Center, facing Strauss and Haneviim Streets be fixed and painted a distinctive, Mediterranean color, and that suitable plants be added, meshing with the railing and windows.

This will, of course, not only beautify this busy street corner, but also make the Israel Center much more attractive and visually prominent. We would like to approach you for help with this undertaking.

With kind personal regards and all good wishes. I look forward to seeing you both in Jerusalem sometime soon.

Yours,

TEDDY KOLLEK.●

MANUFACTURING A TRADE POLICY IN AN ERA OF CHANGE

● Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, last fall, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ] wrote an article for the Journal of International Affairs entitled "Manufacturing a Trade Policy in an Era of Change."

Few among us have been as actively involved as the Senator from Pennsylvania in the deliberations on U.S. trade policy in recent years. Certainly no one is as well versed as he in the intricacies of our antidumping and countervailing duty laws, or has as extensive an understanding of the President's steel program. He has devoted an immense amount of time and energy to understanding our trade laws, and I am honored to have had the opportunity to work with him in shaping major trade legislation during the past decade.

"Manufacturing a Trade Policy in an Era of Change" is an important article. Delving beyond the surface images of a healthy U.S. economy, it offers a sobering review of our current competitive position. Relying on extensive new research by the Office of Technology Assessment, the article highlights the important contributions of the manufacturing sector to our trade balance and describes the extent to which the competitive position of this sector has deteriorated in recent years. It also includes a substantive explanation of the rationale underlying the Omnibus Trade Act of 1988, and emphasizes the critical point that trade and commercial considerations must be given a prominent place in our policymaking process. Finally, the article offers some specific prescriptions for change—in both attitude and policy—so as to come to grips with our persistent trade imbalance.

Everyone may not agree with each of the proposed solutions, but this article certainly represents a worthwhile contribution to the ongoing debate about U.S. trade policy. I commend my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania for his work, and ask that the text of the article be printed in full in the RECORD.

The text of the article follows:

[From the Journal of International Affairs, Fall 1988]

MANUFACTURING A TRADE POLICY IN AN ERA OF CHANGE

(By John Heinz)

With the era of eight years of Ronald Reagan drawn to a close—which no doubt fills some with gloom and others with enthusiasm—there is an opportunity to stop to take measure of where the United States is economically and where President George Bush will have to lead us. Determining the proper direction, not to mention exercising the leadership, is no small task, since there remains fundamental disagreement among economists and those who claim to be economists over the state of the American economy, how we got here (wherever it is that we are) and where we go from here. Respectable prescriptions range from more of the same—an updated version of "stay the course"—to radical change.

This article will provide one perspective on those questions by arguing that the United States has some fundamental long-term problems despite the surface good news; that we have reached this point through years of poor management and concentration on the wrong issues; and that we need a new, more coherent approach. My recommendations will not represent a radical departure, but will require a new, more precise calculation of our interests and, most importantly, will insist that we act with those interests in mind rather than with an idealized view of a world trading system that fits our fantasies rather than reality.

WHERE WE ARE AND HOW WE GOT THERE

On the surface, at least as of this writing, the economic picture is suffused with good news. Unemployment is down to levels not seen in fourteen years. At the same time, inflation has stayed low and interest rates, while up from their trough, are not rising rapidly. We stand in stark and favorable contrast to the European Community (EC) in our job-creating ability.

Digging beneath the surface, however, reveals a few slugs and other undesirables crawling around. The high standard of living we enjoy and the consumer buying binge that has been such an important part of it, have produced the largest budget and trade deficits in our history—the former, ironically, a piece of Keynesian pump priming in supply-side clothing that the most liberal of economists would not have thought possible ten years ago.

Maintaining this pleasant but inevitably unstable equilibrium has required a massive inflow of foreign investment that has kept us afloat but has had two more ominous consequences. First, foreign investors give signs of beginning a move out of financial instruments and into equity, including real estate and some high profile industries that are causing many in Congress to have second thoughts about the unqualified benefits of foreign ownership. Japanese interests now own about 40 percent of the office space in downtown Los Angeles.[1] That may or may not be bad, but it should make one think abut the direction in which our economy is heading.

The second result of our twin deficits is a debt greater than any nation's in the world. Americans will pass this debt on to their children and grandchildren for payment, payment which will come in the form of harder work for lower wages and a lower standard of living than we have enjoyed.

As our debt grows, we are losing our capacity to control our own destiny. We are facing constraints on our scope of action due to our dependence on the continued inflow of foreign funds. We have been told, primarily by the Reagan administration, that the cost of pressng Japan or Europe too hard on other bilateral matters could well result in the redirection of foreign funds to other areas, a consequence that would force us to pay our own debts.

It is understandable that this would be an unwelcome development for the administration in power, since it would lead to a significant reduction in demand and/or increases in productivity, which translates into, at best, working harder for less and, at worst, into a recession. Yet extricating ourselves from our debt burden will inevitably mean the same sooner or later. Is it better to begin that process now when it is manageable or later when it is not?

The Reagan administration's benign neglect of the international economy from 1982 to February 1985, followed by its frantic efforts to control this process, led to the roller coaster ride the dollar has experienced over the last six years. First forced to the economic equivalent of Mt. Everest by foreign demand, the administration has now plunged into the Grand Canyon in a vain effort to reverse the tide of imports that led to the rise in the first place. This ride, lasting more than three years, has treated the public to one of the more abstruse policy debates in many years. This debate has concerned the "J-curve," the function which is supposed to demonstrate how exports will recover with the dollar's decline. More than a year ago, in my comments in the Finance Committee report on the Senate trade bill, I mentioned that the "J-curve" in fact was more like an "L," and little has happened since then to change that view.[2]

The reason for this discrepancy is rather simple. When the dollar began to fall in late 1985, foreign producers reacted in a perfect-

[1] Footnotes at end of article.

ly rational way, but not the way economic textbooks predicted. Instead of predictably raising prices to accommodate the currency devaluation, foreign producers kept prices down and sacrificed profits to maintain market share. The result was a continued influx of imports and the rather sad spectacle of the administration's bragging that the monthly trade deficit had fallen first to "only" $12 billion and more recently to $9 billion, figures that might have represented an *annual* tally fifteen years ago.

Recently, there appears to be some evidence that exports are increasing, thanks to the low dollars, but there is still no evidence that imports are declining. Because this is a necessary part of the equation, the result has been a string of monthly deficits that remain at historic levels.

Another crippling impact of the high dollar is that during the mid-1980s it stimulated the movement of manufacturing offshore. Moving manufacturing back to the United States in order to benefit from a relatively lower dollar, of course, is not so easy. We have been forced to learn to live with the internationalization of our production as well as our consumption, a development, as will be discussed below, that by itself requires a sharp shift in perspective.

THE MANUFACTURING SECTOR [3]

Just as some animals were more equal than others in *Animal Farm*, some economic sectors are more equal than others when it comes to measuring our overall health. The manufacturing sector is arguably the most important, both in its contribution to our current problems and in the role it must inevitably play in their solution. Discussing solutions requires a detailed understanding of what has been going on in this sector, and it is precisely this question that has been the subject of greatest controversy.

In my judgment, the manufacturing sector has suffered particularly severely from the macroeconomic changes I have discussed, although elaborating on that statement requires both careful definition and a look at some new data.

Careful definition means avoiding labor's mistake of defining a sector's health solely in terms of the number of jobs, and the economists' mistake of defining it solely in terms of gross output or share of GNP. It also means use of appropriate data. Everything looks better compared to 1982, for example, but for precisely that reason the snapshot is not very revealing.

In terms of jobs, the real picture is mixed. Manufacturing's share of employment has declined, as has the absolute number of jobs in the sector since the 1979 peak. In 1979, there were 21 million manufacturing jobs; by the end of 1987 there were 19.4 million jobs, more than in 1986 but still below the peak.

Some of this decline was due to productivity growth—an average of 3.5 percent per year from 1979 to 1986. At the same time, another part of the decline was due to imports, either directly or through their role in forcing the closure of inefficient plants. This was particularly true in industries where demand was flat or increasing slowly, like steel, textiles and autos. While the late President John F. Kennedy summarized a useful economic truth when he said, "A rising tide lifts all boats," it is also true that when the sea is calm, some boats sink anyway—stagnant demand leaves an industry vulnerable to imports whether these are the result of fair or unfair trade practices—and the workers suffer inevitably because the industry shrinks, either through its lack of competitiveness or its improvements in productivity that allow it to shed workers.

Determining manufacturing's share of GNP, as a new Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) study points out, is fraught with difficulty. Measured in current dollars, the share dropped from 29 percent in 1960 to under 20 percent in 1986, with an increasing rate of decline since 1979. Current dollar analyses, however, fail to deal adequately with productivity improvements.

Constant dollar calculations, on the other hand, vary depending on the assumptions made and the years chosen. For example, the OTA study makes clear that in 1982 dollars, manufacturing has been a steady 21 or 22 percent of total output since the late 1940s; whereas, using 1972 constant dollars it has hovered around 24 percent; and with 1958 dollars around 30 percent. Each constant dollar revision appears to produce a reasonably straight line, but at a lower level.

This phenomenon is related both to the different weights given to industry inputs in different years that distort the actual structure of the economy in previous years, as well as the need to adjust for quality and performance improvements in products that are nominally the same from year to year. (A 1952 and a 1986 car are statistically the same thing, but in terms of actual performance or quality are light years apart.)

In addition, the 1982 results are skewed by the performance of the nonelectrical machinery sector, which included computers, whose gains were so great they offset losses not only in the rest of that sector, but also in the other sectors that make up manufacturing as well. The statistical result of this huge improvement in a portion of one sector is to prop up the share of GNP of all manufacturing. An OTA reassessment of the data, using 1980 constant dollars, showed that manufacturing's share of GNP declined from 23.3 percent in 1972 to 21.9 percent in 1984, with an accelerated rate of decline after 1979, as in the Commerce Department's analysis.

The OTA study suggests fairly clearly that domestic manufacturing production has been declining, but, as is always the case in these matters, production is only one side of the equation. What is unquestionably less controversial is that consumption of manufactured goods has outstripped corresponding domestic levels of production, leading to a growing gap that is reflected in the trade deficit. OTA estimates, for example, that the American share of spending on manufactured goods increased from 23 percent of GNP in 1948 to 27.7 percent in 1986. Meanwhile, manufacturing output in the latter year was 20.5 percent of GNP, a continuation of the declining trend that began in the early 1970s.

Some economists have compared this deterioration to that of agriculture, which over a longer period of time declined significantly as a percentage of the U.S. economy—from 22 percent of GNP at the beginning of the century to 2.2 percent in 1986. This change is used to justify the increased manufacturing share as an inevitable and healthy part of a transition to a postindustrial economy.

The analogy, however, is inexact. While agriculture's share of the economy has declined, its output has not only kept pace with demand, but has also consistently generated surpluses. In the case of manufacturing, not only has the sector failed to keep pace with demand, but demand itself also has increased, as previously noted. This is not the hallmark of an economy in transition, where demand for services is replacing demand for manufactured goods. In fact, from a consumer point of view, the manufacturing sector is alive and well. From a producer point of view, however, it has been seriously ill.

This is not a unique situation. According to OTA, it is reflected in the economies of all the major industrial nations, including Japan, although the sector's "downward slope" has been steeper in the United States.

"As a share of gross domestic product, the U.S. manufacturing sector shrank by 31 percent from 1965 to 1985. This compares to declines of 27 percent in Britain, 23 percent in Germany, and 14 percent in France. Japan, which was still in a stage of industrialization in 1965, saw a decline of only 7 percent over the period. As would be expected, the share of manufacturing in the economy rose in newly industrializing nations like South Korea, the Philippines, and Singapore." [4]

This extended discussion of manufacturing is necessary because analysts and policymakers are increasingly coming to the conclusion that its health is the key to solving our macroeconomic problems. There is little doubt that events in the manufacturing sector are largely responsible for the trade deficit. In March 1988, when the merchandise trade deficit reached a several year low of $9.7 billion, manufacturing accounted for more than two-thirds of our exports and nearly 79 percent of our imports. Eighty-five percent of the 1987 current account deficit was in the manufacturing sector.

The obvious conclusion is that closing the trade gap depends upon some change in manufacturing. This would entail, most likely, both an increase in exports, which seem to be occurring, and a decrease in imports, which has not yet begun. Even the major improvement in March, which featured a 27.7 percent increase in exports over the 1988 average, simultaneously brought a 7 percent *increase* in imports over the 1988 average.

MANUFACTURING VERSUS SERVICES

Beyond the fact that manufacturing constitutes the major part of the deficit, and thus inevitably must constitute the major part of the solution, there is another reason why we need to focus our attention there. In its most simplified form, it is the premise that our economic strength rests on production, not consumption. As William R. Hawkins, assistant professor of economics at Radford University in Virginia wrote, "The long-run replacement of high value-added industry by low value-added industry will undermine the American economic strength. Wealth and power ultimately rests on the power of production, not consumption." [5]

This is not the place to resurrect the debate on whether service jobs are preferable to or as well paying as manufacturing jobs, but the link between the two is clear, computer hardware and software being the most obvious contemporary example. The OTA study concludes that some 8 million service jobs are directly linked to manufacturing; while research by Stephen Cohen and John Zysman at the University of California at Berkeley suggests that the number might be as high as 50-60 million. Advertising, law, banking, transportation, engineering and architecture would be particularly vulnerable to further manufacturing declines.[6] There is little question that most service jobs, whether they are hamburger

flippers, architects or investment bankers, ultimately rest on the production of something, and it is by that production in the manfacturing sector that our strength must be measured.

MANUFACTURING AND FOREIGN INVESTMENT

The crisis in the manufacturing sector is not limited to short-term consequences for the health of our economy. The trade deficit and the Treasury Department's strategy of preserving a lower value of the dollar threaten to produce serious long-term consequences. Anecdotal evidence reflecting concerns about declining production and its impact on our security and independence of action is already beginning to surface, as is concern about foreign acquisition of U.S. property.

The Defense Department is developing a program to determine what procurement is "endangered" in the sense of insufficient domestic production to meet our needs—either presently or in the event of war.[7] Inquiry has focused on sectors such as machine tools, certain computers, specialty steel, forgings and castings, and ball bearings. Some of this concern has been stimulated by Congress, but much of it originated with the Defense Department, as its inability to meet its needs from the U.S. defense base has become obvious.

Likewise, increased foreign acquisition of U.S. companies, such as that proposed in the attempt of Fujitsu to take over Fairchild Semiconductor (although Fairchild was already owned by a different foreign company), has raised concerns both about the transfer of critical technology abroad and about our continued ability to meet our defense needs from secure sources. This concern led to the inclusion of the so-called Exon/Florio Amendment in the trade bill. This provision gives the president authority to block foreign acquisition on national security grounds. The challenge for the amendment's drafters, and for the administration that will ultimately implement it, is to insure that this new authority does not become transformed by the bureaucratic process into a formal investment screening process of all transactions based upon the pretext of an expanded definition of national security.

Sometimes the goals of adequate domestic production and domestic ownership of technology are in conflict. The Pentagon is increasingly finding cases where the best way to maintain U.S. production is to allow a foreign takeover, even at some risk to the technology involved:

"For years, the Pentagon discouraged substantial foreign investment in defense companies, for reasons still cited by opponents of such acquisitions. They say that allowing foreign companies to control vital defense weaponry would leave the U.S. vulnerable in the event of war. They add that a stake in a U.S. defense-electronics contractor could let a foreign company and a foreign government see potentially critical technology—strengthening foreign competitors and increasing the danger of espionage.

"The critics see yet another example of America's technological and industrial dominance slipping away. And their concern is all the deeper because of American defense contractors' increasing purchases of sophisticated parts from abroad.

"But with Frank Carlucci's ascension to the Defense Department's top job, economic considerations have gained ground in foreign-investment decisions. Many at the Pentagon—and in the industry—now say that preventing jobs from drifting overseas and remaining able to crank out weapons at home are more important than lessening the risk of espionage or a loss of face as an industrial power. With the right controls, they believe, the national interest can be protected as well. 'We must not allow ourselves to use this issue as a shroud for protectionism,' says Robert B. Costello, who oversees Pentagon procurement."[8]

Anecdotal evidence, of course, is hardly dispositive, but in the political environment it carries great weight because it represents political, i.e. constituent, pressure for action. When machine-tool manufacturers complain about imports and lost market share, for example, they go first to their congressmen and senators. While that might produce protectionist proposals in the short run, they often are not intended to be enacted—and rarely are enacted—but rather serve as catalysts for a thorough examination of the problem through already existing procedures.

In the machine-tool case, for example, the industry ultimately filed a petition under section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 seeking relief from imports on national security grounds. After a year-long investigation by the Department of Commerce and a two-year review by the White House (far too long, in the judgment of everyone associated with this case), the president decided under considerable pressure from Congress, that some action was warranted and directed the negotiation of import restraints to be held with key foreign producers.

This case, along with the 1984 steel section 210 case that was resolved by steel quota legislation, suggest that congressional agitation, though it might ultimately not produce a law, is an action-inducing device that a wise industry will seek to employ. A second conclusion, unfortunately, is that there are inevitably elements in the bureaucracy of any administration that prefer smooth relations with our trading partners regardless of the domestic cost and will oppose actions that might be viewed by our trading partners as disruptive.

Congressional pressure, however, is generally concerned with the short term and specific cases. The big picture is not alien to congressmen, but it is often put on the back burner by the force of current events. In addressing those events we *de facto* make policy more often by accident than design. A better means of focusing on that big picture is needed.

GLOBAL CHANGES

It is precisely that bigger picture that must serve as a background for the changes I have discussed in the manufacturing sector and in foreign investment. These changes cannot be viewed in isolation but rather must be seen as part of a broader series of developments that are taking place world-wide and that have contributed to a decline in our relative position of strength in the world economy. Our share of the free world's GNP has declined in the postwar era from 60 percent to 25 percent and with it, inevitably, a degree of the influence we are able to exert internationally. Several of these changes are worth noting.

Permeable economies

The increasing speed and sophistication of transportation and communications systems have created a true world market for goods as well as services. Who would have thought even ten years ago, for example, that over half our daily supply of fresh carnations and chrysanthemums would come from overseas (Colombia, Israel and Europe)? Satellite communications systems and electronic financial systems now permit virtually instantaneous transfer not only of news, but also of data and business and financial transactions. Approximately $70 trillion of foreign exchange transactions occurred in 1986, more than $200 billion every working day, a volume of transactions that dwarfs trade flows by a factor of eighteen times. More recent figures suggest current financial transactions are more than twice that level. These developments have made virtually every economy accessible to every other and have made the movement of money more important than the movement of goods.

Growth of the trade sector

In part as a result of the permeable economies, foreign markets have become more important both for American producers seeking growth and for foreign producers seeking to take advantage of our open market to promote their growth. While in 1970 exports and imports of goods represented 7 percent of U.S. GNP, in 1987 they amounted to 15.1 percent. This figure, although significant, was still behind that of most European nations.

Demand for discipline

The increased importance of trade has created powerful constituencies for stronger international standards for the conduct of commercial activities and a better means of enforcing those standards. It is no longer only the import-impacted industries such as steel, footwear and textiles that are sensitive, but modern, technologically competitive industries such as machine tools, computers and semiconductors as well as growing segments of the agricultural sector that are joining the chorus of complaints about subsidized imports and access to foreign markets. These complaints translate into the newly popular term "fair trade."

Failure of adjustment

The insistence on discipline in the trading system has also been aided by the almost unanimous failure of developed countries to successfully pursue and implement adjustment strategies for industries that are no longer competitive.

In steel, for example, the United States and the EC represent contrasting extremes of failure. The United States, having had virtually no policy, forced the steel industry to adjust in the most painful way possible. The result was abrupt reductions in employment (from 453,000 in 1979 to 163,000 in 1987—a decline of 64 percent in eight years!) and a series of corporate bankruptcies and mergers. The EC, in contrast, has regularly postponed the pain of adjustment by continuing subsidies and attempting to regulate levels of production between the member nations. The result has not been enough to stop exporting the responsibility for shrinkage to the United States. Parenthetically, it is worth noting that James Clifton of the Center for Industrial Competitiveness has done some preliminary analysis that suggests the United States leads other developed countries in downsizing its basic industries and that the gap in this country is being filled by imports from other developed countries rather than from lesser developed countries (LDCs).[9]

Lack of consensus on rules

The world has witnessed the growing importance of non-Western trade players, whose standards, practices and ways of doing business are at variance with the essentially Western trade system drawn up by

the United States and its European allies in the postwar era. The growing problem of counterfeiting, patent piracy and other forms of theft of intellectual property—books, recordings and tapes, for example—are manifestations of the fact that many of the LDCs and newly industrializing countries (NICs) do not accept or have not developed Western legal standards, and often regard them as instruments of Western economic exploitation. This spring the Thai government was threatened with collapse because of the nation's legislators' resistance to proposals to strengthen Thailand's copyright law.

Recognizing economic change

The United States has personal experience with the difficulty developed nations have in handling LDC industrialization. This is matched by the LDCs' difficulties in understanding the additional responsibility that comes with development. Admitting that a Korea or a Brazil can produce products of equivalent quality more cheaply than we can has been painful but necessary. Persuading a Korea or a Brazil that industrialization should mean a phasing out of the special benefits given LDCs and that a market-oriented system without subsidies offers the best hope of further balanced growth is equally painful, but equally necessary.

The debt bomb

Finally, we have to face the devastating effect of the LDC debt crisis. In recent years nearly 40 percent of U.S. exports went to Third World markets. This figure is greater than that exported by Europe and Japan combined. But LDC debt problems and an inability to finance previous levels of imports caused a $22 billion deterioration in U.S. exports to Latin America alone between 1981 and 1984. This loss in trade translated into the loss of 550,000 jobs in the U.S. export sector.

International Monetary Fund (IMF) action in 1983 and 1984 staved off catastrophe, and reductions in the dollar's value have brought the United States back to the point where exports to Latin America are now only 18 percent below 1981 levels. Nonetheless, there is a growing suspicion that we have at best abated the crisis, but not resolved it. In 1986 alone, the United States lost $70 billion in exports to LDCs compared to what would have occurred had the export growth rate of the 1970s continued; that amounts to 2.1 million jobs.

Most developing countries still find themselves in a slow-growth mode with per capita growth rates over the last five years half the average of the 1970s. Debtor nations, however, complain that IMF austerity programs have failed, and these countries continue to demonstrate growing sympathy for a more development-oriented set of policies with greater World Bank involvement. Secretary of the Treasury James Baker's plan to lend an additional $20 billion has been received skeptically by both LDCs and some U.S. banks. Growing private bank reluctance to provide new funds in the face of increasing LDC resistance to repayment shows clearly the difficulty of arriving at any long-term solution.

The evidence of productivity.[10]

There is no better evidence of the change in global terms of trade than productivity figures. The U.S. rate of productivity growth averaged less than 3 percent per year from 1960 to 1986, although since 1979 the record has been significantly better. Yet over the entire period, our improvement pales in comparison with that of Japan (8 percent), France, Italy, and Germany (5 percent) and Great Britain and Canada (over 3 percent).

It is the earlier years that are the most telling. While our productivity growth rate from 1960 to 1973 was 3.2 percent per year, European countries did significantly better, largely because they were still repairing war damage and investing in new equipment. Japan, which had substantial destruction as well as a lower base, enjoyed an average annual rate of 10.3 percent during this period.

These numbers reflect Europe and Japan's "catching up" to the United States from what amounted to a lower base. They were aided by an exceptionally poor U.S. performance from 1973 to 1979 (1.4 percent per year) that was probably attributable to a rapid expansion of the labor force as well as inflation and oil price increases (although the latter two factors affected other nations as well).

Since 1979, the U.S. performance has matched our trading partners, but the damage was already done. We are now competing on equal terms with Europe and Japan and in some respects may have fallen behind. As with many other developments over the past thirty years, this one may be good for the system and is certainly good for our trading partners. However, it is clearly not so good for us, particularly when viewed in conjunction with other events that occurred simultaneously.

All these changes mean a very different trading system, one in which the United States is no longer the dominant player and in which there is no common agreement on the rules of the game. The consequences for American firms doing business internationally are no more clearly spelled out than in a speech by Cordell Hull, director and senior vice president of Bechtel Power Corp., a company on the cutting edge of large-scale engineering and construction technology. Commenting on the growing need for officially subsidized government support for exports, Mr. Hull said:

"In the 1960's, the U.S. engineering and construction industry did not need as much credit support from Eximbank with respect to other international activities because:

"This country held a commanding lead in technical know-how, equipment quality, and price position backed by strong project-management capabilities;

"Competition from the newly industrialized countries was virtually non-existent;

"Foreign exchange rates were stable and, for the most part, predictable.

"Moving into the 1970's, economic storm clouds gathered as:

"Host countries became more directly involved in project development and consequently required financing for their projects; in response, foreign engineering and construction competitors quickly emerged supported by subsidized government loans . . .

"Emerging foreign competition secured increasingly larger shares of the engineering and construction market with their government's subsidies and support. Further, some of these competitors were state enterprises, directly owned and backed by their governments, able to take extraordinary risks with impunity." [11]

SHUTTING THE WORLD'S DOORS

The other change that Mr. Hull alluded to that impacts directly on our policy and economic performance is the growth of market restraints and barriers abroad. It is common practice among nations, not to mention good domestic politics, periodically to accuse one's trading partners of protectionism. It is axiomatic that it is always easier to blame one's problems on someone else, and foreigners in particular are easy political targets since they do not vote in the United States.

At the same time, however, there is growing evidence, both anecdotal and statistical, that suggests an increasing portion of world trade is becoming subject to restraints of one form or another. The Reagan administration is pursuing more section 301 cases asserting violations of our General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) rights or barriers to our products in other markets than in past years. News articles have fully covered our fights over citrus (EC), pasta (EC), beef (Japan), soybean oil (EC), apples (EC), almonds (India), oranges (Japan), informatics (Brazil), fish (Canada), semiconductors (Japan), tobacco (Japan, South Korea), chocolate (Japan, South Korea, Taiwan), insurance (South Korea), motion pictures (South Korea, Canada), ice cream (Canada), eggs (EC, Brazil), lawyers (Japan), telecommunications equipment (Japan), medical equipment (Japan), wood products (Japan) and aircraft (EC), and this is hardly a complete list.

In addition, we have been forced to cope with increasing penetration of our own market by dumped and subsidized goods or by fraud and circumvention of our laws. Those fights are also publicly chronicled: steel (over twenty countries), photo albums (South Korea), textiles and apparel (many countries), various electronic components (Japan and others), forklifts (Japan), raspberries (Canada), potatoes (Canada), lumber (Canada), pork (Canada), brass (several countries) and various chemicals (many countries) to mention only a few.

These specific cases constitute graphic evidence of what observers have begun to report in the aggregate—the growth of nontariff barriers (NTBs) to trade as a way of life in most of the world. The World Bank summarized this trend with a table showing the proportion of trade covered by "hard core" NTBs by region: [12]

TABLE 1.—INDUSTRIAL COUNTRY IMPORTS SUBJECT TO "HARD-CORE" NTB'S 1981 AND 1986

[In percent]

Importer	Source of imports			
	Industrial countries		Developing countries	
	1981	1986	1981	1986
EC	10	13	22	23
Japan	29	29	22	22
United States	9	15	14	17
All industrial countries	13	16	19	21

Source: World Bank, "1987 World Development Report," p. 142.

The bank defines hard-core NTB's as those "most likely to have significant restrictive effects." It lists among them import prohibitions, quantitative restrictions, voluntary export restraints, variable levies, Multifiber Agreement (MFA) restrictions (textiles and apparel) and nonautomatic licensing.

Table 1 leads to several interesting conclusions. First, it is clear that the overall situation is getting worse rather than better—barriers are increasing in virtually every category. Second, the United States lags behind its major counterparts in protection, although we appear to be getting worse at a

faster rate that the others. Third, Japan is clearly the worst offender, particularly with respect to imports from industrial countries, which would include proportionately more manufactured goods and fewer raw materials; but it does not appear to be increasing its hard-core barriers. Fourth, with the notable exception of Japan, developed countries treat their LDC partners worse than their industrialized counterparts.

These conclusions do not suggest the smooth transition to free trade that economists would like to see. In fact, they suggest the opposite: the system is disintegrating rather than coalescing. The 1988 Omnibus Trade Act was intended to be a response to this process.

THE 1988 TRADE BILL

The trade bill, very simply, is a reflection of the congressional view that there is a discontinuity between the way we behave and the way others behave, and the realization that we can no longer afford to go our own way. It was acceptable in the immediate postwar era when the United States accounted for 60 percent of the world's GNP for us to act in ways that were system-reinforcing and that furthered our political or military goals, because the economic cost was small. Rebuilding Europe and integrating Japan into the Western alliance made political sense and there were few, if any, short-term costs.

Now, however, the bill is coming due. Ironically, this is because from an economic rather than a trade policy perspective the playing field has already become level. For years our higher industrial base tilted it in our favor; now we are competing on more equal terms and not liking it.

The softness in our own system is reflected in a poor productivity performance and a troubled manufacturing sector, as discussed above, as well as in our collective inability to discipline ourselves to rectify either of our two budget imbalances.

Our competitors, on the other hand, have discovered short cuts on the road to comparative advantage through such means as the combined use of government subsidies and protection to nurture fledgling industries beyond the point where they are competitive, and the practice of businesses dumping in the U.S. market to capture market share at any price while sustaining themselves in the interim through a protected home market. Both of these practices are market-distorting deviations from free trade principles that in most cases are GATT-illegal. Clyde Prestowitz, author of *Trading Places: How We Allowed Japan to take the Lead*, commented on these tactics as applied by Japan:

"Just as the U.S. government orchestrated industry efforts to put a man on the moon, the Japanese government bent every effort to create world-class industries in such areas as steel, computers, and semiconductors. Critics say that government is no good at picking 'winners' and 'losers.' But the Japanese government hasn't picked aircraft, computers, telecommunications, biotechnology and advanced ceramics as 'winners,' the market has. The government is just making sure that Japanese industries ride with the winners.

"In this context, Japanese companies can sometimes see a long-run strategic advantage in selling in a foreign market at a price below cost or below the price in the home market. Yes, such dumping can mean an immediate windfall for non-Japanese consumers, but it can also allow a Japanese industry to get or keep a lock-hold on an important market.

"For example, the conquest of the U.S. television market, partly by dumping, paved the way for Japan's lucrative monopoly in VCR's. Today U.S. entrepreneurs who wish to build improved VCR's or peripherals cannot, because Japanese suppliers will not provide the critical parts or licenses.

"Similarly, the driving of U.S. semiconductor producers out of key products has made U.S. electronics makers dependent on Japanese suppliers—their biggest competitors. And the Japanese will find it easier to block the entry of new electronic entrepreneurs into the market. Dumping can also protect market share while an industry adjusts to changing market conditions; during the recent rapid appreciation of the yen, Japanese producers held the line on prices, despite profit losses, to give them time to cut costs.

"From the point of view, far from being a gift, dumped products look more like the hot goods of a fence. Of course the consumers get a low price and the fence makes a nice profit, but ultimately, legitimate producers get put out of business." [13]

The United States has historically been less reliant on subsidies than its counterparts and has only recently begun to increase its use of market-closing tactics, often as a response to others' trade distorting practices, as in the case of steel. The trade bill is an indication of congressional determination that our tougher line against market distorting practices should continue. It is ironic that it comes so late and is so weak that it simply amounts to little more than a validation of the somewhat more aggressive position the Reagan administration had already begun in 1986.

WHERE WE HAVE TO GO

While the trade bill points the country in the right direction, no one has ever claimed it alone is a sufficient solution to all our problems. Indeed, action will be necessary on a far broader scale if there is to be any significant impact on the trade deficit, and such action will have to address both our attitude and our policy.

CHANGES IN ATTITUDES

One of the things we should have learned from the trade debate over the past few years is that competitiveness is, among other things, a state of mind and way of thinking; and there are a number of things we can do to recognize our thought processes for competitiveness.

Understand the real basis of our strength

The Reagan administration continued the historical tendency of American governments in the postwar era to define our strength in military terms—the size and credibility of our nuclear deterrent and our ability to project our strength and further our foreign policy goals around the globe. Recent poll data as well as media stories, perhaps inspired by books such as Paul Kennedy's *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, reflect a growing awareness among the populace that the question is more complicated and that real strength at its core is a question of economic power and the industrial base of one's economy. In graphic terms it is the growing realization that a 600-ship navy is an irrelvant objective if you do not have the infrastructure to build it or the money to buy it. It is the suggestion that the issue is not necessarily guns vs. butter, but rather that in economic terms guns *are* butter, and vice versa.

All policy-making involves choices. Understanding the real nature of our strength means making different choices in the future—choices that nurture economic growth and productivity improvements, particularly in the manufacturing sector.

Reprioritize trade policy

This corollary is a logical consequence of the first principle. It is a sad but necessary fact of life in the bureaucracy that decisions are not made in isolation. A decision on whether to press Japan on any of its various agriculture quotas will be influenced by concerns of the Defense Department on possible Japanese reduction in defense spending, of the State Department on a range of pending political issues, of the National Security Council on Japanese political and military cooperation in the Pacific Rim, and so on.

The insertion of these not directly relevant concerns is neither surprising nor troubling; it is an inevitable part of a decision-making process. What is troubling is the fact that nontrade considerations consistently carry the day when trade policy decisions are actually made. The National Security Council, for example, delayed resolution of the machine-tool industry's request for import relief for more than two years, among other reasons because of concerns about the impact it would have on Japan's cooperation with us on strategic matters. Over three years ago, then chairman of the International Trade Subcommittee, Senator John Danforth, succinctly summed up this problem in a speech at the National Press Club:

"For years, trade policy has been the poor stepchild of our Government. It has been shoved to the back of the line, behind foreign policy and tax policy, behind antitrust policy and export controls, and behind any number of other considerations. For the sake of our own people as well as the international trading system itself, the era of second-class status must be brought to an end." [14]

The solution to this problem is not to eliminate these other considerations; nor is it to launch yet another reorganization that will leave the bureaucracy in chaos for another year. Rather it is simply to make decisions that properly reflect our real priorities.

Reevaluate the role of government in the economy

As discussed above, the international trend of events in the trade sector seems to be in favor of greater government direction of the economy, particularly the trade and export sector. The success of Japan in literally creating comparative advantage out of a mix of government subsidies, effective allocation of credit and selective protection has not been lost on its Pacific Rim competitors, beginning with Korea and Taiwan. There are signs that the lesson is also being learned farther south as well. Likewise in the LDCs, what has been heralded as a gradual shift to free market principles in the more successful countries may actually be little more than a shift to smarter subsidies.

That does not mean we should follow the same path. On the contrary, we should continue to do everything we can internationally to insist on free market principles, as the Reagan administration did. To the extent we fail in obtaining worldwide adherence to that standard, we may face over the long run little choice but to adopt some of the same tactics employed by our trading part-

ners. In addition, our experience with the so-called Export-Import Bank "war chest" and with some of our recent agriculture programs suggests that sometimes the best way to deal with other nations' subsidies and market-distorting measures is to demonstrate graphically that we have deeper pockets and are prepared to use what is in them. This is the kind of tactical flexibility that is appropriate to changing global economic conditions and is something we need to keep in the forefront of our thinking as we confront new multilateral challenges.

CHANGES IN POLICY—TO BITE OR NOT TO BITE THE BULLET

The past eight years, if nothing else, have made clear the unwillingness of anyone—the president, the Congress, even the American people—to take decisive action in dealing with our twin deficits. The reason for that is simple: there are no pleasant choices; ergo, there is no one who wants to choose. This final section discusses the policy changes that the next administration will be required to make.

THE BUDGET DEFICIT

Reducing our federal budget deficit inevitably means either increases in taxes or cuts in spending, including defense, or, more likely, a combination of both. Politically speaking, announcing support for a tax increase is akin to announcing one has the plague. It is a ticket to a short political career. Likewise, trying to produce a public consensus on where to cut spending has been futile. As a result, Congress resorted to such ingenious steps as selling federal assets at a discount to raise money and changing the armed services' payday from September 30 to October 1, which had the effect of shifting a large expenditure into the next fiscal year and, in budget terms, freeing those funds for other spending in the earlier year. Sooner or later Congress and the president will run out of gimmicks and will have to face real choices.

THE TRADE DEFICIT

Reducing the trade deficit requires a similar hard choice we have resisted making. The essence of the dilemma is that it is rapidly becoming clear that the easy choice of increasing exports will not work. The dollar's decline in value—too little too late in my judgment—has helped increase exports (up 30.9 percent from third quarter 1986 to first quarter 1988), but as Albert Wojnilower pointed out in a prescient analysis:

"Trying to reduce the deficit rapidly through higher *exports* would produce overheating, draw in much larger imports, and culminate in recession. Even in the longer run, bringing down our deficit by export growth to the other members of the industrial establishment has its limits because it threatens their economies and a political as well as economic backlash. The only sustainable export market is among the developing countries. To increase sales to them quickly, we would have to import more industrial goods from them, pay higher prices for their raw materials, or forgive their debts. While we are doing some of all these things, it is by no means clear that we are ready to [do] so on the large scale required." [15]

The export increases that have occurred, however, have been accompanied by climbing imports. For the first four months of 1988, imports were running nearly 12 percent, or $15.7 billion, ahead of the same period last year. More to the point, they were more than $1.3 billion higher than the last four months in 1987. Subsequent data show some further declines in both exports and imports, but the change is at best glacial. Consumpton is not clearly declining, and until it does, the trade deficit will remain too high, and the increases in savings and investment necessary for our long-term competitiveness will have to be postponed.

It is a dirty little secret of the trade debate that those who pride themselves on being free traders do not like to mention that any effective solution requires reducing imports as well as increasing exports. To reduce the deficit only through the latter would require a more than $150 billion increase in our sales abroad—a level of domination of the global economy unprecedented in human history.

As Wojnilower also points out, however, the means of reducing imports are hardly fashionable:

"The three ways to reduce the deficit through lower *imports* are import substitution, reducing general demand, or protectionism. For the moment at least, import substitution—making things at home rather than importing them—has the same drawback as export increases, namely, heightening the inflationary pressure on domestic resources. Reducing demand is a euphemism for recession. With the United States accounting for 18% of the world's imports, recession here likely would mean recessions abroad and it is doubtful that anyone would come out ahead. One consequence would be certain: protectionism would mushroom everywhere. In fact protectionism is probably the only, though hardly a desirable, way to shrink the trade deficit in a hurry." [16]

This is not a choice members of Congress like to see. They will resist the obvious—some sort of across-the-board import surcharge or other restrictive device—and instead try to define the problem as that of "unfair" trade and fine tune our trade laws to deal with it. Of course, no analyst and no congressman has ever argued that opening closed markets abroad or stopping unfair trade practices will solve more than a fraction of the problem, but we politicians like to believe these problems can be "worked out" through negotiation. Obviously, they should be worked out for the reasons outlined by Clyde Prestowitz above, but we should not be under the illusion that doing so is by itself a sufficient answer to our economic problems.

Ultimately, meaningful progress will require both import-limiting action on our part and action to increase growth elsewhere in the world. Import-limiting action could be either general or targeted. In either case it will hit Japan the hardest. In the spring of 1985, I was among the first to propose an import surcharge on Japanese goods, a tariff increase that would both reduce imports and raise revenue. That idea has not found much favor, but it will return inevitably as the choices narrow.

One action that will probably not work is further reduction in the dollar's value. Although its 38 percent reduction from its 1985 peak (against a basket of currencies) has made a difference, it has not been nearly as great as textbooks would suggest, and there clearly is a limit to how much more juice can be squeezed out of that particular orange.

The reasons for this is simple. Foreign producers elected in many cases to reduce or even eliminate profits and kept prices low to retain market share. U.S. producers, who must have been reading different textbooks than the Japanese, often did the reverse, increasing prices to restore profits that had been missing in the early 1980s. At the same time, U.S. consumers have continued in their determination to buy foreign products regardless of price increases. In some situations, VCRs being the most conspicuous example, there is no significant U.S. producer, and yen appreciation goes straight into U.S. inflation. We have done well so far in reducing the dollar's value without stimulating inflation, but it does not appear that there is much more benefit to be gained from that strategy.

The other choice is increased economic growth elsewhere. Jim Baker, as Treasury Secretary, had pursued this policy with enthusiasm but with limited success. Japan responded, but not in a way that will produce rapid results here. Germany remains paralyzed by its fear of inflation—not entirely irrational in view of its history—and appears willing to live with less economic growth as a consequence. Many of the NICs are constrained by their debt burdens from making much of a contribution. That leaves Taiwan, South Korea and a few others—not enough to make a difference. It remains the right policy, but counting on others to solve our problems is at best naive and at worst foolish. In the end we will have to solve our own problems through our own actions.

Wojnilower's response to this dilemma is that "we must learn if not to love our deficit at least to become more relaxed about it," [17] a reflection of his pessimism about a near-term solution.

The right response is for the private sector to understand the profound challenge we face and for labor and management to work far more realistically and cooperatively. Nevertheless, our government must recognize the urgency of creating a climate for the success of these efforts. We must go directly to the core of the problem and start with a comprehensive blueprint to support and encourage the revitalization of our manufacturing base. Following are some necessary parts of such a blueprint.

Shift the tax system to favor savings and investment rather than consumption; provide tax incentives for research and development

The United States has consistently had the lowest savings rate in the developed world. This has both crippled our ability to make badly needed investments in research and development and infrastructure, but it has permitted the consumption binge that has created our trade and current account deficits.

Devise strategies to create targeted comparative advantage while facilitating adjustment

I first proposed a market facilitating adjustment strategy for industry five years ago. The best approach is not one that is government led or dictated, but one in which the government conditions its support on the industry—labor and management—cooperating to devise solutions to its problems. The government becomes a facilitator not a partner in the process.

Help develop a stronger export mentality among our manufacturers

It is axiomatic in any analysis of American economic history that Americans have ignored foreign markets in favor of the large domestic market. Even those who have sought to export have often not tackled the global market systematically and have gone to it only in times of surplus capacity, pulling back when domestic demand has in-

creased. This has prevented the development of a true export mentality in the United States, in sharp contrast to so many of our trading partners who rely on exporting as an integral part of their economies.

We need to encourage more thinking about exports. The Commerce Department has launched several such initiatives, most recently its Export Now program, and the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 was intended to do the same thing for smaller businesses. We need to pursue these and other initiatives aggressively to help our manufacturers fully undestand the extent to which they are now part of a global market.

Aggressively defined the market system against competitors' unfair trade practices

Stopping dumped and subsidized imports makes economic sense over the long term for both the United States and foreign economies. In the short term, aggressive enforcement limits inports not only in the directly affected sector but more broadly because of the message it sends our trading partners about our determination to support market principles.

Another unfair practice gaining in popularity is patent/trademark piracy. America's lead in innovation is already under siege for legitimate reasons. Theft of technology and outright copying of our products make the problem much worse. The recently passed trade bill will help crack down on this activity, but international negotiation on stronger protection for intellectual property will also be necessary.

Indeed, the entire Uruguay Round can play an important role in the reduction of our trade deficit, not just by opening others' closed doors, but by further tightening the rules on unfair practices, particularly in the area of agricultural subsidies.

Lower the cost of capital by reducing the budget deficit

This has been discussed above, but it is worth reiterating to stress its relevance as part of a comprehensive approach.

Upgrade the capability of the work force through education and retraining

The trade bill takes some important steps in this direction by significantly increasing our job retraining and trade adjustment assistance funds. The decline in unemployment over the past year makes it tempting to put retraining on the back burner. That would be a grave mistake. Changes in the structure of our economy and the nature of our manufacturing sector are coming ever faster. Making sure our work force is prepared to adapt to them is critical.

Better manage our current account deficit by reducing energy imports through conservation and substitution and increasing defense burden-sharing by our allies

Obviously, reducing the trade and budget deficits will also contribute to better current-account control, but reducing our energy and defense bills would be two important steps beyond that, steps that are also justifiable on their own merits.

Following this blueprint is essential for both revitalizing our manufacturing sector and bringing our overall trade problems under control. There is a very real possibility, however, that in some specific cases we may be too late. To the extent that whole industries have already been decimated, recovery may be impossible. For example, the ability of the Japanese to understand interrelated end-use markets in the electronics sector has enabled them to take a commanding world lead in video recorders, video cameras, lens manufacturing, small precision electronic motor design, automatic camera focusing systems, 35 millimeter cameras, television sets, audio recorders, compact disk playback systems, video disk playback systems and high speed digital fiber transmission equipment.[18] The next battleground will likely be high definition television, where our industry faces the same technological, organizational and marketing challenge.

Related to that is the continuing struggle of our high-tech sector to maintain a full range of production of components and finished products, including dynamic random access memory chips. Our ability to develop new generations of products depends on investment in research and development, which in turn depends on earnings from sales of current generation products. Companies that abandon a product line are not just giving up present earnings; they are forfeiting their future.

Our success is also dependent on our ability to rise to the challenge. So long as a Japanese company can take a product from idea to pilot production in three and a half years while an American company takes over five years with about twice as many engineering hours, and so long as a Japanese company can use the same flexible manufacturing system to produce fifty products that our companies employ to make only fifteen, we will not make up the ground we have lost.

Our failure thus far to meet this challenge has meant thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in earnings surrendered overseas. We cannot get them back. We can, however, prevent the same thing from happening again, if we have the discipline and vision to follow the kind of blueprint laid out above.

Finally, President Bush must at all costs avoid a relaxed approach that hopes for favorable trends in the monthly deficit figures, a favorite media exercise. This ignores the real issues, including the serious and continuing erosion of the manufacturing sector that has been the focus of much of this article. While productivity improvements are welcome developments, they cannot substitute for the jobs lost that will not be regained, the factories closed that will not be reopened and most importantly the industries that permanently stopped producing in the United States. These consequences can only be addressed by a sea of change in our thinking. Simply put, we have to understand the primary role that economics plays in our national strength; we have to define more clearly our economic interests, both short and long term; and we have to be prepared to act aggressively to further those interests, regardless of the complaints we might receive from our trading partners. The status quo works very well for them. Nobody should be surprised if they resist changing it.

But our obligation is to pursue policies that are in our interest, not theirs. We have not done that for some years, and it is long past time to make the switch. Nearly 150 years ago, Benjamin Disraeli said, "Free trade is not a principle. It is an expedient." Free trade served the British well, and it served us well, but over the years we have forgotten Disraeli's advice and turned it into the eleventh commandment. It is past time to put it back in its rightful place—a sound policy to be pursued when circumstances and interests dictate—which may not be right now.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Clyde Prestowitz, "Let's Wake Up on Trade," *Washington Post*, 12 June 1988, p. C4.

[2] John Heinz, "Additional Views," *Senate Finance Committee Report on the Omnibus Trade Act of 1987*, Senate Report 100-71, p. 269.

[3] The data in this section are taken from Office of Technology Assessment, "Paying the Bill: Manufacturing and America's Trade Deficit," draft report, June 1988.

[4] *Ibid*, chapter 4, p. 11.

[5] William R. Hawkins, letter to the editor, *The American Spectator*, October 1985.

[6] Stephen S. Cohen and John Zysman, "The Myth of a Post-Industrial Economy," *Technology Review*, February-March 1987, p. 58. (This article was adapted from Cohen and Zysman's book, *Manufacturing Matters: The Myth of a Post-Industrial Economy.*)

[7] General Accounting Office, "Information Relating to Industries Critical to the Defense Industrial Base," draft report, 7 March 1988.

[8] Cynthia F. Mitchell, "Pentagon Eases Stand Against Foreign Stakes in U.S. Defense Firms," *Wall Street Journal*, 28 April 1988, p. 1.

[9] James Clifton, "Why Should the United States Unilaterally Downsize its Basic Industries?", unpublished monograph.

[10] Office of Technology Assessment, "Paying the Bill: Manufacturing and America's Trade Deficit," draft report, June 1988.

[11] Cordell Hull, speech at the "Trade 1984" conference, U.S. State Department, Washington, DC, 25 October 1984.

[12] World Bank, *World Development Report 1987*, p. 142.

[13] Clyde Prestowitz, "Let's Wake Up on Trade," *Washington Post*, 12 June 1988, p. C4.

[14] John C. Danforth, speech at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., April 1985. Reprinted in *Congressional Record*, 25 April 1985, p. 9428.

[15] Albert M. Wojnilower, "A Trade Deficit for All Seasons," remarks delivered to the Conference Board's 1988 Business Outlook Conference, New York, NY, 10 September 1987, p. 15.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[18] Richard Elkus, Jr., "Towards a National Strategy: The Strategy of Leverage," presentation at a conference on "Compete or Concede? CEOs Respond to the High-Tech Challenge," sponsored by Rebuild America, American Electronics Association, Congressional Clearninghouse on the Future, 13 July 1988.●

HONORING THE AMERICAN LITHUANIAN CITIZENS BENEFICIAL CLUB

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, in 1914, thousands of Lithuanians fled their Russian-occupied homeland for the sanctuary of the United States and founded the American Lithuanian Citizens Beneficial Club. Today, I join with all Rhode Islanders in congratulating this organization on 75 years of continuous service to the American Lithuanian community and to the State of Rhode Island.

For three-quarters of a century, the club has eased the transition process for Lithuanian settlers in Rhode Island. At its inception, it provided a forum for American Lithuanians to express freedom of religion and expression long suppressed under Russian rule. Later, the organization helped its members obtain American citizenship.

Sponsoring important educational, social, and philanthropic activities throughout the State, the American Lithuanian Citizens Beneficial Club is truly a valuable asset to Rhode Island. Specifically, it promotes Lithuanian culture, aids the sick and infirmed,

and instructs members in United States history.

As the club celebrates its Diamond Jubilee, we salute the continued commitment and service its members have contributed to the American Lithuanian community and the State. With great appreciation we wish them continued success in all their future endeavors.●

HONORING WILLIAM H. KELLEY UPON HIS RETIREMENT FROM NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE CO.

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased to pay tribute to William H. Kelley of Narragansett, RI, who will retire this month after 35 years of service to the New England Telephone Co. That longevity, in itself, is noteworthy, but Bill Kelley has become a fixture of Rhode Island's public life. A graduate of Providence College and an Army veteran, Bill Kelley began his work at the telephone company on August 25, 1954, and had a baptism by fire—Hurricane Carol lashed the Rhode Island coast the following day. Bill learned quickly the importance of a cool head during times of crisis.

Since those early days, Bill has distinguished himself both within his company and throughout the State of Rhode Island.

He is the past president of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, the Providence Rotary Club, and the Telephone Pioneers. He is a director of Blue Cross-Blue Shield, HMO-RI, and the Rhode Island Heart Fund, as well as a member of the executive committee of the Catholic Charity Fund.

Bill Kelley has represented his company well in his dealings with State government and as an ombudsman for customers, and he has exhibited extraordinary fortitude over the years in his appearance on local radio talk shows.

New England Telephone has recognized his value and as he retires, Bill does so with the title "Director of External Affairs."

By his side during all these years has been his wife Peg, a loving spouse and mother. They are the parents of three daughters, Mary, Margaret, and Maureen; indeed, Mary was a member of my Washington staff in the late 1970's. Bill and Peg are also the proud grandparents of four—Michael, Stephanie, Nicholas, and Joseph.

Bill Kelley is a good Rhode Islander, and we are pleased to call him friend.●

ROBYN E. HARBERT, BRIDGEPORT, WV

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure and pride that I rise to share with my colleagues a very special honor that has been bestowed to a young, fellow West Virginian, Robyn E. Harbert of Bridgeport, WV. Robyn has been honored as a Presidential scholar in the arts in writing.

I place very high importance on encouraging our youth to do well in arts and humanities. Robyn has proven herself to be one of the very best in writing. Robyn is 1 of only 20 American students who have been recognized by the White House Commission on Presidential Scholars for outstanding academic and artistic pursuits. I am particularly proud that she has received this award as it is the highest official accolade achievable by a high school senior in the United States.

It pleases me very much to see a high school student work so hard in her area of interest and be rewarded for her accomplishments. Robyn is a real tribute to her school and all other American students her age. I wholeheartedly support the President in honoring Robyn E. Harbert and West Virginia is proud to count her as one of its citizens. I am sure that my colleagues and my fellow West Virginians join me in congratulating Robyn on this outstanding achievement.●

MICHIGAMME, MI, EMERGENCY CARE SERVICE

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, few services in the communities of our Nation are as vital as emergency medical care. They are literally a lifesaving bridge and they shorten the distance between injury and recovery for thousands of Americans each day. One such emergency care unit is called the Michigamme-Spurr First Responder Team in Michigamme, MI. Recently the Michigamme Town Board recognized the work of this team with a resolution of appreciation. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and to it I add my own congratulations for a job well done.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION—FIRST RESPONDER TEAM

Whereas, the Michigamme-Spurr First Responder Team have served the area for ten years in providing emergency aid to any person in the service area; and

Whereas, these people made great personal sacrifice of their time to take the many hours of training to qualify to provide the emergency service; regardless of weather or time of day; and

Whereas, these dedicated persons have volunteered their time willingly to provide emergency medical aid to the sick and injured; and

Whereas, the First Responder Team is trained and equipped to treat and stabilize a patient until an ambulance service arrives for transport or the patient no longer desires help; and

Whereas, the 11 dedicated people on the First Responder Team; 2 licensed EMT's and 9 licensed attendants; who each carry a pager so they can be reached by Central Dispatch from the 911 number; and

Whereas, 5 faithful people of the team have served the communities for the 10 years; therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Michigamme Township Board recognizes and proclaims on this date June 26, 1989, the people who have displayed such dedication and commitment to their communities.

FIRST RESPONDER TEAM—10 YEAR'S SERVICE

Melvin Bentti, Charles Gardner, Jon Koski, Reino Linne, Karen Moore, Jane Boshears, Roxane Gardner, Linda Koski, John Leaf, Peggy Steele, Stanley Steele.

JEAN HOWE,
Clerk, Michigamme Township Board.●

STEVE LARSON

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an inspiring story of a constitutent of mine who has truly defied the odds. For so many of us, we take for granted every day tasks of being able to open a door, write a note, drive a car, or even the luxury of not being stared at as you walk down the street. But for Steve Larson who was born without arms these tasks are not automatic. His story is one of struggles as well as successes. His story is a reminder to us all that it is often those without a disability, those who do not understand firsthand the problems persons with disabilities face in our society, who have the most to overcome. Mr. President, I would like to submit for the RECORD an article entitled "Disability Is Society's Problem, Not Larson's," as printed in the Mankato Free Press on June 8, 1989. I believe you will find his story an inspiration to us all.

The article follows:

DISABILITY IS SOCIETY'S PROBLEM, NOT LARSON'S

(By Ross Gersten)

ST. PETER.—A warm June wind blows into Steve Larson's office at the Regional Treatment Center. Larson, a vocational rehabilitation counselor, gently rolls a pen on the floor with his bare feet and muses over the warning a doctor gave his mother while she was still pregnant:

"Your son is never going to lead a normal life."

In one respect, the doctor was right. Born without arms 30 years ago, Larson has traveled a rough road involving teen-age drug abuse to self-sufficiency and fatherhood.

The youngest of four brothers, Larson said his parents treated him no differently than his able-bodied siblings. As an infant he held his milk bottle with his feet, and as an older child was responsible for such household chores as shining his father's shoes.

In this environment, in the small central Minnesota town of Eagle Bend, "for the first several years, I had no insight that I was different," he said.

But at a town picnic when he was about 5 or 6, Larson was reaching for a pickle with his foot when he encountered the stares and frowns of disapproval that would forever mark his identity as a member of the world of the disabled.

"From then on, I developed the notion that I was different. Up until then, I always had a positive outlook. After that I was depressed, introverted."

Though he was mainstreamed easily into school—he had many friends and used a desk that was lowered nearly to ground level so he could write and turn pages with his feet—Larson maintained an attitude of helplessness, frequently using the word "cannot."

Finally, his father, partially disabled by a club foot, exploded.

"He slammed his fist down on the table and told me, 'I never want to hear you say that word again.' That left a big impression on me."

Afterward, Larson tried to envision difficult encounters as challenges, not problems.

When he was 10, his family moved to Brainerd. In gym class, he overcame his fear of water and became an expert swimmer. In school, he participated in such activities as theater.

Once again he was readily accepted by other children. As he discovered, "when a disabled person is comfortable with himself and articulate and can make the other individual less anxious, the chances are better for being accepted."

But entering adolescence, normally a difficult time, was especially excruciating for Larson.

Not only did he stand out for his lack of arms, he stuttered badly and, at 14, developed scoliosis, requiring him to wear a back brace until he was 17.

He became so self-conscious that going into a grocery store and reaching for an item with his foot could turn into a source of great embarrassment.

Also, around that time, he lost one of his greatest sources of encouragement, his father.

Larson turned to drugs. "I was stoned on marijuana every minute of class in the 10th grade," he said.

But he saw the route as a deadend; by the beginning of the next school year, Larson was off drugs. Over the next year, he became more independent, refusing any help in getting dressed.

He overcame the disabled's greatest barrier, transportation, by getting a 1976 Chevy Nova. Modified with controls on the floor, he was able to steer with his left foot and control the gas flow and brakes with his right.

"Getting that car was very significant; it had a lot to do with my self-esteem."

Graduating early, Larson attended a community college in Brainerd, then went to St. Olaf College in Northfield. He became a loner again, using scholarly pursuits as a convenient escape from fellow students, most of whom came from far wealthier families. He earned a bachelor's degree in psychology, again graduating early.

Enrolling at Mankato State University in 1981, he earned a master's degree in vocational rehabilitation counseling. His self-confidence again took an upswing, and he began to see the stares and frowns as the symptom of a larger problem.

"Our society is totally preoccupied with physical appearance," said Larson, who wears prosetheses mostly to make other people feel comfortable. "In Europe or Latin America, they see right through physical appearance. The attitudinal barriers are the most limiting and handicapping the disabled have to face.

"You have to have a great ego to overcome the looks and stares of disapproval from people who can't accept that [disability]."

Also, he said, the sight of disabled persons often reminds ablebodied people of their own mortality.

Shortly after getting his master's degree in June 1983, Larson got his first job, at Brown-Nicollet Industries Shelter Workshop in New Ulm, where he was a case workers with more than 670 mentally ill and mentally retarded clients.

Going to a New Ulm pizza parlor every Thursday evening, Larson came face to face with one of his most persistent fears; women.

In fall 1983, he began a friendly, flirtatious relationship with the night manager. Throughout his weekly visits, he got the feeling she wanted him to ask her out. But there was a problem—he had never dated.

"I had to overcome the fear that as a disabled person, what do I have to offer a person of the opposite sex," Larson said.

After eight monghs of hearing about this woman, a friend told Larson to put up or shut up. Larson gave himself a deadline to get up the courage to ask her out, and traded in his beat-up Chevy for a brand-new Ford Bronco to impress her.

In August 1984, on the last day of his deadline, "I finally forced myself to ask her." She said yes and they went to the movies. On the second anniversary of their first date, they were married.

"The final segment of my identity was secured. I could help other disabled people, I could take society's ignorance, I could take love and be loved."

But, internally, Larson was still fighting.

"Throughout my life, I've had extreme anger at society, at the world, at God—for the obstacles, the fears, the shame, the guilt. It's been a long process to do away with the anger."

As he was reaching outward for love, he was reaching inward for peace. He became a devout Christian, finally accepting his place in the world when he read the biblical phrase "so the glory of God can be seen."

"It was the first line in the Bible I read that explained all that, that good things can come from the bad," he said.

In April 1985, Larson started as a vocational rehabilitation counselor at the state hospital, the final lap to self-fulfillment.

"I always wanted to be a vocational counselor. . . . I've got a job where I can enjoy freedom and exercise my creativity."

Working with about 100 clients, mostly through Nicollet County, Larson also lends his services to Immanuel-St. Joseph's Hospital and Nicollet and St. Peter high schools, working with learning-disabled and emotionally troubled students.

On Jan. 18, his wife, Julie Jo, gave birth to Alexander Dane Larson, and Steve Larson entered the world of parenting.

"The evolution of my self-concept has been lifelong; it was really significant to know I could procreate."

When an ultrasound showed a tiny hand playing with the umbilical cord, "I realized I could be a part of creation without birth defects," he said.

With the same determination he uses to drive, type, bowl, throw a Frisbee, mow his lawn and garden, Larson uses his feet to clothe, feed and change his baby's diapers. While carrying him is impossible, Larson interacts with his infant son on familiar turf.

"My world is on the floor, that's where my desk is . . . and Alex is accustomed to being on the floor."

As president of Southern Minnesota Independent Living Enterprises and Services (SMILES), Larson gives his voice to a struggle he entered 30 years.

"Disabled persons have a right to access to equal opportunity and a right to be treated with dignity," he said.

"Life is a wonderful experience. I wouldn't trade this for a non-disabled life from birth because I've found such beauty and joy through all this grief."●

COSPONSORSHIP OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 78, NATIONAL HOSPICE MONTH

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senate Joint Resolution 78, a joint resolution designating November 1989 as National Hospice Month. This resolution will recognize our Nation's hospices and hospice volunteers for the quality care they provide to terminally ill individuals and their families.

Hospice was initiated in 1974 as an alternative to traditional methods of terminal care. Based on similar successful programs in England, the first hospice programs in America focused on providing palliative and supportive services in-home and in-patient setting. Today's hospices typcially employ a team approach, involving families, religious and community groups, and medical professionals in meeting the human and medical needs of terminally ill persons.

Since 1974, more than 1,700 hospice programs have been developed, with more programs formed every week. This, and the fact that one in four hospice programs are currently eligible for Medicare reimbursement, demonstrates the increasing public acceptance of the hospice concept. Just last year on April 2, 1988, Fulton County admitted its first patient. The agency served a total of 37 patients in its inaugural year, proving there is a vital need for hospice care for the terminally ill and their families.

The increased access to hospice care will be especially important in view of the aging of our population and the need to fully address the health care needs of persons with AIDS. I hope that this resolution will assist hospice programs in recruiting the additional volunteers needed to carry on with this important work.

Mr. President, it must be emphasized that hospice exists to provide as much comfort as possible to the terminally ill as well as provide support to the families. I applaud the goals of hospice, and I am pleased to cosponsor Senate Joint Resolution 78. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I urge its immediate passage.●

CHEBOYGAN, MI, CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this Sunday, July 16, the city of Cheboygan, MI, will celebrate its 100th anni-

versary with a grand community festival at Gordon Turner Park.

In the State of Michigan, you can stand anywhere and never be more than 5 miles from a lake or stream or more than 85 miles from one of the Great Lakes. No better illustration of the natural wealth of our State exists than Cheboygan, a city with a heritage inseparable from the rivers and lakes. Indeed, the name "Cheboygan" is an Indian name meaning "a water passage."

From its early days in the first half of the 19th century as a home for Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, through its incorporation as a city in 1889, to today, Cheboygan has stood the difficult tests of time to emerge as a hub of regional activity.

Visitors to this region bordered by the Straits of Mackinac have made Cheboygan a destination for tourism, including a burgeoning sport-fishing industry. Community leaders have matched the natural beauty of the area with plans for controlled growth that enhances opportunity for residents and protects environmental resources for us all.

Congratulations to the citizens of Cheboygan on the city's first 100 years and best wishes on the century of progress to come.●

THE BLUE KNIGHTS DRUM AND BUGLE CORPS OF COLORADO

● Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, today, I would like to recognize an outstanding youth organization in Colorado. The Blue Knights Drum and Bugle Corps of Colorado is a nonprofit organization that has been instrumental to the education and maturity of young people. Members of the Blue Knights range from 14 to 21 years of age and are brought together because of their love of music. In a typical summer, the Blue Knights travel over 10,000 miles coast to coast throughout the United States and Canada. During these travels, the corps performs in over 30 contests, parades, and other events.

For the past 3 decades, the drum and bugle corps has provided hundreds of young people with an education of a lifetime. Prospective members are evaluated on their desire to achieve more than their individual talent or basic skills. Through a commitment to the Blue Knights, young adults learn new responsibilities while enhancing self-esteem.

Youth are learning the gratification of participating in a group that is based on common goals and interests. The self-discipline of being a Knight teaches individuality while providing an opportunity to participate in an outstanding musical organization. It has been said that the strength of our country is with our youth, and the Blue Knights exemplify that statement.

The Blue Knights are a flagship for success. This highly competitive musical group is on the threshold of being a premier organization in the world. For the members of the Blue Knights, the dream is becoming a reality. Colorado is proud to have such an excellent group representing our great State.●

NATIONAL SIBLINGS OF DISABLED PERSONS DAY

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a resolution to designate Friday, September 29, 1989, as National Siblings of Disabled Persons Day.

Inspired by the tremendous love, courage, and devotion generated by the brothers and sisters of our country's 37 million disabled citizens, this resolution will set aside 1 day in the year 1989 to honor all who partake in this special relationship. The members of this group who will be honored have dedicated time and effort to aid their siblings. Their support helps to lower the barriers which their siblings' handicaps present, allowing them to progress and achieve their full potential.

A group of siblings who are particularly active is Siblings For Significant Change, a New York-based advocacy group. This organization eases the strain of helping the handicapped by providing legal and counseling services to caregivers. The organization publishes a newsletter, provides informational media programs, and conducts workshops and conferences for siblings of the disabled. By establishing a network of caring and support, the group provides an invaluable source of strength and renewal for those helping the handicapped. Siblings For Significant Change is an excellent example of what private citizens can do to improve society and shines as one of the thousands points of light which brighten the lives of others.

Mr. President, in recognition of the outstanding efforts of those who help disabled brothers and sisters lead happier and more fulfilling lives, this resolution proposes designating Friday, September 29, 1989, as National Siblings of Disabled Persons Day. A dedicated and unselfish sibling is one of life's greatest treasures, deserving our respect and gratitude. By honoring them, we underscore their importance to the American family.●

CHARLES S. RIVCHUN, CLEVELAND, OH

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I rise today to mark the passing of a milestone. Yesterday, July 10, 1989, Charles S. Rivchun of Cleveland, OH, celebrated his 100th birthday. I ask my colleagues to take a moment today to honor him.

To say that Charles Rivchun is an experienced businessman would be one of the great understatements of all time. He has been in the jewelry business for longer than most people live. He began his career at the ripe old age of 14 years, and continues to this day to be an active participant in the daily operation of the family business.

The community that he serves and the customers that he has satisfied over the years know him as a man of integrity and fairness. He has a reputation as a consummate professional and a considerate person. It is a reputation well earned through decades of service to the public.

But I have the great good fortune of knowing Charles Rivchun a little better than most people, and I would like to share some personal observations of the man. He has a strong sense of family. He has been a loving husband, father, father-in-law, grandfather and great-grandfather. His three sons and their wives, and their children and grandchildren have been blessed with a close and warm family relationship.

It should also be recognized that this highly skilled tradesman, this astute and shrewd businessman, continues to have a definite passionate spot in his heart for the newly engaged couples he meets. I know that his kindness to those couples is long remembered as a cherished moment in their lives, as it was for my Shirley and me.

Mr. President, I know all my colleagues join me in honoring Charles Rivchun, a man dedicated to his family, his business, and his community. We wish him continued health, happiness, and prosperity for years to come.●

MORE VIGILANCE NEEDED IN WESTERN ALLIANCE FINANCIAL SECURITY

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I am going to offer an amendment to the State Department authorization bill that in substance is the same as Senate Resolution 132, adopted by the Senate on May 18, 1989, unanimously expressing concern with recent Soviet economic initiatives, particularly their push to raise funds in Western capital markets. The resolution that we adopted called on the President of the United States to consult with leaders of our allies about the potentially adverse impact on Western security from Soviet financial activities.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

It is important that the Senate once more advise the President and the Secretary of State that we have serious concern about what is happening with the Soviet penetration of Western capital markets.

Tomorrow night on the Public Broadcasting System there will be an hour-long documentary program that I would urge my colleagues to watch: The producers of the weekly public affairs discussion program, "American Interests," have produced a special report entitled "Follow the Money," which presents facts and figures about this growing danger of Soviet penetration of Western capital markets to finance their bankrupt economic system.

The amendment I am offering today is an attempt to get the administration to address this fundamental question in East-West relations, that is, how is the Soviet Union financing itself? We are all very well aware the Soviet Union is facing very serious economic problems. The Soviet Prime Minister himself openly admitted to the Congress of People's Deputies the Soviet economy is in trouble. Yet, despite their economic problems the Soviet Union continues to be able to spend between 17 to 25 percent of its GNP on its military. During the mid-1980's the Soviet Union spent some $27 billion in aid, credits, and subsidies on its allies.

It is my contention, shared by many of our colleagues here, that part of the answer to that question lies in the Western banking system. Recently the Soviets have been extremely active in raising money in Western capital markets and it is highly likely that some of that money is being used to finance activities that are hostile to Western interests. This is possible because there are few controls on the funds going to the Soviet Union, which makes it possible for them to divert it to other, noncommercial purposes.

This being the case, the American taxpayer is faced with a twofold cost. First, American banks, and ultimately the American taxpayer, are helping to finance our adversaries. Second, it increases the cost to us to maintain our vigilance and defense against threats to our interests.

Mr. President, I am offering this amendment requesting the President to immediately begin consultations with our allies at the forthcoming economic summit in Paris because I strongly believe that we can no longer afford to ignore this very important aspect of relations with the Soviet bloc.

I must say, in all candor, that there is no evidence the administration responded in any way to the sense-of-the-Senate resolution (S. Res. 132) which we adopted on May 18, 1989, requesting the President to raise this issue at the NATO meetings in Brussels, May 29-30. It is very disappointing to this Senator to see the Senate's advisory role taken so lightly by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State.

But frankly, Mr. President, this Senator is not eager to press forward with substantive legislation to impose penalties or to impose administrative controls because American banks and other financial institutions are not the ones primarily encouraging the problem I want to see addressed. The danger is one that arises because of the lending activities of European and Japanese banks and the attitudes of their governments that pumping hard currency into the Soviet economy is good business. I want the President to take the lead—as we are the leader of the Western alliance—to focus our Allies' attention on this problem.

We must be very careful about what money flows from West to East and what it is ultimately used for. What is needed is more discipline and control in our financial dealings with the Soviet bloc. This is essential for the sake of peace and security of the United States and of the free world.

The text of the amendment to be proposed follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE —

It is the sense of the Senate that during the Economic Summit meetings in Paris, July 14-16, 1989, the President of the United States should consult with the leaders of allied countries on the potentially adverse impact on Western security of tied and untied loans, trade credits, direct investments, joint ventures, lines of credit, and guarantees or other subsidies to the Soviet Union, Warsaw Pact countries, Cuba, Vietnam, Libya, and Nicaragua.●

DEDICATION OF THE STROM THURMOND INSTITUTE AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on April 22, I had the pleasure of joining Vice President QUAYLE and other distinguished guests at the formal dedication of the Strom Thurmond Institute of Government and Public Affairs at Clemson University. Of course, here in the U.S. Senate, STROM THURMOND is a kind of institution within an institution. Yet the fact is that his career and influence transcend the confines of this body. By any measure, STROM ranks as an authentic legend of 20th-century American politics. He has attained that status not just on the strength of the causes he has championed, but equally on the strength of his character: the extraordinary courage and tenacity and vigor that are his trademarks in politics.

In 1981, Senator THURMOND announced that his public papers and memorabilia would be entrusted to Clemson University, his alma mater. That gift became the cornerstone of the Strom Thurmond Center for Excellence in Government and Public Service, which has now sprouted a magnificent new building on the Clemson campus housing the Thurmond Institute. The institute is a nonpartisan organization dedicated both to academic research and to programs aimed at stimulating citizen participation in government. I am sure I speak for the entire Senate in congratulating Clemson University on the dedication of the Thurmond Institute, and in wishing the institute the best of luck. Certainly it will have its work cut out for it living up to the standard of excellence and public service of its namesake, our very distinguished colleague, STROM THURMOND.

Mr. President, I have a transcript of excerpts from remarks delivered by Vice President QUAYLE and others at the April 22 dedication ceremony. I request that these excerpts be printed in the RECORD.

The excerpts follow:

STROM THURMOND INSTITUTE DEDICATION, APRIL 22, 1989, CLEMSON, SC, EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS

Venerable FREDRICK C. BYRD, Archdeacon of the Episcopal Diocese of upper South Carolina. Let us pray.

Father God, we thank You for Your presence this day, as we set apart this Institute for sound learning, for new discoveries, and for the pursuit of wisdom. Grant that those who teach and those who learn may find You to be the source of all truth and beauty. Father, You gave the gift of vision to those who planned this enterprise. We thank You. You gave the gift of insight to the donors who have made it possible. We thank You. You have given the gift of public service and statesmanship to Strom, who has touched so many of our lives. We thank You. Direct and bless, O Lord, those who will speak, and learn, and search in this place. And help us in word and deed to promote the well being of all of our people and to preserve that which is true, and pure, and good. In the Holy Name of Christ, we pray. Amen.

Mr. BUCK MICKEL [moderator]. It has truly been the most personally enriching experience of my life to be associated with the Strom Thurmond Institute, and it is a part of my life that I will cherish forever.

I would like to publicly thank Senator and Mrs. Thurmond for their tireless dedication to this most important project. As I have contacted people from across the State regarding the Strom Thurmond Institute, I have been amazed at the responses which I have received. Senator Thurmond has done so much for the State of South Carolina. He has touched so many lives, and the people of our State have such respect and admiration for him. It has been my honor to know and work with Senator Thurmond and to be a part of this dedication of the Strom Thurmond Institute.

Dr. MAX LENNON, President, Clemson University. Welcome, ladies and gentlemen. We are here tonight to honor a very special person, a very special family.

For me it is an inspiration as I admire Senator Strom Thurmond as a person, as a diplomat, as a political leader in South Carolina, and as one of the most highly respected men in Washington, D.C. I do not know that I have ever met a person like him, because as you know, as you get busier and busier with all the assignments that are attributed to you, you have less and less time for other people. But Senator Thurmond anytime anyone asks, stops and listens in a most unique way. He is one of our

most distinguished graduates, so as President of Clemson University, it is spine tingling to be a part of an occasion such as this when we gather to begin to celebrate such a person.

We assemble ourselves with a group of admirers and supporters, Senator, in such a way that not only a building, but a program is being put in place that will live forever. It will be a constant reminder to people for many, many generations of what can be done in this great Country.

Represe. tative BUTLER DERRICK. Mr. Vice President, it's nice to have you in South Carolina, Prime Minister Charles, Senator Thurmond, Senator Hollings, Governor Campbell and President Lennon. In 200 years, about 11,200 men and women have served in the United States Senate and House. History will recognize only a handful of these Legislators who are making lasting contributions to their states, their nation and their time. I am proud to be able to tell you that we have someone here today who will be remembered by historians as both a leader and statesman of his time, Senator Strom Thurmond. His commitment to our State and our Nation has spanned more than 66 years. First as a teacher in Edgefield County, where we are both from, and other positions and now as a United States Senator. It is my privilege to serve with him in the Congress of the United States.

Senator HOLLINGS. Today we honor the revolutionary. In 1941, immune from military service as a result of his post as Circuit Judge in South Carolina, Strom revolted against that immunity, volunteered, landed on D-Day in Normandy, won a Purple Heart and was decorated 18 times by three countries. In 1947 as a young Governor, he revolted against community opinion and pressured the prosecution of 31 white men for the lynching of Willie Earl, a black man. South Carolina has not had a lynching since. In 1948, Strom said originally there was not a dime's worth of difference between the two parties, and he organized a third one, ran as its presidential nominee and won more electoral votes than George McGovern and Fritz Mondale put together. In 1954, he revolted against the selection of a Senate nominee by the South Carolina Democratic Executive Committee and ran and was elected as the first and only write-in United States Senator in history.

I could go on, but we have a distinguished main speaker here, the Vice President, today. My point is that whenever the crisis arose, Strom met it without a political poll, with conviction and courage, as a leader, and he was right. Absolutely fearless, he would debate you around the clock, and he would wrestle you to the floor. Absolutely tireless, he is in constant motion for the people of South Carolina.

People who say they do not trust politicians anymore may be waiting for politicians to behave as though they trust the people. Strom Thurmond trusts the people. He is the epitome of public service, a constant inspiration to me. It is entirely appropriate that this Institute be named for Strom Thurmond. You know, habitually, a university to honor a person, would name a building or institute after them, but today this is the reverse. Clemson University is honored by its association with South Carolina's greatest statesman, Strom Thurmond.

Prime Minister EUGENIA CHARLES. It is not often that politicians are recognized while they are still alive and still serving. You are fortunate, Senator Thurmond, that the years you have served have allowed you the opportunity of seeing your public service appreciated. Perhaps the most striking memory for me of this occasion is the unassuming manner, the laid back attitude, with which you have accepted the recognition given to you by this inauguration and the naming of the Institute for you.

Listening and observing you this weekend would lead one to believe you are saying, "That is all well and good. Thanks to all of you who have made this Institute a reality. But let us get on with what really matters—ensuring that this Institute performs the task we have envisioned for it—that it be influential in making America a better place for all who live in it." I can understand your motives, though I still marvel at the attitude that you have shown.

On behalf of my country, I pledge our fullest cooperation with the Institute so that we together can build a better world.

Gov. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL Jr. The legacy of service to the people of South Carolina that was established a century ago by Thomas Green Clemson is personified in the man Strom Thurmond, a 1923 graduate of this University.

Those of you who might know me have probably heard me say that I probably would not be Governor if it were not for Senator Thurmond, and the direction which he has provided me throughout my political career. I am one of the few people in politics today who has never worked for him, but I have learned a lot from him.

Over the years I have learned many lessons from Senator Thurmond—not the least of which is to never forget where you come from. This is the epitome of the leadership that Strom Thurmond has provided throughout his career. There is not a person in South Carolina who has not been touched by the work of Strom Thurmond. Whether it happens to be the roads of South Carolina, the schools of South Carolina, the jobs that are created in this State, Strom Thurmond has had a hand in it. All of us have benefited from his commitment to our State.

Today we dedicate the Strom Thurmond Institute to the future leaders of this State. In addition to providing a forum for the exchange of ideas and the development of new ideas, 36 tons of Senator Thurmond's papers and materials will be archived here as a part of South Carolina's history. He just sent half of it, I think. As you know, Senator Thurmond is a frugal man. Frugal with our tax dollars as he is with his own dollars. He has never been known to throw anything away which might serve a useful purpose in the future, whether a scrap of paper or a paper clip.

Senator Thurmond, for all the opportunities that you provided the people, and for all of the lives that you have touched through your generosity and compassion, we thank you.

Vice President QUAYLE. When I was talking to President Bush yesterday and we were going over our weekend plans, I told him that I would be coming here. He has fond memories of when he was here, Strom, as the Vice President at the groundbreaking ceremony. Now, I am here as Vice President at the dedication, and I cannot wait for what the next Vice President will be doing down at the Strom Thurmond Institute. I am not only personally delighted and honored to be here, but to share the President's comments to me, to you and to Nancy and your family, the friends of Clemson and the friends of yours who are gathered here in South Carolina. President George Bush said of Strom Thurmond to me, "Strom Thurmond is, in fact, one of the outstanding public servants in our American history."

That you truly are, Strom. As I have moved on to the Office of Vice President, some might not say up but on, Fritz and Strom would appreciate this, a friend of mine in Washington the other day introduced me as a former Senator, somebody who used to have an important position in Washington, D.C.

I can recall with fond memory, many times in the United States Senate, walking in and there being a Thurmond amendment or a Thurmond bill on the floor. You would walk down the aisle to find out exactly what it is, and Strom would be there to coach you. Fritz knows what I am talking about, too. The coaching of Strom Thurmond is a very firm grasp of his hand around your bicep, saying very gently in that southern language that he speaks so well, "I need your vote." If there was any procrastination, the tighter the grip got; And I learned very quickly, Fritz, I don't know about you, I said yes early on. Because Strom Thurmond is tenacious. If you don't believe me, you can see the imprint that is still with me from Strom Thurmond for my years of service with him in the United States Senate.

Not only was he willing to gently and politely take on his colleagues in the Senate, I will always remember the diplomacy and the artful skill of your senior Senator from South Carolina in a meeting with President Ronald Reagan one day talking about his favorite issue—textiles. There was a group of about 10 or 15 of us. We were all sitting there and the President was standing, and all of a sudden Strom Thurmond rose, and we knew what was on his mind. We knew that here was the President of the United States and Senator Strom Thurmond. We were wondering who was going to win this one. Strom, in his very best, says, "Mr. President," and you know what a supporter Strom was of Ronald Reagan, "you know I love you, and I respect you and I always vote with you. But on this issue, Mr. President, you're getting bad advice from your advisers." Then he commenced to chew out the advisers right in front of the President of the United States. That is your Senator!

I certainly believe that in participating in this dedication ceremony here today, all of us are helping to launch a unique educational institution. A home not only for books and scholars and archives, but for ideas. Ideas that will shape the future of our nation. Indeed I would go so far as to say that nothing is more decisive for the health and well being of a country than the ideas its people have about the fundamental issues of public policy.

Fortunately we live at a time in history when the idea of freedom—free elections, free markets, freedom of choice—has captured the imagination of the world. Once it was competently asserted that socialism was the wave of the future. Today even the socialist countries know better. Today it is clear that freedom works, the market works, not just here in America, but nations everywhere in the world.

The question facing us today is this; How do we transform the promise of freedom into a better life for all Americans and for all of mankind? How do we design public policies that promote growth, that foster opportunity and that strengthen the peace? These are the issues that Strom Thurmond has been concerned with throughout his long and distinguished public career—issues

that the occupants of this building will be pondering in the years to come.

Of course, you and I all know that there are no final answers. Every discovery opens up new avenues of inquiry. Every policy idea poses new issues, new complexities and all sorts of unexpected twists and turns; and though the journey is an endless one, it is very much worth making. For in the very process of making it, we find that we, too, are somewhat transformed. We grow rich with experience, ripe with wisdom and razor-sharp with knowledge. In short, we become a little bit like the man who we are honoring today, Strom Thurmond.

So, Strom, I congratulate you on this remarkable building that bears your name, your heritage, things that you stand for. I can only hope that along with your papers and your memorabilia, a bit of your spirit has entered into these walls to inspire and instruct the men and women who will follow in your footsteps. Strom Thurmond, you as an individual, are an institution. You are the one that has advanced the power of ideas. You have put ideas on the table, you have waged the philosophical and ideological battles throughout your public service. And so today we are here to dedicate the Strom Thurmond Institute in your name, for your heritage and for what you have done not just for South Carolina, but for a nation and for our world. Thank you, congratulations on a job well done, and God Bless you and your family.

Mrs. NANCY MOORE THURMOND. Vice President Quayle, Dr. Lennon, Dr. Fleming, family and friends. It is a great pleasure for me to respond on behalf of our family at the dedication of the Strom Thurmond Institute. As I sat here listening to these distinguished and illustrious speakers, I thought back to the time that our youngest child, our son Paul, was talking to his young friend, Brandon Fitch of Aiken. Brandon asked Paul why we live in South Carolina and his Dad worked in Washington. Paul scratched his head and said, "That is simple. Dad could not get a job in South Carolina."

Strom mentioned that he was graduated from Clemson 66 years ago this spring. Now, I well remember the good old Tiger days myself when shortly before we were married, Coach Frank Howard pinned a corsage on my lapel and said, "Nancy, honey, have you heard the news? The Atlanta Constitution just ran an article announcing the birth of Strom's third wife." Yes, the future is bright, both for the Institute and for Strom Thurmond.

Over the years, Strom has been so very interested in Clemson University. He once even tried to give our children to the Institute along with all his papers and memorabilia. On behalf of our entire family, from our senior, most admired and loved member, Gertrude Thurmond, who could not be here today, to our littlest angels, Ashile Cook, Brian Young and John Andrew Bishop, we say thank you for honoring Strom in such a meaningful and lasting way.

To Dan Quayle, our dynamic Vice President, we express our deepest gratitude for your presence here today. Dan, you have truly put the mission of the Strom Thurmond Institute on the map.

To our elected leaders, our distinguished Governor, Carroll Campbell; my Senator, Fritz Hollings, and Peatsy; my Congressman, Butler Derrick, and Beverly; God's miracle Congressman Floyd Spence, and all of our other elected officials, for your participation here today, we say from the heart, thank you.

And last, to you, Strom. You are incredible. You are one in a million. When you were born, God did away with the mold. Strom, you have made us very proud. We appreciate you for your compassion and selfless desire to help your fellow man. We respect you for your integrity and sterling character. We admire you for your energy, stamina and vitality. And we love you because we just cannot help it. Strom, your mother and your father must be smiling proudly down on this day on their son, J. Strom. Now that you have had your day in the sun, knowing you Strom, as I do, you will not rest on your laurels, but will work even harder to do your very best as you serve the people of our state and nation. When the Great Scorer comes to mark against your name, He will surely say, "Well done my good and faithful servant."

We thank all of you who, by your presence here, have demonstrated that through education and the pursuit of excellence, we can climb to the top of the mountain and meet the challenges of tomorrow. An old Chinese proverb summarizes what I envision for the Strom Thurmond Institute and the role it will play for generations to come. The Chinese proverb goes like this: I hear and I forget. I see and I remember. I do and I understand.

God Bless you, Strom and God Bless all of you. Thank you.

Dr. Horace Fleming, Director, Strom Thurmond Institute

To Senator Thurmond. It is very difficult to say thanks to Senator Thurmond. You try many different ways, and there is just no way adequately to do it. But he is a unique individual. I have a favorite saying and it is as follows. So many of you can identify with this. It is attributed to many different persons, but I attribute it originally to Sir Isaac Newton. It goes like this, "If I have seen further, it is by standing upon the shoulders of Giants." Senator, we thank you for allowing so many of us to stand upon your shoulders. We have seen more and we have been further than we ever could have hoped without that. God Bless you Senator and Mrs. Thurmond. God Bless each of you here.●

THE FEDERAL EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT [EITC] IS A REALISTIC TAX RELIEF PROGRAM THAT IS NEEDED TO HELP THE POOR

● Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, today I wish to share with my colleagues a column written by Robert J. Samuelson which recently appeared in the Washington Post. Mr. Samuelson endorses the earned income tax credit program [EITC] as the preferred means of aiding low-income workers with one or more dependent children.

Mr. Samuelson states correctly that the poor must pull themselves out of poverty by joining the work force. I agree that the Government can best assist the poor by helping them help themselves. That's why I have introduced legislation to expand the existing program.

The column goes on to express dissatisfaction with proposals simply to increase the minimum wage because neither the poor nor family heads typically work for minimum wages. Usually teenagers fill this role. Ultimately, the minimum wage bill as it stands would not help the people it was created for.

Mr. President, we need to take constructive steps to help the poor people of America. The EITC is not a Government handout. It merely reduces the tax burden of the working poor. I encourage my fellow Senators to consider Mr. Samuelson's column carefully, and to join me in support of legislation to help the poor by expanding the EITC.

Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Samuelson's column be printed in full in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

HELP THE WORKING POOR

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

If we have learned anything about curing poverty, it is that the most important kind of help is self-help. Government programs don't pull people out of poverty; people pull themselves out of poverty. That's why the problem of the "underclass" is so stubborn. People in the underclass aren't just poor. They're so unemployable, hopeless or welfare-dependent that they've lost the ability or the will to overcome their poverty.

By that point, the chances of government even helping are slim. What government can best do—but isn't—is to help those who help themselves. It can provide tax relief for the working poor. This is the most straightforward way of aiding many poor parents and their children. The poorest workers deserve to keep all their wages. Taxes simply push them closer to welfare, where their prospects diminish and they become a burden on society. Tax relief is common sense and fortunately there's a mechanism to provide it: the federal earned income tax credit (EITC).

The credit is refundable, which means that the poorest workers get money from the government. The credit is now 14 percent for workers with children (others aren't eligible) on earnings up to $6,500. The maximum credit of $910 applies until earnings reach $10,240 and then is phased out. This maximum credit should be raised to somewhere between $2,500 and $3,000, with a larger credit for larger families. The credit should also be phased out more gradually, so that working parents with incomes up to about $20,000 would have their federal taxes cut significantly.

What's interesting is that liberal and conservative poverty specialists have reached a striking consensus that expanding the EITC is desirable. "It rewards people for taking responsibility for their own lives," says Robert Rector of the conservative Heritage Foundation. And, writes liberal economist David Ellwood of Harvard in his book, "Poor Support" (Basic Books, 1988): "People are helped without any need of a stigmatizing, invasive, and often degrading welfare system. . . ."

So what are Congress and the president doing? Almost nothing. They want to be seen as helping poor families—without finding the money. It's cynical political theater.

There are some worthy proposals. Reps. Thomas Petri, Republican of Wisconsin, and Thomas Downey, Democrat of New York, have offered plans to increase the EITC. President Bush's child-care program involves a new tax credit for working parents of children under the age of 4. But these

modest proposals aren't going anywhere, and the Bush plan aims mainly to prevent Democrats from stealing the child-care issue. Most Democrats pretend they're helping the working poor by favoring direct child-care subsidies and a higher minimum wage. These measures would aid the poor in haphazard and ineffective ways.

Consider first the minimum wage. The House and Senate have passed legislation raising it to $4.55 an hour by late 1991, up from the current $3.35. Bush, who has supported an increase only to $4.25, is expected to veto the congressional measure. He should. Congress is raising the minimum for only two reasons. First, it's something for nothing; it seems to provide a benefit without requiring Congress to vote for higher spending. And second, more than 70 percent of the public supports a higher minimum.

But this enthusiasm reflects bad information. Minimum-wage workers are not primarily from poor families. Nor are they family heads. Mostly, they are teen-agers and young adults (nearly 60 percent are under 25) or second earners. In 1988, less than one in seven was a family head. The main effects of raising the minimum would be to increase inflation and unemployment slightly. Businesses would react by either boosting prices or providing fewer job opportunities for the least-skilled workers.

Day-care subsidies are an even more dubious exercise. Under legislation approved by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, families could receive subsidies if they place children in paid day-care arrangements. Families with up to a state's median income (almost $33,000 nationally) would be eligible. Government should help needy families, regardless of how they raise their children. It shouldn't subsidize one style of child rearing over another. This bill would do precisely that.

If mom and dad juggle work schedules so one parent is always home, they wouldn't get a subsidy. If grandma takes care of the child free, there would be no subsidy. Even a single mother who uses a day-care center might miss the subsidy because the eligible population dwarfs the likely funding. Perhaps 1 million children out of an eligible population of 18 million could be subsidized with the authorized $2.5 billion. The legislation's popularity is based on its "appearance of generosity" and "false hopes" as Sen. Nancy Kassebaum, Republican of Kansas, notes. It's political grandstanding. The point is to deceive.

Providing extra cash to a whole class of working parents is more honest and effective. Everyone who is eligible gets a benefit. It lets parents decide what their most pressing needs are. It minimizes bureaucratic overhead costs. Because some families receive money from the government, it's easy to see the EITC as a handout. That's wrong. For the poorest workers, even an expanded EITC would only crudely offset all their nonincome taxes: Social Security, excise and state and local sales taxes. For better-paid workers, it would merely reduce their total tax burden.

In an era of big budget deficits, government need not be paralyzed. Good programs can be financed by ending less worthy spending programs or tax breaks. The expanded EITC outlined here would probably cost about $10 billion. There are ways to raise that money. An existing tax credit for child-care expenses costs the government about $4 billion annually. It should be eliminated. Three quarters of the benefits go to the wealthiest half of families; only 3 percent go to the poorest 30 percent. Another $5.5 billion could be raised by requiring that capital-gains taxes be paid on stocks and bonds when the owner dies.

It should be easy for liberals and conservatives to agree to help the working poor. The only obstacle is hard political work—making choices and upsetting some constituents. Sadly, it's quite an obstacle. Much as the working poor deserve tax relief, they probably won't get it.●

POLISH PROGRESS TOWARD FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, June 28, 1989 marked the 33d anniversary of the Polish workers' revolt of 1956—a violent and tragic day in Poland's history. Unfortunately, June 28, 1956, was but a prolog to the long struggle of the Polish people against its Communist oppressors. As we commemorate the anniversary of the 1956 revolt, however, we cannot ignore the recent and promising moves which Poland has made toward democracy.

On June 28, 1956, workers rioted in protest over severe and protracted food shortages. The intensity of worker unrest in 1956 brought an impending political crisis to a head, and ushered in the return of Wladyslaw Gomulka to power. Under Gomulka's leadership, Soviet reintervention in Polish affairs was successfully resisted. For 6 years, the acquiescence of Soviet political authority allowed Poland to undertake a substantial economic reform program betwen 1964 and 1970. Yet, despite progress in economic reform, the Polish economy continued to languish under Moscow's lumbering economic and political controls.

In 1976, 1978, and in July 1980, cycles of popular unrest—largely in reaction to Poland's chronic economic ills—continued to challenge the legitimacy of the Communist government. By the early 1980's, the Polish labor movement had coalesced into a vital and coherent popular force behind democracy and the secession of Poland from Soviet domination. Both the consolidation of Poland's labor movement, and the recent strides towards liberal reform in the Soviet Union, have led to the recent political developments in Poland.

During the past 3 months, there have been unprecedented moves by the Polish Communist Party to incorporate the democratic labor union movement into the political process. In April, the Communist Party and opposition groups reached an agreement on the shape of Poland's new legislative apparatus. According to the April roundtable agreement, 161 seats of the 460-seat Polish parliament—the Sejm—were opened to contest between party and opposition candidates in the election of June 4. In addition to reform of the Sejm, the roundtable participants created an upper house of 100 Senators. The new Senate may veto any legislation which originates in the Sejm. Senate vetos can be overrided by the Sejm, however, with a two-thirds vote. All 100 seats of the Senate were opened to party and opposition candidates in the June 18 election.

On June 4, Solidarity candidates won almost 35 percent of the Sejm, taking 160 of the 161 available seats. On June 18, 99 of the 100 Senate seats fell to Solidarity. Legislation from the Sejm can now be effectively blocked by opposition representatives. The results of both elections represent both a clear vote of support for the Solidarity movement and lack of confidence in the Communist Party leadership. As a block, Solidarity can now effectively veto any government legislation that is proposed in the Sejm.

Mr. President, I can only look upon the recent election successes of Solidarity as a free and clear expression of the Polish people's will. However, the future of United States-Polish relations will depend on the Polish Government keeping its word to the people of Poland. Furthermore, United States economic and technological assistance to Poland will also be contingent on the Polish Government's actions.

I believe that President Bush's visit to Poland this week is another encouraging step in United States-Polish relations. For the first time during an official state visit, a U.S. President was greeted by a representative of Solidarity, and President Bush was allowed to meet with Solidarity leader Lech Walesa. President Bush offered a $115 million aid package, on Monday, before a session of Poland's new Senate. One hundred million dollars of the package will be directed to assistance of Poland's private sector. The remaining $15 million will be spent on an environmental cleanup of Krakow. In addition to the $115 million package, the President promised Poland's Senate that he will press for approval of $325 million in loans to Poland now being considered by the World Bank.

I believe that the President's proposals are promising and signify a new beginning in United States-Polish relations. Mr. President, today I urge my colleagues to join me in voicing my support for Solidarity and the Polish people and their efforts to promote freedom and democracy in Poland.●

GWENDOLYN BROOKS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, for more than 40 years Gwendolyn Brooks has been enriching American literature with her poetry. She has continued to capture and convey the many different aspects of black American culture through her poetry topics, which range from poor children and

racial discrimination, to peace, happiness, and the celebration of life. Ms. Brooks has painted a vivid picture of black culture, its strengths and weaknesses, and its impact on society.

Gwendolyn Brooks' zest for life coupled with her passion for writing makes her one of the most loved and well respected poets in America. Her books, lectures, and readings come from the heart.

Jacqueline Trescott, a reporter for the Washington Post writes:

In the late 60's, the time she [Ms. Brooks] considers the most exciting of her life, she became an example to the younger generation of vocal and political black poets as a writer who lived what she wrote.

She has lived in the same frame house and modest neighborhood for 32 years where she has maintained close ties with the concerns and changes of her neighborhood. "She has, more than any other nationally acclaimed writer, remained in touch with the community she writes about," says poet Hari Madhubuti. "She is her work."

The following poem, taken from her book "Street," is an example of her work and conjures up an image of the underlying racial tone and social class tension that existed during the 1960's. In her poem, "At the hairdresser," she writes:

Gimme an unsweep, Minnie
With humpteen baby curls.
'Bout time I got some glamour
I'll show them girls.
Think they so fly a-struttin'
With they wool a-blowin 'round
Wait'll they see my unsweep
That'll jop 'em back on the ground.

Ms. Brooks has made an important contribution to American literature. Her success is obvious from the overflowing number of requests she receives to give lectures and readings. She has also received two of the most prestigious poet awards: In 1950 she won the Pulitzer Prize for poetry, the only black American woman to achieve this honor. In addition, she was the successor to Carl Sandburg as poet laureate of Illinois, a distinguished title that has earned her worldwide respect and recognition.

Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to announce Gwendolyn Brooks as the recipient of the Senior Fellowship Award, which is founded by the National Endowment for the Arts. This award is evidence that she is an inspiration to young writers throughout the world.

I congratulate Gwendolyn Brooks for winning the Senior Fellowship Award and for her success and contribution to American culture, which is richer thanks to her work.●

PRESIDENT BUSH'S TRIP TO POLAND

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, yesterday, President Bush addressed the newly elected Polish parliament—the first elected parliament in the Eastern bloc with a substantial opposition membership. I am very pleased that President Bush has been allowed this opportunity. His trip to Poland represents a unique opportunity to strengthen our relationship with Poland, and, more importantly, an opportunity to encourage the kind of open political and economic system to which every nation should be entitled.

In his remarks, President Bush has expressed his desire to work with this Congress to help pass an economic assistance package which will help boost Poland's troubled economy. As a strong supporter of Solidarity, and as an original cosponsor of S. 1183, the Democracy in Eastern Europe Act of 1989 which provides economic assistance to Poland, I welcome his remarks.

I firmly believe that we must provide the necessary support and assistance that will continue Poland down its road toward further democratization. I look forward to working with the administration, the newly elected Polish congress, and my Senate colleagues toward this endeavor, and wish the President my best during his European trip.●

CONGRESSIONAL CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL ON BEHALF OF ANATOLY GENIS

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, recent statistics from the United States Department of State and the National Conference on Soviet Jewry show that for the past few years the number of Jews emigrating from the Soviet Union has been rapidly increasing. During the early 1980's emigration for Soviet Jews dropped as low as approximately 1,000 emigrants a year. Since that time, new thinking in the Soviet Union, brought about by General Secretary Gorbachev's programs of perestroika and glasnost as well as continued pressure from the West, have opened the way for substantial improvement in the areas of Soviet human rights. It is expected that an unprecedented 60,000 Jews will emigrate from the Soviet Union this year.

In spite of these encouraging statistics, I believe that we must continue to pressure the Soviet leadership to release the 200,000 Jews whose applications for emigration have yet to be approved. I commend my fellow colleagues and those individuals and organizations throughout the United States who also have spoken out on behalf of Soviet Jews wishing to emigrate. Although, our efforts are showing signs of success, we must continue to pressure the Soviet Government.

Mr. President, today I once again join the Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil on behalf of one Soviet Jew who has not been allowed to emigrate, Anatoly Genis. Possessing a doctorate degree in mathematics from Moscow University, Mr. Genis' specialty is the theory of probability. Mr. Genis applied for emigration in 1977 and was refused in 1979. Mr. Genis was told that his application was denied because it was believed that he held "State Secrets," which he could have obtained while working at an electronic mechanical institute. Anatoly Genis believes that was an unfair excuse for refusal, because while he worked at the institute his director, who would have had access to more secret information than Mr. Genis, often traveled to the West without any hinderance due to the information which he possessed.

Since his first attempt to emigrate, Mr. Genis has become a target of Soviet persecution. Consequently, he has been entirely forced out of the field of mathematics. Unable to find a job as a mathematician, Mr. Genis worked for many years at odd jobs in order to support his family. At one point he worked 14 hours a day as a heavy laborer. He has three children, one of whom suffers from Cushings disease, and his wife is ill from the birth of their third child. Now Mr. Genis, struggling to support his family, is unable to find even part time work. Mr. President, I find it truely unjust that Mr. Genis has been forced to such degradation for desiring to emigrate.

Anatoly Genis is an example of individuals in the Soviet Union suffering from the oppression of religous prohibition and faulty emigration policies. Mr. Gorbachev's efforts for democratization have done little to help Mr. Genis. At least 60 percent of the requests for emigration which are denied, are refused on the basis of secrets which might endanger Soviet national security. Many of these so called secrecy refusals are given to those who have no current knowledge of any information which would endanger Soviet national security. It is true that great numbers of Soviet Jews are successfully emigrating, but it is also true that the human rights of many Jews inside the Soviet Union continue to be violated. Mr. President, it is imperative that the Soviet Union stop the irrational and arbitrary denial of exit visas. I call upon Mr. Gorbachev and the Soviet Government to codify the freedom of emigration into Soviet law, to end the arbitrary use of "secrecy refusals," to continue to approve emigration visas for the increasing numbers of Soviet Jews, and to allow Mr. Anatoly Genis and his family to emigrate.●

APPOINTMENT BY THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces on behalf of the Re-

publican leader, pursuant to Public Law 100-494, his appointment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] to the U.S. Alternative Fuels Council.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, appoints the following Senators to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP].

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT—S. 774

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator RIEGLE, I ask unanimous consent that the report for S. 774, the savings and loan bill, be star printed to reflect the changes I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR—H.R. 2705

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 2705, relating to Federal Employees' Health Benefits Program, just received from the House of Representatives, be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING CHANGE IN TIME RELATIVE TO COMMITTEES SUBMITTING BUDGET RECONCILIATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time by which Senate committees must submit their reconciliation recommendations to the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 5 of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, House Concurrent Resolution 106, be changed to 5 o'clock in the afternoon of Friday, July 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A.M., MORNING BUSINESS, AND RESUME PENDING BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 12, 1989; that following the time for the two leaders, there be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, and that at 11 a.m., the Senate resume consideration of S. 358, the legal immigration bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TIME AGREEMENT AND VOTE RELATIVE TO THE HELMS AMENDMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m., when the Senate resumes debate on S. 358, Senator HELMS be recognized, with 30 minutes remaining on his amendment, equally divided and controlled between Senators HELMS and KENNEDY, and that a vote on or in relation to the Helms amendment occur at 11:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, at 11 a.m. tomorrow, when the Senate resumes debate on S. 358, Senator HELMS will be recognized for the purpose of continuing debate on his amendment, with 30 minutes remaining. Senators are on notice that a vote on or in relation to the Helms amendment will occur at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. President, if the distinguished acting Republican leader has no further business.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I think, if I might, respectfully modify to reflect that Senator HELMS has 16 minutes and Senator KENNEDY 14 minutes, I believe, if I recall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes 17 seconds.

Mr. SIMPSON. I see.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am glad we made that correction.

RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if the distinguished acting Republican leader has no further business, and if no Senator is seeking recognition, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order until 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 12, 1989.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:54 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, July 12, 1989, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 11, 1989:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ARTHUR W. FORT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, VICE SHELDON J. KRYS, RESIGNED.

RAYMOND CHARLES EWING, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GHANA.

ERIC M. JAVITS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA.

JERRY ALEXANDER MOORE, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF LESOTHO.

EDWARD JOSEPH PERKINS, OF OREGON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE, VICE GEORGE SOUTHALL VEST, RESIGNED.

MICHAEL G. SOTIRHOS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GREECE.

JOY A. SILVERMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BARBADOS, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF DOMINICA, AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO SAINT LUCIA, AND AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES.

THOMAS F. STROOCK, OF WYOMING, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA.

EVELYN IRENE HOOPES TEEGEN, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO FIJI, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF TONGA, AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO TUVALU, AND AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KIRIBATI.

ALEXANDER FLETCHER WATSON, OF MASSACHUSETTS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE THE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

MILTON JAMES WILKINSON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

LINDA M. COMBS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE JILL E. KENT, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MARTIN C. FAGA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE TIDAL W. MCCOY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

GILBERT E. CARMICHAEL, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION, VICE JOHN H. RILEY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MICHELLE EASTON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE PETER R. GREER, RESIGNED, TO WHICH POSITION SHE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM OCTOBER 22, 1988, TO JANUARY 3, 1989.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

HARRY M. SNYDER, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT, VICE ROBERT H. GENTILE, RESIGNED.

ACTION AGENCY

JANE A. KENNY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE ACTION AGENCY, VICE DONNA M. ALVARADO, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

ALFRED C. SIKES, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 1988, VICE MARY ANN WEYFORTH DAWSON, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

JEAN MCKEE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JULY 1, 1994. (REAPPOINTMENT)

KATHLEEN DAY KOCH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE DENNIS M. DEVANEY, TO WHICH POSITION SHE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM OCTOBER 2, 1988, TO JANUARY 3, 1989.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

JANET DEMPSEY STEIGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSIONER FOR THE TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM SEPTEMBER 26, 1988, VICE DANIEL OLIVER, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

DAPHNE WOOD MURRAY, OF TEXAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM SERVICES, VICE LOIS BURKE SHEPARD, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

EUGENE P. KOPP, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY, VICE MARVIN L. STONE, RESIGNED.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING REGULAR OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE):

JEFFREY R. GUYON
ARTHUR R. THOMAS, JR.
WALTER F. CAPPS, JR.
RONALD L. HENSEL
CHARLES V. MATHIS
BARRY O. ARNOLD
SAMMY SHORT, JR.
MARK CULLINANE
GREGORY J. SANIAL
JOHN A. HEALY
JULIE A. SUTHERLAND
MICHAEL S. LOZICH
JAN M. JOHNSON
KEITH A. RUSSELL
MICHAEL P. RYAN
LARRY R. KENNEDY
ROBERT P. HAYES
JEFFREY R. KUNST
STUART L. LEBRUSKA
CHARLES A. RICHARDS
ANNE M. SEBASTIAN
CHARLES E. RAWSON
CHRISTOPHER D. NICHOLS
DOMINIC DIBARI
KURT C. O'BRIEN
MARIBETH YASINSKI
JOEL D. DOLBECK
DAVID R. GAHN
GARY C. ARMSTRONG
ED A. AUZENBERGS
MICHAEL J. LOPEZ
ALAN N. ARSENAULT
THOMAS G. NELSON
PHILIP J. SKOWRONEK
AMY S. LANDWEHR
PAT DEQUATTRO
DAVID M. DERMANELIAN
LEONARD C. MURPHY
JAMES W. THILENIUS
ANDY J. FORDHAM
LAURENCE J. PREVOST
DOUGLAS B. MATHIEU
PATRICK G. FORAN
MATTHEW J. O'CONNOR
JULIE L. FRITZ
CHARLES L. CASHIN
VITO D. ROSELLI
GLENN M. SULMASY
MATTHEW J. ZAMARY
AMY B. TETREAULT
ANTHONY S. LLOYD
STEVEN C. MELANSON
MICHAEL W. JACKSON
FRANCIS E. GENCHO
CARLOS S. AMPONIN
THOMAS E. CAFFERTY
JEFFREY A. REEVES
DOUGLAS E. WEST
MARC P. LEBEAU
ROBERT J. GONZALEZ
ERIC G. WESTERBERG
KURT A. SEBASTIAN
FRANK R. PARKER
TINA L. MANCINI
JOHN D. WOOD
BRAD M. BELANGER
TIMOTHY G. STUEVE
JOHN F. MORIARTY
JOHN B. SULLIVAN
JAYSON L. HELSEL
PETER F. SMITH
MARK A. FRANKFORD
CHRISTOPHER J. MEADE
DONALD JILLSON
BRIAN J. SWAYNE
SCOTT V. AUSTIN
JOEL D. SLOTTEN
STEPHEN P. CZERWONKA
ROBERT T. MCCARTY
KEVIN P. FREEMAN
RICHARD D. FONTANA
JAMES E. ELLIOTT
SEAN M. BURKE
JOEL D. MAGNUSSEN
THOMAS F. RYAN
PETER N. DECOLA
JAMES CARLSON
THOMAS SNIDER
CHRISTOPHER A. HERR
ROBERT L. KROEGER
AUSTIN J. GOULD
MATTHEW D. KELLY
STEPHEN M. SABELLICO
SCOTT D. PISEL
JEFFREY J. MCSPADEN
JOSEPH M. PESCI
ALAN S. WATKA
THOMAS A. GREGER
DAVID A. KINDT
ANDREW J. SORENSON
JESSE K. MOORE
WILLIAM J. ANTONAKIS
CARLTON H. DAY
JAMES M. NEUSCHWANDER
KIRK A. BARTNIK
JAMES M. BOUSE
WILLIAM J. WOLTER
DAVID P. CROWLEY
GREGORY L. MCHENRY
KATHLEEN J. BOGAN
JOSEPH F. HESTER
JOHN C. RENDON
WILLIAM R. MEESE
MARK E. KOTEK
MICHAEL P. CAROSOTTO
KARL GRAMS
STEVEN A. BANKS
TIMOTHY F. PETTEK
JAMES E. SCHEYE
JOSEPH E. BALDA
JAMES TABOR
GARY A. CHARBONNEAU
EDWARD J. CUBANSKI
PATRICK J. MCGUIRE
JOSEPH J. LOSCIUTO
ROMUALDO DOMINGO
CAMERON T. NARON
MARK H. LENOX
TODD C. DUBOIS
TIMOTHY E. MEYERS
WALTER PETIG
IAN LIU
BASIL F. BROWN
RICHARD F. RONCONE
BRENDA A. KELLEY
IVAN J. VIKIN
SHADD D. WILLIAMS
PAUL G. LINDSAY
TIMOTHY J. CARTON
MITCHELL C. EKSTROM
ROBERT E. STYRON
DOUGLAS M. RUHDE
EDWARD J. KREJCI
DAVID J. FORD
JAMES B. NICHOLSON, JR.
GERALD F. DOLAN, JR.
ROBERT A. LAAHS
FRANK D. WAKEFIELD
CEDRIC A. HUGHES
ROGER E. BAILEY
JAMES F. STORY
JEFFREY K. ENOMOTO
SUSAN M. SMITHOUSER
PHILIP L. MORRIS
CHARLES S. CAMP
SCOTT A. BUDKA
MARK R. GOING
PATRICK J. RYAN
BRENT M. PRISTAS
JOSEPH E. MANJONE
KEITH T. WHITEMAN
KEVIN W. NELSON
JAMES R. OLIVE
MARY E. DICKEY
RICHARD G. POTTIEGER
ERIC G. JOHNSON
BRADFORD CLARK
VICTORIA A. VANVALKENBURG
ADELL L. FULLAWAY
JASON A. FOSDICK
KIRSTEN R. MARTIN
DONALD L. FLEMING
ADAM J. SHAW
CARL M. FERLAUTO
PATRICK FOLEY
GEORGE ELDRIDGE
JAMES E. PAIGE
GEORGE M. ZEITLER
JORGE PEREIRA
CHRISTIAN J. HERZBERGER
ROBERT F. OLSON, JR.
MICHAEL Z. ERNESTO
MICHAEL D. CALLAHAN
RANDY G. ADOLF
DARWYN A. WILMOTH
JAMES M. JENKINS
STEVEN M. SHERIDAN
TIMOTHY GRIFFING
JOSEPH L. DUFFY
MATTHEW P. DUESING
JOEL D. BROWN
TIMOTHY S. MESSINGER
CARMEN T. LAPKIEWICZ

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL ON THE RETIRED LIST PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be general

GEN. DUANE H. CASSIDY, [redacted] FR, U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601, TO BE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. HANSFORD T. JOHNSON, [redacted] FR, U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL ON THE RETIRED LIST PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. CLAUDIUS E. WATTS III, [redacted] FR, U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601, TO BE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. BRADLEY C. HOSMER, [redacted] FR, U.S. AIR FORCE.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION1 370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. WILLIAM H. SCHNEIDER, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN W. WOODMANSEE, JR., [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A), IN CONJUNCTION WITH ASSIGNMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JACK B. FARRIS, JR., [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A), IN CONJUNCTION WITH ASSIGNMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM S. FLYNN, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A), IN CONJUNCTION WITH ASSIGNMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN M. SHALIKASHVILI, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A), IN CONJUNCTION WITH ASSIGNMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. GEORGE R. STOTSER, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 611(A) AND 624:

To be permanent major general

BRIG. GEN. WALLACE C. ARNOLD, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. PATRICK H. BRADY, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. HENRY M. HAGWOOD, JR., [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. RONALD E. BROOKS, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. JAMES W. BALL, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. PETER M. MCVEY, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. JERE H. AKIN, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. PATRICK J. KELLY, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. SAMUEL A. LEFFLER, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM H. FORSTER, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. EDWARD R. BALDWIN, JR., [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. DONALD M. LIONETTI, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM N. FARMEN, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. JOHN D. ROBINSON, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. MALCOLM R. O'NEILL, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. JAMES A. GUEST, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM C. PAGE, JR., [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. GUY A. LABOA, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN SILVASY, JR., [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. FRED F. MARTY, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. PAUL E. FUNK, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. JOHN C. HELDSTAB, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. BARRY R. MCCAFFREY, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. NEAL T. JACO, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. CRAIG A. HAGAN, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. GERALD H. PUTMAN, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. JAMES D. STARLING, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. MARC A. CISNEROS, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. PAUL E. MENOHER, JR., [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT L. ORD III, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. WALDO D. FREEMAN, JR., [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. JOHN F. SOBKE, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. JOHN P. HERRLING, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. RONALD H. GRIFFITH, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. SAMUEL E. EBBESEN, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. JAMES R. ELLIS, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. WALTER B. MOORE, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. ERNEST J. HARRELL, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.
BRIG. GEN. JOHN E. MILLER, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM DUTIES INDICATED WITH GRADE AND DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS BE APPOINTED IN A HIGHER GRADE THAN THAT INDICATED.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

BURNS, ROBERT R., [redacted]
LEGASPI, LESTER M., [redacted]

To be lieutenant colonel

POHL, STEPHEN E., [redacted]
THORPE, ROBERT J., [redacted]
VILLACIS, BERNARDO F., [redacted]
WHITTON, RANDALL C., [redacted]

To be major

PETERSON, DAVID A., [redacted]

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

BURSINGER, JAMES C., [redacted]
DOUGLAS, GEORGE, [redacted]
TIFFANY, RAYMOND L., [redacted]

To be major

CORTES, JESUS, [redacted]
HAINES, LYNN F., [redacted]
LATTNER, MICHAEL J., [redacted]
MORELLI, ERNEST F., [redacted]

NEWTON, ALAN D., xxx-xx-x...
SCHNEID, THOMAS R., xxx-xx-x...
STRICKLAND, JUDY R., xxx-xx-x...

To be captain

BROWN, GRAIG D., xxx-xx-x...
SCHUMACHER, JAMES W., xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT AS RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE, IN GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 593, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM THE DUTIES INDICATED.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

BARTZ, JOHN K., xxx-xx-x...
CARTER, GARY D., xxx-xx-x...
CATES, ROBERT C., III, xxx-xx-x...
CROWDER, WADE A., xxx-xx-x...
DEFEE, WILLIAM J., III, xxx-xx-x...
HERNANDEZ, FRANCISCO S., xxx-xx-x...
HIBBERT, JOHN DAVID, xxx-xx-x...
JOHNSON, THOMAS G., xxx-xx-x...
KALEEMULLAH, ANWAR J., xxx-xx-x...
LEVITT, MORTON H., xxx-xx-x...
MORRIS, FRANCIS MARION, xxx-xx-x...
MORRISON, JOHN C., JR., xxx-xx-x...
PEREZ, VELARDE P., xxx-xx-x...
REEDER, THOMAS A., xxx-xx-x...
SCHUMANN, FREDERICK A., xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, DONALD SANFORD, JR., xxx-xx-x...
STOCK, DONALD H., xxx-xx-x...
WALSH, DAVID WILLIAM, xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING AIR FORCE OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 9333(B), TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

FRANCK, RAYMOND E., JR., xxx-xx-x...

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH GRADE AND DATE OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL THE OFFICER BE APPOINTED IN A GRADE HIGHER THAN LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

WINCHESTER, MICHAEL E., xxx-xx-x...

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM THE DUTIES INDICATED, PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL ANY OF THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS BE APPOINTED IN A GRADE HIGHER THAN LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

NURSE CORPS

WINDMUELLER, PAMELA A., xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

THORNELL, MICHAEL J., xxx-xx-x...

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 593 AND 8379, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE. PROMOTIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 8379 AND CONFIRMED BY THE SENATE UNDER SECTION 593 SHALL BEAR AN EFFECTIVE DATE ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 8374, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. DAVID E. AVENELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. BRENT Y. BARTSCHI, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. MICHAEL P. BOGUMILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. DANIEL F. CALLAHAN III, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. JOHN S. COTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. MICHAEL A. CUSHMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. WARREN E. DALTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. THOMAS L. DODDS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. ALAN T. FUJITA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. RICHARD C. HALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. ELWYN R. HARRIS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. JOHN I. HOWARTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. WALTER W. HUEHLEFELD, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. STANLEY H. LEIBOWITZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. CHARLES W. LIPPELGOOS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. VINCENT J. LONG, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. VINCENT G. MASSA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. JERRY M. MATSUDA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. JOHN E. MOLLOY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. DANIEL W. MOORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. CHARLES A. MORGAN III, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. JAMES L. MORRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. JOHN P. MURRAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. RICHARD W. NOBLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. TERENCE E. O'BRIEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. ROBERT R. OSTERHOUT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. GEORGE B. PATRICK III, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. CHARLES W. PLUNKETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. JOHN A. PORONSKY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. WILLIAM K. RICHARDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. DONALD E. RISSER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. ROBERT D. RODEKOHR, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. MICHAEL E. SAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. ROBERT J. SCHNEIDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. THOMAS O. SHERMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. LLOYD B. SYDNEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. WALLEY A. TURNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. JOHN R. WALKER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. JOHN F. WEBB, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. STEVE A. WINKLER, xxx-xx-xxxx

LEGAL CORPS

MAJ. CHARLES E. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

MAJ. GARY N. HARVEY, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

MAJ. DAVID L. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 593 AND 8379, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE. PROMOTIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 8379 AND CONFIRMED BY THE SENATE UNDER SECTION 593 SHALL BEAR AN EFFECTIVE DATE ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 8374, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. JAMES W. ADAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. RONALD D. BALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. DAVID F. BORJES, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. ALAN L. BOWMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. EDWARD L. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. WAYNE E. BRUGGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. WILLIAM H. CLELAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. JIMMIE C. EWING, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. ATLEE E. FRITZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. THOMAS A. JORDAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. RONALD A. KEITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. DAVID A. LUNDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. GEORGE E. MEHRTENS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. LARRY R. SADLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. ROBERT J. SAUDO, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. WALTER S. THEDFORD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. TERRY G. THOMPSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. JAMES S. B. WATT, xxx-xx-xxxx

LEGAL CORPS

MAJ. BRUCE S. ASAY, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

MAJ. BIPINCHANDRA H. AVASHIA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAJ. J. PAUL MEYER, xxx-xx-xxxx

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

MAJ. DORIS M. LEWIS, xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 593 AND 3353:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

BALME, ROBERT H., xxx-xx-xxxx
CHUN, LAWRENCE S. K., xxx-xx-xxxx
DYSTER, MELVIN B., xxx-xx-xxxx
FILTZER, HORST S., xxx-xx-xxxx
KANE, PETER E., xxx-xx-xxxx
KANHOUWA, SURYABALA, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAFONTANT, ROBERT R., xxx-xx-xxxx
LAURING, LEWIS M., xxx-xx-xxxx
LOWENTHAL, DAVID T., xxx-xx-xxxx
MALONEY, CHRISTOPHER T., xxx-xx-xxxx
MOLL, FRANCIS K., JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
SCHLESINGER, ROBERT M., xxx-xx-xxxx
SPIER, ROGER D., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

ALLEN, ROBERT K., xxx-xx-xxxx
FLORES, JOSE C., xxx-xx-xxxx
GURNEY, NELSON P., xxx-xx-xxxx
KATZ, ALLAN M., xxx-xx-xxxx
KOLNER, EDWARD H., xxx-xx-xxxx
LAMBIASI, CARL J., xxx-xx-xxxx
LUTHIN, RICHARD B., xxx-xx-xxxx
MARKER, HOWARD W., xxx-xx-xxxx
MCCAFFERY, MICHAEL K., xxx-xx-xxxx
NISHITANI, MICHAEL E., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'CALLAGHAN, THOMAS J., xxx-xx-xxxx
OWENS, BRIAN D., xxx-xx-xxxx
PFEIFER, WILLIAM F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
REISS, ROBERT F., xxx-xx-xxxx
SCHLESINGER, ROBERT M., xxx-xx-xxxx
SHAW, JOHN C., xxx-xx-xxxx
SUTTERFIELD, THOMAS C., xxx-xx-xxxx
SUTTON, RICHARD O., xxx-xx-xxxx
TARICCO, ALFRED S., xxx-xx-xxxx
TSE, FRANCIS H., xxx-xx-xxxx
WHITE, CECIL E., xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS GRADUATES FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, SECTION 2107:

CRAFTS, LAWRENCE, J., xx...
CUNNINGHAM, STEVEN M., xx...
EDWARDS, MICHAEL P., xx...
FORD, PHILLIP T., xx...
HANNIGAN, PATRICIA M., xx...
LUCIUS, JR., ROBERT E., xx...
NICHOLS, TIMOTHY W., xx...
PIGG, VON H., xx...
PLUES, ERIC A., xx...
TIERNAN, CHRISTOPHER E., xx...
TRIPOLI, JOSEPH G., xx...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED MARINE CORPS ENLISTED COMMISSIONING EDUCATION PROGRAM GRADUATES FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, SECTION 531:

BERIGAN, MICHAEL C., xx...
BOOTHBY, ALLEN C., JR., xx...
BORTFIELD, NANCY A., xx...
BUDSTOS, JOSE D., xx...
CAPDEPON, JOHN W., xx...
COWELL, CHARLES R., xx...
CRAIG, THOMAS M., xx...
DUGAN, LOREN J., xx...
GARDNER, RUSSELL A., xx...
LUCKEY, MICHAEL X., xx...
MARCINKIEWICZ, THOMAS F., xx...
MERASHOFF, MARY K., xx...
RAYMOND, BRIAN D., xx...
RODRIQUEZ, JUSTIN C., xx...
WREDE, RUSSELL E., xx...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY GRADUATES FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, SECTION 531:

GLYNN, JAMES F., xx...
PANGRAZIO, RONALD B., xx...
PHELAN, THOMAS J., xx...
POPIELEC, JAMES A., xx...
SEAMAN, SUSAN B., xx...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY GRADUATES FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, SECTION 531:

POPPE, PETER L., xx...
SHEA, KEVIN M., xx...
THOMPSON, JAMES H., xx...

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED FORMER U.S. NAVY OFFICERS TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593.

SMITH, CHARLES T. DONALDSON, JOHN F.
PRYOR, ARTHUR E.

THE FOLLOWING MEDICAL COLLEGE GRADUATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593.

AKBARI, AHMAD SENIOR, ROBERT J.
LANDON, CHARLES

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS IN THE STAFF CORPS OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF COMMANDER AND LIEUTENANT COMMANDER AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 628, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFORE AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be commander

BRADLEY, BARBARA M.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant commander

KRASOWSKI, GEORGE

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be lieutenant commander

SWANSON, LYLE W.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM CANDIDATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OF

STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

BARRETT, DANELLE
BERARDUCCI, BRENT
BLETZ, TODD
BLOOM, DAVID
BIRCKMAN, ERIC
BRERETON, RICHARD
CHRISTOPHER, JANET
CLAPPERTON, CRAIG
COOPER, JULIA
COWAN, GREGORY
DELANEY, RUSSELL
DUPREE, CHARLES
DENNIS, CHRISTOPHER
EDMISTON, MARCIA
FEDORCHAK, DAVID, JR.
GAJEWSKI, THOMAS
GRANT, MARJORIE
HARTUNG, PAUL
HIGGINS, JAMES
HUBER, DAVID
KIM, ALEXANDER
KIRSCHE, SHERRY
KOSKOWSKI, LEONARD, JR.
KRAFT, NEAL
KRAFFT, PETER
LANDIS, CHRISTOPHER
LEWIS, TODD
LOVETTE, ERIC
MAYFIELD, CHARLES
MILES, CHRISTOPHER
NAMAN, JOSEPH
PAYNE, CHARLES
QUICK, DAVID
RICHARDSON, CHARLES
REYNOLDS, COLLINS, IV
SCHWINGHAMMER, KURT
SCHNEIDER, JOSEPH
SMITH, GREGORY
STEWART, JESSE
SUGHROE, PAUL
TAYLOR, ROBERT
TERRY, ALEXANDER
TROYER, CLARK
WELCH, PATRICK
WESTBROOK, SCOTT
WILSON, ANHTUAN
WINSTEAD, RAYMOND

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM CANDIDATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OR STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

BARD, MICHAEL
BILL, PAUL
BOCK, STEPHEN
CAMPBELL, JAN
DREW, DAVID
DURNAK, HENRY
EARLS, CRAIG
FEHR, ALLAN
GERBAULT-VANA, PHILIP
GRANADUS, DANIEL
HAMPTON, JAMES
HANSEN, ROY
MCVADON, KEVIN
MONZON, RUSSELL
OGDEN, CHRISTOPHER
PEARSON, FRANK
PRZESMICKI, STEVEN
ROBERTSON, JOHN
SOWLES, RICHARD
SPENCER, DAVID

THE FOLLOWING NAMED NAVY ENLISTED COMMISSIONING PROGRAM CANDIDATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OR STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

BABOCA, OCTAVIO
BAILEY, JAMES
BARRINGER, GREGORY
BRATCHER, RANDY
BRAZ, ERNEST
FOSTER, WAYNE
GOODMAN, SCOTT
HOSKINS, JAMES
JEAN, THOMAS
JOHNSTONE, GEORGE
JONES, KEITH
KEETON, JOHN
LOMAX, BRIAN
ORECHOVESKY, JOSEPH
TINSLEY, TODD
WINDLE, JERRY

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 307, TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE, AND SECTIONS 8363 AND 593, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

To be colonel

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

GARY D. BAILEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. BALDWIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE G. BRAMLETTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS BURNETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH M. BYRNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. COCHRAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD DALTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
TOMMY L. DANIELS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GILBERT R. DARDIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE A. DEMERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE E. DONNELLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLAUD E. DUTRO, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD L. EARLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. EASTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANTHONY EDEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. GALBREATH, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. GRANNIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT D. GREEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES N. HAGENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WESLEY F. HALLOWELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE M. HARRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY L. HINDOIEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE P. HUCKELS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND J. INMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. LADD, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD E. MCGLOTHLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD G. MORAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT D. PARISE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL H. PEMBERTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. PRIVETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JULIUS V. PRZYGOCKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES D. RALLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
AUBREY V. RENFROE, xxx-xx-xxxx
VICTOR H. RIPPE, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH L. ROSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE F. SCOGGINS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GILBERT E. SIDNEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. SPENCER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN B. STRICKLAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD R. TAYLOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD W. TUTTLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL A. WEBB, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD E. WEBBER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE L. WEINHAGEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
BEN J. WELCH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ALLAN G. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY B. WILLEMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD M. WILLSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLIFFORD E. WISSER, xxx-xx-xxxx

JUDGE ADVOCATE

DANIEL F. LOPEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD J. RIACH, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

NED E. BEISER, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEFFEN P. CHRISTENSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN J. VONDRELL, xxx-xx-xxxx

DENTAL CORPS

GLENN F. BENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION AS RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 593, 8366, AND 8372 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. PROMOTIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 8372 AND CONFIRMED BY THE SENATE UNDER SECTION 593 SHALL BEAR AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF 10 MARCH 1989, AND PROMOTIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 8366 SHALL BE EFFECTIVE UPON COMPLETION OF SEVEN YEARS OF PROMOTION SERVICE AND TWENTY-ONE YEARS OF TOTAL SERVICE, UNLESS A LATER PROMOTION EFFECTIVE DATE IS REQUIRED BY SECTION 8372(C), OR THE PROMOTION EFFECTIVE DATE IS DELAYED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 8380(B) OF TITLE 10.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

SEYMOUR H. BRICKMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT G. CERTAIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. DOUGHERTY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD E. JEWETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIE L. MCDANIEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN P. MONK, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY W. MYERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID H. PARKINSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIS T. RICHIE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. ROWE, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILLIP H. SCOTT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JIMMY F. TOMLINSON, xxx-xx-xxxx

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

GERALD M. BIEZE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. CADY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID M. DEVIESE, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS W. FAESSLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN L. HARRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT B. JAMES, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE R. MARPE, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRANDEN G. MORAIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS J. MORRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG M. RIRIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY K. SPACKMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT K. STEADMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD E. WHALEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD M. WISE, xxx-xx-xxxx

JUDGE ADVOCATE

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT T. ADAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEWART F. ALY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER W. BAILEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID A. BATEMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM P. BENNETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
LOUIS J. BIZZARRI, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY A. BRAUN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES L. CARPENTER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
WARREN T. CONRAD, xxx-xx-xxxx
RODNEY G. CROWGEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN H. CULLEY, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALBERT C. DEPENBROCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY J. DUNDAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD T. FARRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY E. FUNK, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARROLL A. GANTT, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER W. GILES, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES J. GONZALES, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALFRED L. GREEN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GEOFFREY R. HAMLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES O. HANSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES T. HARRISON, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL L. HAWKLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP S. HOWE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. JACKSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD R. KOLKOSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS W. LYONS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES W. MACDONALD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH V. MANDERS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK E. MAREK, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS S. MARKIEWICZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. MARTIN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
HERBERT T. MCINTOSH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. MCMURPHY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY E. MICHAEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARMANDO O. MONACO, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH M. MURCHISON, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY J. MURPHY, xxx-xx-xxxx
TODD E. NORTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RALPH E. OLSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH E. ORSINI, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD M. PERRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. RANBY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES W. RICHARDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
NEIL S. RICHMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD S. ROBINSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. RONK, xxx-xx-xxxx
LESTER W. SCHIEFELBEIN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD R. SCHLEGEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD S. SCHMIDT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. SEITZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. SHAW, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD T. SMITHERMAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN B. SOUTHARD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH S. SPITZER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDOLPH D. STOWE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES A. THIGPEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK A. TUCKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM C. WALLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ADRIAN J. WASKO, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. WOODS, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

WILFREDO P. APOSTOL, xxx-xx-xxxx
STANLEY A. BARNETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM S. BOURQUARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSE D. BUHAIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
FABIO CABRERAMENDEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN L. CHASE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. CHU, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD E. CONRAD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN S. DOYLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALICJA S. GOLEBIOWSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY K. HARGROVE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANITA MAE HIBLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANKLIN CHANG KEUN IMM, xxx-xx-xxxx
HWA ING KANG, xxx-xx-xxxx
TILMAN E. KLUWE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARTURO M. LOPEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
BALTAZARA G. LOTUACO, xxx-xx-xxxx
THEODORE I. MACEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. MALCOLM, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
YASH P. MALHOTRA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES W. MCCARVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. MEEK, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARTURO A. PIDLAOAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PANANGATTUR N. RAMALINGAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD J. RICHESON, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK E. SAUNDERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GRACITA S. SIMON, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK SPARANDERO, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARIA M. TIAMSONBEATO, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP H. WATKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEWIS WETSTEIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CREED W. WOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx

NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

NANCY A. AYERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DORIS A. BLEDSOE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEANNE M. BRAZIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORMA G. BUTLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LYNN K. CHAPMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
SANDRA C. CLARKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CECILIA CLINT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. CRIBBETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARGARET M. CUTRER, xxx-xx-xxxx
NANCY A. DALPIAZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
SANDRA L. ERICKSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
KAREN A. FOLSOM, xxx-xx-xxxx
PEGGY J. FRYE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD R. GIBSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JULIA T. GORDON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JUDITH L. GREATHOUSE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEANNINE M. GREENFIELD, xxx-xx-xxxx
AWILDA HALLBAUER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOROTHY H. HOLLIDAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICA J. HORSEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
SHIRLEY L. INMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
LINDA M. JANELLI, xxx-xx-xxxx
LINDA S. KETCHUM, xxx-xx-xxxx
LILLIAN A. KRASNOW, xxx-xx-xxxx
JANICE C. KRUEGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JULIAN P. LACHENDRO, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANNA J. LAVELLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
HILDA M. LEWIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BARBARA A. LOGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAROL A. LOIGNON, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAROL M. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JANICE M. MCDANIEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGIA I. MICKA, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORA L. MINISSALE, xxx-xx-xxxx
VIRGINIA MORRISON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANTONIE V. MURPHY, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUZANNE M. NADIG, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY L. NICHOLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARRA E. PECHE, xxx-xx-xxxx
HELEN V. PETERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICIA C. RAVELLA, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT A. REYNOLDS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICIA A. RITTENMEYER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELISE J. ROSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JANET V. ROSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
KATHLEEN M. SALIBA, xxx-xx-xxxx
BONNIE M. SANBORN, xxx-xx-xxxx
LORRAINE C. SCHOEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
LUEANNA E. SHADD, xxx-xx-xxxx

JUDITH A. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
WANDA E. TACEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAXINE C. THELEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDERICK W. TROUTMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLAUDINE M. VASILO, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORALEA J. WAKELEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAROL C. WALKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
REBECCA A. WHITFIELD, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERESA J. WILLMANN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICIA A. WILSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LINDA M. WOLF, xxx-xx-xxxx
SANDRA J. ZUBRITZKY, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE

To be lieutenant colonel

GERARD C. ESKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID J. FESSLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH R. HALLBAUER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD D. IVERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL F. SHAW, xxx-xx-xxxx

BIO–MED CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

LARRY D. ALLGOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx
VANCE M. BRIDGES, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK J. CUNNINGHAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
VICTOR C. DUNN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD B. FORD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN S. GLENN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS R. HAMMOND, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES F. HARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERHARD ILLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD Y. JACOBSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES A. MCANDREW, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE D. REINERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALTER L. RIGGS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD L. SCHUR, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN H. SLUSHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES L. UNMACK, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD D. WHEATLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, UNDER THE APPROPRIATE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, AS AMENDED, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

DAVID W. ABATI, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD W. ABBOTT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ERROL S. ABOE, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS C. ADANG, xxx-xx-xxxx
VITO A. ADOCCHIO, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE E. ADRIANCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLENN D. AHRENS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. AKERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARNULFO S. ALANIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN G. ALBERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. ALCAPARRAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHNNY D. ALEXANDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RALPH ALEXANDER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
BRIAN R. ALLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD K. ALLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT H. ALLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. ALLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. ALLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIM M. ALLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD J. ALMASSY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES A. ALMEIDA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES A. ALSOP, xxx-xx-xxxx
HECTOR R. ALVAREZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH H. AMEND, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILLIP B. AMIDON, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN K. AMMON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD A. ANAWALT, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE A. ANDERSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
EMMET D. ANDERSON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAMARR L. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY O. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT O. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN J. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE W. ANDREN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD J. ANEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY S. ANTAL, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY P. APEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL J. APUZZO, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN E. ARMIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN D. ARMSTRONG, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM C. ARMSTRONG, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. ARNETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
NEIL J. ARNOTT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID A. ARPIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
NATIVIDAD ARRIETA, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN A. ARRINGTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY J. ARSENEAU, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDERICK K. ARZT, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD K. ASHLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS R. ASHMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM G. ATEN, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEITH R. ATTENBOROUGH, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEITH A. ATWELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JUDITH P. AUSTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM C. AUSTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM M. AVEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GENNARO J. AVVENTO, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. AWTREY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROY R. L. AYDELOTTE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANCIS H. AYERS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS K. AYERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOYCE K. S. BABIAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JUNE I. R. BABSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARTHUR D. BADGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT B. BAHNIJ, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES A. BAILEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND A. BAILEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER A. BAILEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS L. BAIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRADLEY S. BAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHRISTOPHER J. BAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DEBORAH A. BAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. BAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
OWEN B. BAKER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. BAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS R. BAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE BALASH, xxx-xx-xxxx
TED M. BALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD M. BALLANCO, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL P. BALLARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK R. BALLARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. BALYEAT, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY M. BARBEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM D. BARBER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN L. BARCHIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. BARKER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DIETER BARNES, xxx-xx-xxxx
JACK R. BARNES, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER W. BARNES, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE E. BARR, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
GUY K. BARRETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
BERNARD C. BARRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN I. BARRON, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
KLAUS B. BARTELS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE R. BARTHOLD, xxx-xx-xxxx
DARRELL D. BASH, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARY A. BASS, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY L. BAUGHMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHRISTOPHER BAUM, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRIAN W. BAURIES, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIE BAXTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
BYRON E. BEAL, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY N. BEALLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD W. BEAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL D. BEAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN H. BEARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
NELSON L. BEARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. BEAUCHAMP, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALLACE A. BEAUCHAMP, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER J. BECKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS C. BECKWITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. BEDFORD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES J. BEHAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANA H. BELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID M. BELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDERICK J. BELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD G. BELLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK F. BENDA, xxx-xx-xxxx
GORDON L. BENDICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD R. BENFIELD, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP G. BENJAMIN, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE G. BENNETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JUDITH S. BENNETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY W. BENNETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK E. BENOIT, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIM E. BEREUTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DALE K. BERGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES V. BERTOGLIO, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD E. BESTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENVER A. BETTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT E. BINA, xxx-xx-xxxx
IAN A. BIRDSALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. BISHOP, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT DAMON BISHOP, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANKLIN O. BJORING, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID R. BJURSTROM, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD G. BJURSTROM, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD J. BLANCHET, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY G. BLANCHETTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. BLECHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. BLEDSOE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL R. BLOHM, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. BLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. BLYTHE, xxx-xx-xxxx
KURT F. BOCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
TODD A. BODENHAMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL W. BODENHEIMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES G. BOEHM, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL R. BOGGS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSE BOLTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
KYLE C. BOND, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. BOND, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD A. BONDZELESKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. BONNGARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. BOOT, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. BOOTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. BOOTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. BORCHARDT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. BORTZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
KERMIT V. BOSCHERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. BOVENIZER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. BOWEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDALL B. BOWLBY, xxx-xx-xxxx
TED F. BOWLDS, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDMUND G. BOY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. BOYD, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY L. BOYER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. BOYLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN E. BOZARTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK C. BRADBURY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLEN L. BRADY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. BRADY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT C. BRAGG, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD A. BRANDAU, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK A. BRANDEBERRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
TUIREN A. BRATINA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH K. BRATTON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS F. BRAUND, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID J. BREERWOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAULETTE I. BREHOB, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH S. BREJWO, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH A. BRENNAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN F. BROCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE G. BRONSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. BROOKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY L. BROOKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. BROOME, xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG F. BROTCHIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL R. BROUSSEAU, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES A. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY H. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK N. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD E. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD D. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD D. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RUSSELL H. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN D. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN R. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN V. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEO A. BROWNYARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. BRUCKNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. BRUINGTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD A. BRUST, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES E. BRYANT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANNY M. BRYANT, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD BRYCHCY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND J. BRYLSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
DELBERT H. BUCHANAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH M. BUCHWALD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES L. BUCKLEY, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT S. BUNN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD G. BURDETTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEROME W. BURG, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOAN R. BURG, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWIN P. BURGE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE H. BURGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT D. BURGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY S. BURGESS, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH J. BURKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER L. BURLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND D. BURRELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY W. BURRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. BURROWS, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT D. BURROWS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. BURT, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRADLEY R. BUSCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRED E. BUSING, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRADLEY L. BUTLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY W. BUTLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS BUTLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
HEINZ L. BUTNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. BUTTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. BUZZELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALBERT D. BYRD, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES E. BYRD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. CADE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDOLPH L. CAGLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY L. CAIPEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE E. CALLAWAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. CALVERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
SPENCE M. CAMERON, xxx-xx-xxxx
HOWARD CAMPBELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
BIAGIO E. CANNISTRACI, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY D. CANNON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDALL R. CANTRELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
BUDDY C. CAPLES, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS W. CAPP, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES J. CAPPLES, SR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD D. CARBON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL R. CARDINAL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALEXANDER CARLISLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. CARLSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN L. CARNDUFF, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES L. CARPENTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS M. CARPENTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM D. CARPENTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY C. CARR, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. CARR, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT E. CARR, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CLARENCE D. CARROLL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JACK S. CARSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD T. CARSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. CARSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD F. CARTEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOE N. CARTER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
LEON R. CASAUBON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. CASE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RODNEY N. CASEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
TOMMY G. CATES, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN J. CATTON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS H. CECIL, xxx-xx-xxxx
THELMA J. CERVENY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL CHALIFOUX, xxx-xx-xxxx
EMILY E. CHAMBERLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROY G. CHANDLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
BENJAMIN N. CHAPMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLAYTON J. CHAPMAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GLENN M. CHARCZUK, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS J. CHAREK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY R. CHARLES, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. CHASE, xxx-xx-xxxx

GARY R. CHEESEMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLIE CHILDRESS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS W. CHOWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN L. CHRISTENSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES N. CHRISTIAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS R. CLARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY A. CLARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN E. CLARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
TRUDY H. CLARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES C. CLATTERBAUGH, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK W. CLAWSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
HAROLD M. CLAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. CLAYTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL S. CLEARY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANNY K. CLIFTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN T. CLINES, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEWART C. CLUCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALLACE W. COATES, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES R. COHOON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY D. COLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALLAN M. COLEMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES E. COLLIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. COLLINGS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK R. COLLINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH A. COMBS, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY L. COMBS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH J. COMEAUX, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD L. COMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER B. CONDIT, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY G. CONEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. CONLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL W. CONNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD T. CONNOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE A. CONNORS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. CONNORS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. CONRAD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN E. COOMBS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RALPH E. COOPER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT C. COPENHAFER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES C. CORFMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
TOM N. CORLETTE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENVER G. CORLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. W. CORLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES O. CORNELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK J. CORRIGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS M. COST, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAURA C. COUNTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. COX, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT G. CRAIG, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES E. CRAIN, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM P. CRAMSIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DALE L. CRANDALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. CRANDLEY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
KENT J. CRANER, xxx-xx-xxxx
HOWARD E. CREEK, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY J. CREWS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT C. CRIPE, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN J. CRISTIANI, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN S. CROOK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES W. CROPPER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JETT CROUCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. CROWE, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP J. CROWLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN B. CRUCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY W. CRUIT, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY D. CRUM, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFERY L. CRUSE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. CRUSOE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICARDO G. CUADROS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER M. CUDE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. CUMMINGS, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY W. CUMMINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN T. CUNNINGHAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL T. H. CURRIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES I. CUTLER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. CUTTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LUCIAN A. DADE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM M. DAGGITT, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD F. DAIGLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RUSSELL L. DAISLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JUDSON D. DALEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. DALSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE M. DAMMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONATO P. DAMORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE F. DAMORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
TONY G. DANIELS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS L. DANIELSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS J. DANIELSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL J. DARNELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOYLE C. DAUGHTRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES R. DAVIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. DAVIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LESLIE M. DAVIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK L. DAVIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORVIN L. DAVIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP R. DAVIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICKEY I. DAVIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS DAVIS, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS L. DAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH G. DAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY L. DEAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD L. DEASON, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP C. DEBRUIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL E. DECKER, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG R. DEDRICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
CYNTHIA A. DEESE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. DEFOLIART, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD B. DEIULIO, xxx-xx-xxxx
RUSSELL P. DELCAMBRE, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK J. DELUCA, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL DEMARCHI, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. DEMENT, xxx-xx-xxxx
RUSSELL A. DEMING, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEE F. DEMITRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH T. DENBLEYKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE R. DENNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD W. DENNIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. DENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID A. DEPTULA, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANDREW S. DICHTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RALPH P. DICICCO, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS R. DICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. DICKEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK C. DICKERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDDIE A. DICKINSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROSS E. DICKINSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH P. DIGRADO, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID O. DIMARCHI, xxx-xx-xxxx
J. MATTHEW DIONNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES G. DIVELBISS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT DIXON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ERNEST D. DODSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY E. DONAHUE, xxx-xx-xxxx
HAROLD H. DONALD, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT J. DONALDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT F. DONOHUE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT K. DOSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN P. DOUCET, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND A. DOUTHIT, xxx-xx-xxxx
RYAN S. DOW, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH E. DOWDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANA S. DOWNEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID A. DOYE, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY E. DREADEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG W. DREIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN P. DRETAR, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL W. DREW, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. DUBEAU, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK J. DUCOS, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL T. DUERSON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK L. DUES, xxx-xx-xxxx
OWEN L. DUGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH K. DUMM, xxx-xx-xxxx
LYLE C. DUNABLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARTIN DUNBAR, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. DUNBAR, xxx-xx-xxxx
C. M. DUNCAN, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
DALE E. DUNFORD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALDEN L. DUNLAP, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. DUNLAP, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN E. DUNLAP, xxx-xx-xxxx
RUEVA A. DUNN, xxx-xx-xxxx
HARRISON L. DUNNEGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARTIN E. DUPONT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT A. DURYEA, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN R. DUTTRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY R. DYLEWSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
RODNEY B. EAREHART, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANCES M. EARLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD G. EASTERLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. EASTMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALLEN R. EDGAR, xxx-xx-xxxx
SANDY EDGE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE S. EDIE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD J. EDWARDS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD T. EDWARDS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT R. EDWARDS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. EGGERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL B. EHRLICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
STUART M. EHRLICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD L. EILERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
HERBERT F. EISENHART, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
VALERIE A. ELBOW, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES B. ELLEDGE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL G. ELLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL M. ELLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. ELLERBE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
KURT A. ELLIOTT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD B. ELLIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
TRAVIS E. ELMORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH L. ELWOOD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
NEAL M. ELY, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN R. EMERY, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY W. EMMELHAINZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. EMSLIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM F. ENG, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN K. ENGBERG, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDALL M. ENRIGHT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERROLD C. ERDMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE M. ESTES, xxx-xx-xxxx
GORDON M. ETTENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. EUBANKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOE A. EVANS, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN M. EVANS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT H. EVERETT, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
KELLY B. EWEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL E. EWING, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY E. FABER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. FAIR, xxx-xx-xxxx
BUFKIN R. FAIRCHILD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
BOBBY L. FAIRLESS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAURO N. FARINELLI, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID S. FARIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER T. FARKAS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES M. FARR, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP A. FAYE, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK R. FAYKES, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN W. FEATHERSTONE, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD J. FEENEY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANCIS E. FELICE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. FENN, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN T. FENTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. FERGUSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JORGE L. FERNANDEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH O. FERRETTA, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY B. FEW, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. FIBRANZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS P. FILIGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MELVIN H. FINGARSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD W. FINK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES F. FINNEGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM M. FINNEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY H. FISCHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD K. FISHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MELVIN D. FLACK, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARC S. FLAHERTY, xxx-xx-xxxx
BERNARD J. FLANAGAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE M. FLECK, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN A. FLEET, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. FLEMING, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY F. FLOWERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES M. FLOYD, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD E. FLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
COLLIN F. FLYNN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY H. FLYNT, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL A. FOERSTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. FOLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN H. FOLKERTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. FOLLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH A. FORSTIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY A. FORTEZZO, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHESTER G. FOSSUM, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ERNEST L. FOSTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JACKIE L. FOSTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEWART J. FOSTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELLIS W. FOWLER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES T. FOX, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN E. FOX, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. FOX, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM D. FRANK, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS M. FRASER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP J. FRAZEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWIN B. FRAZIER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN P. H. FREEMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. FREEMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN R. FREITAG, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL G. FREUND, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. FRIED, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. FRIESE, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH W. FRITZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG D. FRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLARENCE G. FRYBACK, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN B. FRYE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. FUNDAREK, xxx-xx-xxxx
HENRY C. FUNK, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD L. FURTADO, xxx-xx-xxxx
DEBORAH L. GABLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN B. GAGE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH R. GAHLINGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RODERIC A. GALE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES P. GALLAGHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAMASO GARCIA, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN L. GARDNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD C. GARDNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT E. GARLAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP GARTNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK R. GARY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLENN GASLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN R. GAST, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN R. GAUGERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANDREW M. GECELOSKY, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE D. GEDDES, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY F. GEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS E. GEESAMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY L. GEESEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
SARAH GELLA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. GENTRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN G. GEORGE, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN C. GERMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD A. GERST, xxx-xx-xxxx
BOBBIE S. GERVAIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID P. GESSERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANTHONY J. GIACOBE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL S. GIBLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD B. GIBSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. GIFT, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. GILBERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
HENRY B. GILKES, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS A. GILKEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WARREN L. GILLESPIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
TOMMY R. GILLIAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID C. GILLMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
EUGENE C. GILPIN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER F. GIMBORYS, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH S. GINGRICH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT R. GLASSCOCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY W. GNADT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. GOCI, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY L. GODBY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE A. GOLIGHTLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE W. GOLSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK N. GOLTZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROY D. GONZALES, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAN R. GOODRICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORMAN W. GOODYEAR, xxx-xx-xxxx
HOMER R. GORDON, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT R. GORDON, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN R. GORDON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. GORMLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY E. GOSSETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD GOUIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORBERT C. GRABOWIECKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD R. GRACE, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER G. GRAF, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS B. GRAHAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
BARRY E. GRAMM, xxx-xx-xxxx

CHARLES J. GRANDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS A. GRANT, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN B. GRANT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. GRAVELY, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY S. GRAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROSANNE M. GRECO, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAMERON K. GREEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES W. GREEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT C. GREEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WARREN M. GREENE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DARREL R. GREER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICKY J. GREFF, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN J. GRESCHNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LINDELL R. GRIGG, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. GRISWOLD, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD J. GROENINGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY J. GROGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. GRONE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID C. GRUBE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT A. GRUVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAURICE H. GUFFEY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE D. GUILMAIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL W. GUSTKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
SIDNEY M. GUTIERREZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD G. HAHN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN L. HAINES, xxx-xx-xxxx
TEDDY V. HALE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD D. HALFAST, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD H. HALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
SENAN HALPIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
KATHLEEN D. HAMILTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT A. HAMMELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
LLOYD B. HAMMOND, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID R. HANKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORMAN A. HANNAH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD H. HANSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEVIN P. HANSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN L. HANSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID T. HANSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD L. HANSON, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. HARBECK, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD S. HARDING, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE H. HARJES, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY HARKNESS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. HARMON, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE C. HARPER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARTHUR V. HARRIOTT, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLYDE J. HARRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY R. HARRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN W. HARRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALTER H. HARRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLENN H. HARRISON, xxx-xx-xxxx
HERBERT A. HARRISON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES V. HARTINGER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
BYRON C. HARTLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK S. HARTMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN S. HARTMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY W. HARWOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD S. HASSAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY G. HASTINGS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CLAYTON M. HATAWAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. HAUCK, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
STUART L. HAUPT, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER J. HAUSER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGG R. HAVENS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD D. HAWK, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWIN P. HAWKINS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DEAN H. HAYLETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
RODNEY E. HAZEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANNY C. HEAD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. HEALD, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL T. HEALE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. HEELY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALLAN A. HEESE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. HEIL, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEITH C. HEINEMANN, xxx-xx-xxxx
HAROLD V. HEISCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. HEMPHILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY L. HENDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARVIN J. HENDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD J. HENDRICKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY E. HENLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROSS D. HENNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. HENNING, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONNA C. HERGE, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT M. HESLUP, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD H. HEYDEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALFRED B. HICKS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GRAYDON K. HICKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DORSEY E. HIGDON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
KEVIN S. HIGGINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. HILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHNNY P. HILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARTIN V. HILL, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN K. HINDERLEIDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY D. HINNERICHS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. HITZELBERGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT A. HOBBS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN P. HOCKETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL D. HODGES, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK W. HODGES, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAY P. HODGES, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RUDNALDO HODGES, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD C. HOEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH L. HOFMOCKEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLIFFORD J. HOGUE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
LINN E. HOGUE, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS G. HOLLINGSWORTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDDIE C. HOLLINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY S. HOLLISTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANNY HOLLON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT E. HOLMDEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID G. HOLMES, xxx-xx-xxxx
VERNON I. HOLMES, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK A. HOLT, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES W. HOLTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY HOLTZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. HOLUBIK, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE K. HOLUM, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDY E. HONNET, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT C. HOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM C. HOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx
RALPH F. HOOKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL L. HOOPER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. HOOTEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN D. HOOVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD L. HOOVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE E. HOPFER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS W. HOPKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES W. HOPKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK A. HORAJ, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN J. HORAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS G. HORGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. HORN, xxx-xx-xxxx
BARRY E. HORNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GILMARY M. HOSTAGE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS W. HOUPT, xxx-xx-xxxx
TAMZY J. HOUSE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JACK L. HOUSER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY A. HOWALT, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS O. HOWELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DARYL L. HOWER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALLAN W. HOWEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY L. HOWLETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD G. HOWSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEWIS E. HUBER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. HUBERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEWIS W. HUDGINS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ALLEN R. HUDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH M. HUDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT B. HUDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. HUFFINE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES C. HUGGINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
NICHOLAS E. HUGHES, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD C. HUGHES, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS M. HULSEY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JON A. HULSEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS M. HUMES, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK D. HUMPHRESS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. HUMPHREY, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN A. HUMPHREY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID R. HUNDLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL D. HURLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH L. HURST, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANTHONY A. IMONDI, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROY S. INGLES, xxx-xx-xxxx
IRVING W. IRONS, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD D. ISAACKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN B. ISETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD D. IVEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
COLLINS M. JACKSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JESSIE R. JACKSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN P. JACKSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY M. JACKSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
NEULON D. JACKSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY V. JACKSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. JACKSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
HENRY L. JACOCKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN S. JACZINSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD J. JAECKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WARREN L. JAGODNIK, xxx-xx-xxxx
LOUIS G. JAKOWATZ, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLEY B. JAMES, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH E. JAREMKO, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. JARGSTORF, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEONARD L. JARMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD M. JEANES, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. JENSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY M. JENSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY L. JENSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY W. JENSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT P. JERAL, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK J. JERSHE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. JESTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD L. JEWELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICKEY D. JOHNS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND E. JOHNS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ALBERT L. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES R. JOHNSON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CLARENCE A. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
FERDINAND B. JOHNSON, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. JOHNSON, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK R. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
NOEL G. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILLIP J. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD E. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD G. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE B. JOHNSTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLEN A. JOHNSTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICK A. JOHNSTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
CECIL W. JONES, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CONELL JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVE P. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
GRADY R. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
HENRY A. JONES, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY K. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL T. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER E. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN M. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY C. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
BENJAMIN W. JUBELA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARTIN P. JUBELT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. JUDKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK R. JULICHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD G. JUNGE, xxx-xx-xxxx
STANLEY L. JUSTICE, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS D. KABEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH J. KAHOE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD G. KAISER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL F. KAISER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. KALKMAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS P. KANE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALTER K. KANEAKUA, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
STANLEY S. KANNO, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE A. KARL, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THEODORE N. KAROGLOU, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH P. KARST, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD J. KARVOSKY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. KASSON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY A. KATTNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY W. KATZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY P. KAUFMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL D. KAUFMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY J. KAUFMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY J. KEATING, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES L. KECK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. KEEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN E. KEESEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY A. KEETHLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE A. KEHIAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BILL B. KEITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
SAMUEL K. KELLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY J. KELLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
TOM R. KELLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
HERBERT C. KEMP, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. KEMP, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. KENAGY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH K. KENNEDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD J. KENNEDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS M. KENNEDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND D. KERR, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. KERSHAW, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY P. KETTREY, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN M. KIEFFER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY T. KILCOIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. KINCAID, xxx-xx-xxxx
JACK L. KINCART, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN C. KING, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. KING, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND E. KINKAID, xxx-xx-xxxx
SAMUEL D. KINMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY G. KINNEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK A. KINTNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER W. KIPPIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS W. KIRLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY G. KIZER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE J. KLAZYNSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES B. KLEIBER, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDGAR P. KLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY H. KLINE, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER K. KLOEBER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DUANE K. KLUG, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN B. KNIFFEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY B. KNIGHT, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDERICK S. KNOWLES, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS W. KNUTSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELIZABETH A. KOCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
KARL M. KOCHEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS E. KOHLHEPP, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORMAN J. KOHN, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD S. KOLESAR, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ANTHONY W. KONCEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANA C. KONDURIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH W. KOOPMANS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLARD M. KORNOVICH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL C. KOSER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE A. KOSIBA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEROME O. KRABY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY W. KRAFFT, xxx-xx-xxxx
SANDRA M. KRAMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND L. KRANS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY R. KRAUSE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN S. KREBS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS G. KREMBEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY G. KRYSIAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN D. KUKUK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. LADIEU, xxx-xx-xxxx
MELVIN J. LADOUSIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID S. LADWIG, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY C. LAFOND, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALBERT T. LAGERDA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. LAHART, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRENCE D. LAKIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID R. LAMBERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. LAMONTAGNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
KRIS E. LAMPHERE, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS J. LAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE L. LANE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. LANE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL H. LANEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. LANIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDALL L. LANNING, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS H. LARNED, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWIN M. LARSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DALE L. LARSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. LASALVIA, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM W. LATHAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
EARLE C. LAUDERDALE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN J. LAUTEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL K. LAWHORN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARCH H. LAYMAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS E. LAYNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN S. LAZAR, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
BOYD B. LEASE, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEONARD A. LEATHERWOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORMAN R. LECHTENBERG, xxx-xx-xxxx

ALAN S. LEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD F. LEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY M. LEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK C. LEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICKEY A. LEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT LEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. LEFEVERS, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD C. LEGAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP J. LEGRAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
LENNA K. LEMING, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES L. LEMONS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BILLIE O. LENDERMAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
BRIAN C. LENDING, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH H. LENERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK P. LENNON, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS L. LENTZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICK W. LESTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. LETOURNEAU, xxx-xx-xxxx
KARL F. LEWANDOWSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH M. LEWANDOWSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
HALDON D. LEWIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELLEN K. LEWIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY W. LEWIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LOGAN M. LEWIS, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL C. LEWIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
SANFORD C. LEWIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
VANCE E. LINEBERGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KIRK K. LINKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT G. LINN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. LIOTTA, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHRIS J. LITHERLAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG M. LITTLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RALPH S. LITTREAL, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
LOREN W. LIVERMORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CONNEE LLOYD, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS H. LLOYD, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLEN D. LOCKLEAR, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOEL A. LOEFFLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE A. LOERAKKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE G. LONDON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
HARVEY B. LONGSHORE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK F. LOOS, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. LORINCZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWIN R. LOSKILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
RUSSELL H. LOUGHLIN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANCIS E. LOVE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. LOVELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY W. LOVELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALBERT T. LUCAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID G. LUCAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY I. LULOFF, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY W. LUNSFORD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANN O. LUPTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JIMMIE R. LUTTRELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROLLIN J. LUTZ, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. LYNCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE S. MACHOVINA, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD B. MACNIVEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG K. MACPHERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS R. MADDOCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD M. MADDOX, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. MADDOX, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDERICK L. MADSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD D. MAEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER H. MAGARGEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. MAGEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. MAGILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICIA K. MAGUIRE, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD L. MAHAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVE M. MAHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEITH D. MAJOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRANCE J. MALLON, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN M. MALUTICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENT L. MANUEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARMEN E. MARDIGUIAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE S. MARICLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES A. MARKER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM F. MARKERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD E. MARKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES W. MARKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM W. MARLETT, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
HECTOR M. MARQUEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT A. MARSH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES P. MARSHALL, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT D. MARSHALL, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES A. MARTELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES R. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANE R. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLYN D. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES H. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEROME V. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH P. MARYESKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS K. MASCOT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DIXIE J. MASON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK C. MASTERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES D. MATHENY, xxx-xx-xxxx
CYNTHIA A. MATTHEWS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LYLE B. MATTHEWS, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY K. MATTHEWS, xxx-xx-xxxx
OLIVER MATTHEWS, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID P. MAUNDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALFRED C. MAURER, xxx-xx-xxxx
HARRY P. MAXSON, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEAN I. MAXWELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT C. MAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS L. MAYBERRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD J. MAYER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK E. S. MAYHEW, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL C. MCALISTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. MCANALLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. MCCAMLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD J. MCCARTHY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL F. MCCARTHY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. MCCARTHY, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHENS F. MCCAULEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
FORD H. MCCORMACK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES H. MCCORMICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY T. MCCOY, xxx-xx-xxxx
LORNA G. MCCOY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARIS MCCRABB, xxx-xx-xxxx
PORTIA R. MCCRACKEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID C. MCDANIEL, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. MCDANIEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. MCDANIEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWIN P. MCDERMOTT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. MCDEVITT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. MCDONALD, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS J. MCDONALD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT E. MCDONNELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS L. MCELROY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALTER W. MCELVEEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS P. MCFARLAND, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. MCGANN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL H. MCGINNIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD V. MCGIRR, xxx-xx-xxxx
REGENIA P. MCGOWAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEVIN E. MCHUGH, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY W. MCKILLOP, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES K. MCKINLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. MCKINNEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANGUS M. MCKINNON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN N. MCLEAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. MCMAHAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
BOBBY E. MCMEANS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT B. MCMILLAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD R. MCMONAGLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN E. MCMURRAY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL R. MCMURREY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALTER P. MCMURTRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDERICK L. MCNEIL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JANET K. MCNELIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY MCPHERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. MCTAMNEY, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL J. MEADE, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEE A. MEADOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL D. MECHSNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. MEDLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD M. MEINHART, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD J. MEISTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEONARD T. MELCHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL G. MELCHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK E. MELLINGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNY J. MERIDETH, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. MERRIKEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH A. MERZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK E. METRUSKY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS W. METZGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES A. MEYER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS W. MEYER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES M. MIELKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD W. MILES, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS J. MILLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES C. MILLER, IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES N. MILLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER T. MILLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDY L. MILLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. MILLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM T. MILLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN D. MILLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
IAN M. MILNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. MILNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN D. MINNICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. MINTO, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL E. MINTO, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID J. MIRKOVICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRITTON M. MISTELE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES H. MITCHELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. MITCHELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS A. MITCHELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
HUBERT G. MITCHELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH R. MITCHELL, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT E. MITCHELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANTHONY J. MLINAR, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM P. MOLINE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK C. MONDL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARTHUR J. MONROE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANNY J. MOORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLEN R. MOORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY J. MOORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JULIAN M. MOORE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH L. MOORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CECIL J. MOORMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER R. MOOY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. MORAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. MORAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. MORGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAURICE A. MORGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARTHUR B. MORRILL, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN B. MORRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLENN E. MOSES, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. MOSIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLYDE A. MOSLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES A. MOSORA, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEVIN A. MOSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
KARL J. MOSSO, xxx-xx-xxxx
BARTON J. MOYER, xxx-xx-xxxx
BERNARD M. MUDD, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE I. MUDGE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND J. MUELLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK C. MULLANEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN O. MULLENAX, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES N. MULLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS S. MUNHALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE E. MUNK, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. MUNK, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY L. MURDOCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARION J. MURRELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES A. MYERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
SHELLY L. MYERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
KAREN H. MYRICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN T. NACKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. NAIGLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
KATHRYN F. NANCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM T. NANCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOLF C. NATION, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD W. NEAL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARC J. NEIFERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
WINSTON D. NELMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLARK K. NELSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GALE N. NELSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES B. NELSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RODNEY E. NELSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. NEUHARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID K. NEUMANN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. NEVINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAURENCE R. NEWCOME, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALTER F. NEWGREEN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY K. NEWSOM, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN S. NEWTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD A. NEWTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE A. NICHOLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT E. NICHOLS, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSE E. NIDO, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY J. NIEMIEC, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK E. NILIUS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALEX H. NISBET, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. NISHIMUTA, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWIN E. NOBLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK J. A. NOLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN I. NORBY, xxx-xx-xxxx
LONNIE L. NORRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY L. NORTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM C. NORTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. NOSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
VINCENT C. NOTO, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH E. NOWLAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS L. NUTTBROCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. OAKLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD M. OBERBILLIG, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELSTON E. OBERMANN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE R. OBRIEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. OBRINGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEVIN W. OCALLAGHAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD T. OCONNOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES L. OESER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANDREW J. OGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARTHUR A. OHMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. OMEALLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL D. ONEILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK V. ORLICKY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GILBERTO L. ORNELAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRADLEY ORTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
BILLY K. OSBORN, xxx-xx-xxxx
STANLEY R. OSBORNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD M. OTTINGER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY F. PADULA, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH M. PAGE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT F. PALING, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICIA M. PALMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
STERLING K. PALMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY R. PALMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN T. PARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID S. PARKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELAINE M. PARKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
HUGH A. PARKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MELVIN J. PARKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT D. PARKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. PARKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY B. PARKMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT E. PARKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAROL A. PARRINGTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. PARSONS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAHENDRA K. PATEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD L. PATNEAUD, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL R. PATRICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH G. PATTERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEONARD E. PATTERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK PAUCIELLO, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN H. PAYNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
BETTYE J. PAYNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
BOBBY J. PAYNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN H. PAYNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARTIN A. PAYNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN M. PAYNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD J. PEARCE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS C. PEARSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. PEARSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALLEN G. PECK, xxx-xx-xxxx
LYLE G. PECK, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD E. PECK, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRIAN H. PECKHAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROLAND E. PEIXOTTO, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES W. PENLAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN E. PENNINGTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. PENNINGTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL R. PEPIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILHELM F. PERCIVAL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD G. PEREGOY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANDREW D. PERONA, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALFRED H. PERRIE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICKY A. PERRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS WONDER PETER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN J. PETERSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES V. PETERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS B. PETERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx

JOHN C. PETERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENYON L. PETERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD J. PETERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD W. PETERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN M. PETERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERESA M. PETERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANNIE W. PETKUNAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. PETRILLA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN PETRO, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY L. PETTY, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD D. PHELAN, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALBERT L. PHILLIPS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD V. PHILLIPS, xxx-xx-xxxx
THORNTON D. PHILLIPS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MELVIN L. PHIPPS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARGARET A. PICTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL J. PIERRE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT E. PIERSON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD A. PILLING, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL W. PINTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
BARRY W. PITCHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL A. PITCOVICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENVER L. PLETCHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE G. PLUCKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. PLUMMER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT P. PLUNKETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
HENRY W. POBURKA, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
LOIS E. POLIFKA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARSHALL C. POLLARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH W. POMPA, xxx-xx-xxxx
DELEWIS O. PORTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
TOMMY W. PORTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS P. POTERE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN P. POTTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. POTTS, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILLIP B. POUNDS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD D. POWER, xxx-xx-xxxx
VICTOR C. POWERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY A. PRAESEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAROLYN L. PRATT, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK H. PRATT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL C. PRESTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. PRETZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
BETTY J. PRICE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD N. PRICE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. PRICE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. PRICE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. PRIDEAUX, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK E. PRILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD D. PRYNNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
BERTRAM H. PRYOR, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. PUCKETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY L. PUDWILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY J. PULCHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDALL PUTZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN R. QUICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK C. QUIGLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. RABINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILLIP K. RAGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM F. RAKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RUSSELL E. RAKIP, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ANDREW E. RANDLES, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANDREW J. RANFT, xxx-xx-xxxx
RODNEY R. RASMUSSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES C. RATLIFF, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY E. RATTRAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD W. RAUSCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. RAUSCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES A. RAWLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP M. RAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS J. REAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDERICK J. REAVIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARC I. REBHUN, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORMAN C. REED, xxx-xx-xxxx
SAMUEL M. REED, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
STALKER E. REED, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS P. REGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALTER F. REGEHR, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND W. REHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL T. REICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD L. REID, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT D. REIDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIBURCIO R. RENDON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY J. RENKO, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS J. RENSEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
LOUIS K. REVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES M. REYNOLDS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS D. RICE, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD A. RICE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JON R. RICHARDS, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDRICK C. RICHARDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY M. RICHARDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY D. RICHARDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN L. RICHMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. RICKERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
NEIL R. RIDENOUR, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY R. RIEMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEITH H. RIGGS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD W. RIGSBEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDOLPH R. RIHNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY J. RIJ, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD R. RILEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE G. RIPPON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. RISCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH M. RITCHHART, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM F. RITTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAMON RIVERA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. RIVERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE K. ROBB, xxx-xx-xxxx
ADRIAN D. ROBBE, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDMOND W. ROBERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. ROBERTS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. ROBERTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND J. ROBERTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY A. ROBERTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ERIKA A. ROBESON, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES D. ROBINSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES P. ROBINSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOANNE M. RODEFER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM B. RODIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. ROGACKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
SAMUEL L. ROGERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY D. ROHR, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. ROLANDO, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. ROLSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD E. ROMACK, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. ROMINGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID A. ROODHOUSE, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK J. ROONEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONNA G. ROSA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. ROSA, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILLIP L. ROSE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. ROSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD O. ROSS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GARRY D. ROSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM W. ROSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK A. ROTHE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. ROTHWELL, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT C. ROUNCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID A. ROUND, xxx-xx-xxxx
DALE D. ROWSE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS L. RUDD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT B. RUDD, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL A. RUEHL, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORMAN G. RUIZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES A. RUMLEY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD B. RUNGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID B. RUSSELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES H. RUSSELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. RUSSELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES L. RUTTLER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN E. RYAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILLIP D. SABIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICKIE SADBERRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD G. SAFLARSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDALL L. SAGE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH J. SAILER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GAETANA M. SALETTA, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANTHONY C. SALMONSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
HARRY L. SALTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. SAMPSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. SAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANTHONY M. SANSONE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL C. SANTURE, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN S. SATO, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS H. SAUNDERS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD M. SAVAGE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. SAVAGE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN B. SAXMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES S. SCAPEROTTO, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. SCARBROUGH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL D. SCEARCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES P. SCHAEFER, xxx-xx-xxxx
VERNE S. SCHAEFER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD SCHALLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
HERBERT H. SCHAUNAMAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. SCHEIBLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. SCHIEFER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH H. SCHINDELE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. SCHLAFLI, xxx-xx-xxxx
ORVAL J. SCHLAPKOHL, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. SCHNEIDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK W. SCHONING, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN W. SCHOOLCRAFT, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. SCHRANK, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID M. SCHRUPP, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL C. SCHULTZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE P. SCHULZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALEXANDER SCHUSTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROLAND L. SCHWANDT, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES R. SCHWINN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES C. SCONYERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD J. SCOTT, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. SCULLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHRISTOPHER L. SEBALD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER W. SEBBY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT D. SELIGMANN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL E. SEYMOUR, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD L. SEYMOUR, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANTHONY S. SGROI, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY M. SHAKA, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID P. SHANAHAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ELLIS W. SHARADIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WARREN B. SHAW, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES S. SHEEHAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL E. SHEEHAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL W. SHELOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHRISTOPHER SHELTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. SHELTON, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. SHELTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JONATHAN J. SHEPERD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARTHUR K. SHEPPARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANDREW J. SHERBO, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES L. SHERCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN SHERFESEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY T. SHERVANICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. SHIELD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD L. SHORT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. SHORT, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. SHORT, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK G. SHOWALTER, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY W. SHUGART, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. SILVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PEGGY O. SIMEK, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEVON SIMMONS, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY L. SIMPSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY E. SIMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS M. SINGLETON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT T. SISK, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY L. SISSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS W. SITZMANN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOANNE L. SKIDMORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. B. SLATER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. SLAVENS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE D. SLAWTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. SLAYTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ABRAHAM SMITH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
BOBBY G. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD F. SMITH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS B. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
LIONEL G. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK E. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ODELL A. SMITH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ODES D. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD V. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONNIE W. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT L. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS F. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. SMITH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
WINFIELD H. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. SNOOK, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM T. SNOW, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL T. SNYDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
IVAN D. SOBIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH J. SODA, xxx-xx-xxxx
ERNEST M. SOMOZA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAURICE F. SONNER, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
RUSSELL G. SORENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHNNIE C. SORRELLS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL V. SOTAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP L. SOUCY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. SPADE, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRYAN H. SPARKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS L. SPARROW, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. SPEEGLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY D. SPENCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN H. SPENCER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD K. SPICER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT I. SPILLERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES W. SPRIGGS, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN R. SPRINGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL P. SPROULL, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES E. STALLWORTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE P. STANBERRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH C. STANLEY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ALFRED E. STANTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
BILLY J. STANTON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE A. STANTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER S. STAPLETON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOE M. STATON, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK G. STEGMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY D. STEICHEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. STEINER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. STEINHAGEN, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. STEPAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL C. STEPP, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID E. STEVENER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES L. STEVENS, xxx-xx-xxxx
STANLEY S. STEVENS, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDRIC G. STEWART, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEROY STEWART, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD A. STIBRIK, xxx-xx-xxxx
HANS G. STOLL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS D. STORCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD B. STORRS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM K. STOTHART, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLENN C. STRAIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT A. STRATTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM D. STRAUTMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERALD L. STRAW, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRADLEY K. STREET, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD C. STROM, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS G. STRONG, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. STROUP, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN L. STRUBE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM F. STRUNC, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. STTHOMAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BERNARD D. STUBBS, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN M. STUBBS, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL R. STUCKY, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES R. STURDIVANT, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. SUDEKUM, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE S. SULLENGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KARL S. SULLIVAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN J. SULLIVAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WESLEY B. SULLIVAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD D. SURMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS O. SUTLIFF, xxx-xx-xxxx
STANLEY J. SUTTERFIELD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. SUTTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD G. SUTULA, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID P. SVETZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
RALPH L. SWANN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. SWEENEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS SWEENEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS A. SWERTFAGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND J. SWIDER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM D. SYPTAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT E. TAFT, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM B. TALLON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES J. TANNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY D. TANNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONNA M. TAYLOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK A. TAYLOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
TED D. TAYLOR, xxx-xx-xxxx

TERRY D. TAYLOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. TAYLOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH E. TEAGUE, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN J. TESKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. THAXTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK M. THAYER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES L. THEOBALD, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD J. THIELE, xxx-xx-xxxx
BILLY G. THOMAS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. THOMAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE E. THOMAS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY P. THOMAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD J. THOMAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD L. THOMAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. THOMITS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN E. THOMPSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. THOMPSON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
KC THOMPSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RODNEY C. THOMPSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. THOMSON, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT R. THONN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM F. THORN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. TICKNOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
DALE E. TIETZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
HENRY S. TILLINGHAST, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE A. TITTLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
NATHAN T. TITUS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID F. TODD, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM S. TODD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. TOLBERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILLIP L. TOLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD E. TOMAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN E. TOMPROS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. TOOLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY E. TOPPING, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP E. TORANGO, xxx-xx-xxxx
SAMUEL R. TORREY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RALPH M. TOWELL, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN G. TOWNSEND, xxx-xx-xxxx
SHELBY M. TOWNSEND, xxx-xx-xxxx
HARRY A. TRASK, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY L. TREBON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WESLEY E. TREVETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY M. TRIPLETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY M. TRIPP, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. TRUAX, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD E. TRULL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. TRUMBLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. TSCHORKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARTHUR D. TUBBS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM C. TUCK, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
HAROLD W. TUCKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JESSE R. TUCKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVE J. TULO, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLON D. TURNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL F. TURNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL R. TURNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDALL L. TURNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL B. TUTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER F. TYLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. UECKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALBERT K. UEHARA, xxx-xx-xxxx
DARYL B. UMSTEAD, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID R. UNGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILLIP W. UPCHURCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANCIS J. URBEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLIFFORD M. UTERMOEHLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS E. UTLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
LOYD S. UTTERBACK, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY M. VANCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GUY R. VANDERMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. VANDERWALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARC VANELLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LESLIE R. VANHEESWYK, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL H. VANZANDT, xxx-xx-xxxx
BERTALAN J. VARADY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE L. E. D. VARN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD J. VAUGHAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY L. VECHIK, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANCIS E. VELDMAN, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. VELINO, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK E. VENNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MIGUEL VERANO, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS J. VERBECK, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS D. VERSCHAEVE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE A. VIDRINE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS F. VIEHE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARMANDO V. VILLAGRAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES VITELLI, xxx-xx-xxxx
ERIC M. VOGEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT C. VOGLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
HANS J. VOGT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT E. VOIGT, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLYDE P. VOYLES, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. VROSH, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL E. WABS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CALVIN O. WACHS, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS L. WADE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. WADSWORTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY G. WAEBER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD S. WAGAMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLARENCE H. WAGNER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT N. WAGONER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LYNN W. WAKEFIELD, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARY M. WALGAMOTT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD L. WALKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS B. WALKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. WALKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL W. WALKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRED K. WALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE E. WALLACHY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL D. WALLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN D. WALLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. WALLETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
SANDRA K. WALLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALBERT E. WALMSLEY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD J. WALSH, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN D. WALSWORTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS B. WALTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN J. WALTERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. WALTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
BERT J. WAMPLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. WARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH P. WARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. WARDEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DALE C. WATERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH J. WATERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY W. WATERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAY M. WATKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS J. WATSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHNNIE H. WAUCHOP, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS W. WAYLETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN H. WAYNE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS G. WEBB, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES D. WEBER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD H. WEEKS, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERESA Y. Y. WEGEMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. WEIFORD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES H. WELLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEWIS F. WELLS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK K. WELLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. WELLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. WELTEROTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD M. WEMPE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL S. WENGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD WENGOREK, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES D. WENNERMARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY H. WENZEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK R. WERNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES D. WESSLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD L. WESTFALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD J. WETEKAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN E. WHEELER, xxx-xx-xxxx
HARRY W. WHITAKER, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHNNY WHITAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS D. WHITAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE K. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID B. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GAROLD L. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE L. WHITE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD L. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY W. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD H. WHITLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALFRED H. WHITLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. WHITLEY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
EARL E. WHITT, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES D. WHITTENBERG, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH J. WIATREK, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. WICKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH P. WIDINCAMP, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
TONY L. WIGGINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
HARRY W. WILBANKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRIAN H. WILBER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. WILKEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY WILKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. WILKINSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY F. WILLERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
TURNER WILLFORD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
BEN C. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BILLY G. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES R. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
EUGENE C. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE B. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN G. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAFORREST V. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MELISSA M. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
THEODORE WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE E. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRIAN E. WILLIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. WILLIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. WILLIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN B. WILLIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL P. WILLISON, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDERICK F. WILLISTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES L. WILSON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. WILSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD B. WILSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT D. WILSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM D. WILSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. WINCHESTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES L. WINSTEAD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES M. WINTERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLIFFORD M. WIPPEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALTER P. WISE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELSLEY K. WITT, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK L. WITTKAMP, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES K. WOESSNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN L. WOIDA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. WOJCIK, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH W. WOMACK, xxx-xx-xxxx
REXFORD O. WOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN G. WOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx
HOMER O. WOODARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL Q. G. WOODFORD, xxx-xx-xxxx
GUY A. WOOLMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY V. WOOTTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES N. WORTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN J. WRIGHT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT C. WRIGHT, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN M. H. WRIGHT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD C. WURSTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS F. WYNN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. YARGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY L. YATES, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP G. YAVORSKY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND E. YEILDING, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN K. YERLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN R. YESTNESS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD D. YOHO, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER W. YOUNG, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER A. YOUNG, xxx-xx-xxxx
STUART A. YOUNG, xxx-xx-xxxx
VICKIE A. YOUNG, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT A. YOUNGQUIST, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES R. YOUNKIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL F. ZAUNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID A. ZELLMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH C. ZEMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD M. ZIMMERMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD D. ZIMMERMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL R. ZOERB, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD ZUBER, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD J. ZWIRKO, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

DENNIS E. ALESON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHNNY R. ALMOND, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANNY N. ARMSTRONG, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. BLAIR, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH E. BRIGGS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD T. BROGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
KAREN T. CHRISLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. COLLINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALTER M. COURTER, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID E. CROCKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY C. FOGLTANCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
SHARON M. FREETO, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK J. HALEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
HENRY B. HIGHFILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAY W. HINSCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARTHUR R. HOMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD H. KELLING, xxx-xx-xxxx
MELVIN E. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH F. MCCAHON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
FORREST D. MILLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES W. PERRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES P. REVELLO, xxx-xx-xxxx
CECIL R. RICHARDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS P. SANDI, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES A. SANDS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID J. SCHROEDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
EVERETT C. SCHRUM, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD E. TAYLOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANNY R. THOMPSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. WILSON, xxx-xx-xxxx

JUDGE ADVOCATE

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT C. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE J. BARNARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS G. BECKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM P. BOWEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID R. BRENNAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. CHAPPELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID M. DIVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
BERNARD E. DONAHUE, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN J. DUGGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD T. GAMM, xxx-xx-xxxx
H. MARTIN JAYNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRYAN T. LAWLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT B. MCLAUTHLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN K. PASSEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD A. B. PRICE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALEXANDER W. PURDUE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JACK L. RIVES, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH M. ROBERTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD L. ROBINSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN M. ROTACH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARGARET L. SCHREIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH W. SCHROER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY L. SHARRAR, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK J. SPINNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID P. STEPHENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND T. SWENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. THOMAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. WILSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEE W. ZIMMERMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx

NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

HELEN M. ALVERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
VICKIE H. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DIAN L. ATKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ESTON L. BANNISTER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DEBORAH M. BARNOSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
CORALIE S. BETZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDGAR E. BRYNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. BUCKLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
KATHY K. CASH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANNETTE J. COCKBURN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELLEN A. CONNORS, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDITH M. E. DAQUILALLOYD, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS A. DAVIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARYANNE DEPAOLAUTT, xxx-xx-xxxx
KATHRYN M. FAGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DEBORAH S. FRANCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRENDA K. FULLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY C. GOCKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY C. GRAY, xxx-xx-xxxx

KATHRYN A. GRAZIANI, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLENDANN HARDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DEBORAH A. HART, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN L. HARVEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
KATHRYN M. HENRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DARRELL R. HOFFMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
SHARON A. HOLTZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORMA J. HUMPHREY, xxx-xx-xxxx
PEGGY A. JAMES, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. JOST, xxx-xx-xxxx
CYNTHIA A. KENYON, xxx-xx-xxxx
SHERRIE L. KNECHT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JILL M. LAYMON, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERESA A. LEDZINSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOROTHY M. LEWIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
KAREN L. MARUSZAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
HELEN G. MCGAW, xxx-xx-xxxx
KATHLEEN A. MCINDOE, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY S. MCMILLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
NANCY L. MCNAMARA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARIE A. MOYER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS R. NEWPORT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY A. OPHOF, xxx-xx-xxxx
JANICE K. ORORKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOYCE K. PARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
SHARON D. PATTERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
NANCY C. PREZIOSI, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES B. ROBERTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL R. RUSTVANG, xxx-xx-xxxx
JIMMIE M. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARGARET E. STRICKLAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
EILEEN L. SULLIVAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JACQUELYN J. SUMMERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARTHA L. TARLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRENDA C. TEAL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONNA D. THOMPSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOLORES H. TURNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAMELA A. WINDMUELLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUZANNE WOLF, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL C. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID A. BOYUM, xxx-xx-xxxx
DON C. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY L. BUTLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. CARLETTI, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. CARVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RUSSELL L. COLEMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN G. CORNALI, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD A. DEVALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES C. DUDTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS A. EUREK, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD W. GRUENDELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAURICE R. HAMILTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARLISLE HARRISON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN K. LECHOLOP, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD D. MADDOX, xxx-xx-xxxx
LESLIE L. MALLONEE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG S. MATSUDA, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL MAYER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH L. MCGRAW, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS M. OREILLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. PATCHIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
NEIL G. PATTERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD A. PETERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD S. ROARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. ROBSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. ROTHSTEIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JACKIE W. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. SPARKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARRY W. STANBERRY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOE E. STRANGE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. THORNELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY B. VANCLEAVE, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY F. WITTGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES J. BERGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN E. BROOKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN J. CASSIDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES P. CERHA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. CHARLES, xxx-xx-xxxx
STUART T. CORDTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH A. COSTA, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE V. CROSHAW, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD B. DRAWBAUGH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL I. DUBROFF, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT A. FERGUSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK T. FINK, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM C. HALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOE C. HEFLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICIA A. HOBBS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM F. KELLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
IRA J. KOREMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK T. LUBOZYNSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENT E. MAGNUSSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARTHA M. MARETH, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES A. MCGEHEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MELINDA A. MITCHELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
KARL O. MOE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES D. MONTGOMERY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE R. NEW, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES W. NORMARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUELLYN W. NOVAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL M. OHAVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MELVIN R. ONEAL, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE R. PATTERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS L. PENDERGRAST, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. POTTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS A. ROBILLARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL L. RUNYAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
SHERRELL L. RUSSELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK R. STEPHENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM S. SWINDLING, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. WARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. ZAHLER, xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 3385:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be colonel

THOMAS A. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
BYRON L. BARNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD BRITO, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT A. BRODERICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN S. CALVETTI, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. CUNNINGHAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES J. DAVID, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL J. DILLON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT G. DUNNAVANT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JIMMY W. EASTERLING, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY J. EGGLESTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH L. FERREIRA, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALLEN O. GRELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
HARVEY M. HAAKENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. HADWIGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
NORMAN T. HAINES, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN L. HANSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. HOLMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD C. HULS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BERRY S. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHNNY R. KENDRICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. KENNEDY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD K. KERWOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx
FLOYD KING, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS K. KIRKPATRICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
GAROLD W. LUTHY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANDREW R. MILLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LOUIS L. MURRAY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. OCONNOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD D. ORTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES M. PARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. RAWLINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
REINALDO G. SANCHEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDRICK H. SERMON, xxx-xx-xxxx
EARL V. SHACKELFORD, xxx-xx-xxxx
HENRY D. SINTZENICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALLEN E. TACKETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. VERTREES, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEROY A. WALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
RYLAND E. WREDE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE D. ZAJAC, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID A. ZWEIFEL, xxx-xx-xxxx

CHAPLAIN

To be colonel

RONALD C. BILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS C. BLESSIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. CURTIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES D. WILLIAMS, SR., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

HOWARD AXENROD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JACKIE L. CHURCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES KANAKIS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID R. NICHOLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLAUDE K. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be colonel

GERALD O. DIAL, xxx-xx-xxxx

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be lieutenant colonel

RONALD W. ADAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
REGINALD T. BERNARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP W. BEVIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELLIS E. BRUMBAUGH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JASPER CARPENTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. CASSADY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD S. CHASTAIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH J. CHAVES, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER C. COLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAN M. COLGLAZIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARRY J. COLLOTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES J. COOKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS W. DALTON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE C. DOLL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. DOUGLAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES P. FOOT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH J. GACIOCH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES G. GAMBILL, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
KEITH C. GOODHOPE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM W. GOODWIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
OLEXANDER HNOJEWYJ, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD D. HOVERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES G. HOWARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. HOWER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GILMER T. HURST, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD W. HUSKES, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DANNY D. ISAACS, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRED R. JAECKLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN E. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
BANKS C. KELLY, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES H. KINNEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. KLITZKIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEONID KONDRATIUK, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS R. KRAFT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. LATOURRETTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JULIUS J. LAWTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK D. LEECH, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE E. LETCHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. LITTLETON, xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG L. LOWMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWIN T. LUCAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD A. LUEBKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT F. MILFORD, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS A. MORTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RUDY J. NESVIK, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. OCHSNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
VICTOR M. ORTIZ, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY L. OUTMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. PEARSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH T. PERKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. PERRIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY L. PULS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. RAES, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID J. REHKAMP, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. ROBERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNY W. ROYLANCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM B. RUNYAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. RUX, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLEN I. SAKAGAWA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES O. SALLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANLY H. SANCHEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD J. SCHLEGEL, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GLEN L. SCHOEPP, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD E. SHEEHAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. SIKES, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS D. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS P. SMYTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. SPORES, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE W. STANG, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. SWARTZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. TANCZYN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS M. THOMPSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY W. TIPPS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANDRE J. TROTTIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LESLIE K. TUBB, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY J. VADNAIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL R. VANPATTEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILFORD C. VOYLES, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY D. WELCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
DALE W. WELLS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAN A. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY F. WILHELM, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDALL F. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES D. WILLIAMSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MITCHELL M. WILLOUGHBY, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLARENCE C. WUTHRICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES A. ZERNICKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICKIE J. ZIEGENFUSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS J. ZIFCAK, xxx-xx-xxxx

CHAPLAIN

To be lieutenant colonel

WILBERN C. HOFFMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. YOWN, xxx-xx-xxxx

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MATTIE L. CALDWELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY K. COBBS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BETTY L. FOEHL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARGARET M. MEYER, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MOHAMED S. ALIBRAHIM, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT S. CHAVKIN, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES A. KRUECK, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. KURPIEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS J. MASER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM F. SMITH, III, xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS INDICATED BY ASTERISK ARE ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

CHAPLAIN

To be colonel

RICHARD J. AROLD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT F. BERGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. CLARK, xxx-xx-xxxx

DONALD L. DAVIDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE W. GUDZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. HANNAH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALBERT M. HANSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD H. HOLLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK M. ORNBURN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD O. STENBAKKEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS M. WARME, xxx-xx-xxxx

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL E. ALLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHRISTEN V. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBIN L. APLET, xxx-xx-xxxx
THEODORE BOBACK, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND E. BRADLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK F. BREINHOLT, xxx-xx-xxxx
VINCENT D. *. BURNS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WINFIELD D. BUZBY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES S. COOPER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLENN T. FASANELLA, xxx-xx-xxxx
BILLY W. FOWLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANDERSON H. GRANT, xxx-xx-xxxx
BILL C. GREENWALT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. GRIFFIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD M. *. HARTSELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY J. HEBEBRAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT A. HUTCHERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER D. KAPPEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLEN R. KELSO, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEROY KIEMELE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT D. MCCRORY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS S. MCLEROY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS W. MITCHINER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH R. MORRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM C. MORRISON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM C. NOBLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN B. PATRICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL W. PHIFER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM I. PHILIPS, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
HAROLD D. ROLLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
OTTIS W. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
SAMUEL L. SMITH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD TAYLOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM T. TAYLOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER TELENCIO, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL V. THOMPSON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROOSEVELT WINFREY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. YARBROUGH, xxx-xx-xxxx

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

DENNIS P. *. AKIYAMA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARSHALL L. ASHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD P. *. BANDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK H. *. BEACH, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD W. *. BEATTY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD P. *. BEIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. *. BERWICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRANT A. *. BRADFORD, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES R. *. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL J. BUCCIGROSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHERYL S. BUDD, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS W. *. BUTTERFOSS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID L. CARR, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD E. *. CAVATAIO, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS K. CHUBB, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP B. CIBOROWSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. *. CLAYTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN P. *. COFER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY C. *. CONCILIO, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE J. COOK, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. *. DAVIDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES P. FERRITER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY T. FONDAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARTIN W. *. FRITZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND E. *. GONZALEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE E. GRABOW, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY L. *. HAIUM, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS L. HARPER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. HARRELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH R. *. HELM, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS G. *. HORNING, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS E. *. JENNINGS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM S. *. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JACKIE L. *. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONNIE K. *. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY K. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. MCGUIRE, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY J. MILLIKAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD E. *. MITCHELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. MITCHELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES T. MULLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY D. *. MUNDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL J. *. MURRAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. *. NICKEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY L. NIXON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARTIN J. OAKES, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. OBRIEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT G. OWEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE J. *. PATCHEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN L. PHILLIPS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRYAN K. *. POLLARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
DIANE M. *. POLLICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS P. PRYOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN C. QUERNA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. RAGNO, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY M. *. REDDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
NESTOR L. ROMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAPHAEL T. SCHACH, xxx-xx-xxxx
STANLEY R. *. SCOTT, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. *. SCUBA, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRENCE M. *. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD A. *. SOUZA, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD J. *. STRITTMATTER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS A. SULLIVAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER R. THRONDSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. VALANT, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRADLEY J. *. VANCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
HANS W. WAWROUSEK, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD K. WOLFF, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN T. *. WONDERLICH, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES H. ALGEO, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS M. *. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN R. *. BAILEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. *. BAKER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
LYNN P. *. BEAULIEU, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL M. *. BENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD W. *. BERNTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
BENROE W. *. BLOUNT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ZDENEK *. BOCEK, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM K. *. BRADY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MACEO BRAXTON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD M. *. BRIGGS, xxx-xx-xxxx
VERNON R. *. BRUCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP P. *. BRUNO, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL P. *. BYRNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALBERT D. *. CAIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES E. CARTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CANDICE L. *. CASTRO, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. *. CAWTHON, xxx-xx-xxxx
AIDA G. *. CERVANTES, xxx-xx-xxxx
TANYA R. *. CHEEVERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDY W. *. CHRISTENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. *. CLAYTON, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
LIMONE C. *. COLLINS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MARLISE R. *. COLLINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BEATRIZ H. *. COQUILLA, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAND J. CUTHBERTSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. DAIGH, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. *. DANIEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES E. *. DAVIS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD M. *. DEARMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
HERMAN V. DEVERA, xxx-xx-xxxx
DWIGHT L. *. DONESKY, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS B. *. DOUGHERTY, xxx-xx-xxxx
OTTO E. *. DOVE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY L. *. DRAKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
NEWTON O. *. DUNCAN, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES C. EAVES, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. *. EGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. ENZENAUER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHERRY L. *. GAFFNEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT H. *. GATES, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DEAN R. *. GIULITTO, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLENN L. *. GOLDSTEIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD R. *. GOMEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
NEY M. *. GORE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES D. *. GRIST, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD W. *. GROGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID K. *. HAAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID P. *. HALBACH, xxx-xx-xxxx
JON F. *. HARRELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE P. *. HARTMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
LOMA H. *. HASSELL, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARLA G. *. HAWLEYBOWLAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
LOUIS A. *. HIEB, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH A. *. HIEKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND A. *. HOWARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD C. *. HUYCKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID P. *. JAQUES, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT V. *. JARRETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER S. *. JENSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRIAN R. *. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY P. *. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
MYRON B. *. JONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH A. *. KAPLAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH L. *. KNICKERBOCKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL H. *. KNODEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. *. KURTZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND G. *. LANDE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. *. LEHMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERARD S. *. LETTERIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
IRWIN L. *. LEVEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID B. *. LINTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
NELSON W. *. LUM, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM P. MADIGAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. *. MARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROY D. *. MARKHAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
SAMUEL K. *. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. *. MARX, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEVIN T. *. MASON, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY N. *. MATTESON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM M. *. MCCLINTOCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. *. MCCLURE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES E. *. MCQUEEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSE E. *. MELENDEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH *. MELTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
EMIL J. *. MENK, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL A. *. MEUNIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
HASMUKHLAL A. *. MITHANI, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID A. *. MORTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMERI M. *. MURARI, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWIN A. MURDOCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
BHAGYA *. MURTHY, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEONARD E. NAGORSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL A. *. NEESE, xxx-xx-xxxx
EVERETT W. *. NEWCOMB, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
NESTOR L. *. NIEVES, xxx-xx-xxxx
ISMAEL N. *. NUNO, xxx-xx-xxxx
FORREST W. *. OLIVERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. *. PARKER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CLARENCE E. *. PEARSON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN H. *. PEIXOTTO, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS F. PHILLIP, xxx-xx-xxxx
EARL L. *. PHILLIPS, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILLIP R. *. PITTMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
HUBERT S. *. REID, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY R. *. RIPPLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID E. *. RIVERA, xxx-xx-xxxx
CASEY *. ROGERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY J. *. SCHULTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID G. *. SEIBEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM *. SEID, xxx-xx-xxxx
LINDA M. SERWATKA, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES R. *. SHUMAN, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN O. *. SIMMONS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARTHUR C. *. SIPPO, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT G. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. *. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN B. *. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. SNYDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PARMINDER *. SODHI, xxx-xx-xxxx
VIMAL K. *. SODHI, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEANNETTE E. *. SOUTHPAUL, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL P. *. STAMM, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDERICK A. *. STECKEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
HAROLD H. SULLIVAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID C. *. TAPP, xxx-xx-xxxx
AILEEN *. THONG, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. TIDWELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHNIE S. *. TILLMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID F. *. TOLLEFSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD P. *. TURNICKY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK L. VANDEWALKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSE A. *. VELEZBORRAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAMARAO *. VULLAGANTI, xxx-xx-xxxx
VAN E. *. WAHLGREN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES L. *. WALLINGFORD, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK T. *. WARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY J. *. WEBB, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL M. WEBBER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHRISTOPHER B. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
COURTENAY S. *. WHITMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
SANDRA L. *. WILCOX, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID M. *. WILDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICKY D. *. WILKERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
HENRY L. *. WILSON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY H. WILSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. *. WILSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES W. *. YOST, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY A. ZIESKE, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

LYNN F. *. ABRAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN A. *. ALLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH L. *. ANDERSON, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY W. *. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE L. ANDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
VINCENT L. *. ANGELONI, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARLOS E. ANGUEIRA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES G. *. ARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSE L. *. ARJONA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. ARMSTRONG, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT C. ARMSTRONG, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALLAN R. *. AU, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAROLYN L. AVERY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JANIINE G. *. BABCOCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWIN L. BAKER, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. *. BAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JIMMY L. *. BARROW, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY W. *. BARTELS, xxx-xx-xxxx
HERMAN J. *. BARTHEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP M. *. BAYLISS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD A. *. BECK, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY L. *. BECKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY J. *. BEHRENS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROGER J. *. BELBEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
CALVIN *. BELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
BARRY F. *. BENNETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. *. BERKLAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
VALERIE L. *. BESENBRUCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID T. *. BIZOUSKY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. BLACK, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN A. *. BLACK, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN M. *. BLANEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD S. *. BLUME, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES D. BOLAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOCELYN W. *. BONNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK W. *. BONNEVILLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN C. BORN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RENE A. *. BOUCHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENIS P. *. BOUVIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CYNTHIA A. *. BRANDT, xxx-xx-xxxx
LINDA M. *. BRANTNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY H. *. BRANTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN H. *. BRAXTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAL R. *. BRENNAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD S. BROADHURST, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. *. BROOKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE F. *. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS C. *. BROWN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAROLE A. *. BUCKNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN E. *. BUDD, xxx-xx-xxxx
HENRY B. BURCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK A. *. BURKETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHELNO M. *. BURNETT, xxx-xx-xxxx
LARRY C. *. BURNS, xxx-xx-xxxx
LINDA M. *. BURRELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIE *. CACHO, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx

ROBERT A. *. CAIGNET, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES M. *. CALDWELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES W. *. CALLAHAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRIAN S. *. CAMPBELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL S. *. CAMPBELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
LUIS I. *. CANALES, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM H. *. CANDLER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID B. *. CANTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY W. *. CAPEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER A. CARDINAL, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALLACE R. *. CARTER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
WENDY P. *. CARTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
LESTER C. CAUDLE, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER K. *. CELLUCCI, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALLEN E. *. CHANTELOIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID I. *. CHARNEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVE T. *. CHEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID M. *. CHENEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL T. *. CHING, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH L. CHRISTENSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID P. *. CICERI, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY B. CLARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD A. *. CLARK, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN C. *. CLEMENT, xxx-xx-xxxx
CLARK H. *. COBB, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. *. COCHRAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES *. COFFEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDITH J. *. COHEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
HOWARD B. *. COHEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT L. *. COLEMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD F. *. COLES, xxx-xx-xxxx
MATTHEW M. *. CONKLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY L. *. COOPER, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERESE A. *. COPELAND, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. *. CORAGGIO, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL R. CORDTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
RAYMOND A. *. COSTABILE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DERMOT M. COTTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK *. COTTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM F. *. COUGHLIN, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHRISTOPHER M. *. COVERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DEBORAH H. *. CRUMBAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARLOS *. CRUZ, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG B. *. DANSHAW, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH P. *. DAVENPORT, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL J. *. DAVEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
NELSON A. *. DAVINO, xxx-xx-xxxx
HOWELL E. *. DAVIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
KIMBERLY H. *. DAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD F. DEBO, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN A. *. DECLUE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID A. *. DELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES W. *. DELONG, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENISE M. *. DEMERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN S. DICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. *. DIETZ, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL J. *. DIRE, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY K. *. DIXON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN P. *. DRAGO, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROLF R. *. DRINHAUS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANDREW A. *. DUERR, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN J. *. DUGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL R. *. DUNHAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
SHERMAN *. DUNN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
KEVIN M. *. DWYER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBBY M. *. EAVES, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL A. EDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY L. *. EDWARDS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CELIA H. ELBRECHT, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY P. *. ENDY, xxx-xx-xxxx
HOPE R. *. ENGSBERG, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. *. ETZEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAREN K. *. EUSTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
NANCY I. *. FALLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES A. FARRINGTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
STUART R. FARRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALTER S. *. FASOLAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
KELLY J. FAUCETTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEAN M. *. FERBER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KURT A. *. FICHTNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CECIL W. *. FINCHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KIMBERLY A. *. FINDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN R. *. FISCHLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH J. *. FISH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL R. *. FISHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES P. *. FITCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANNE M. FLYNN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN P. FOLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWIN J. *. FORTENBERY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY J. *. FORTUNE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN T. *. FRAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES J. *. FRANCHINO, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAUREEN D. *. FRANCIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DUSTIN C. *. FRAZIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID P. *. FRISHBERG, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS S. *. FUGATE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD J. *. FUJIMOTO, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAROL A. FUJIYOSHI, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOEL R. *. GALLOWAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
EVERETT L. *. GAYLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
S. G. *. GEDDIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALFRED E. *. GEISSELE, xxx-xx-xxxx
SORELL D. *. GELINAS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALTER J. *. GIBLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY W. *. GLASSHEIM, xxx-xx-xxxx
INES *. GONZALEZTORRES, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT G. *. GOODRICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN E. *. GREEFKENS, xxx-xx-xxxx
COLIN M. *. GREENE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. *. GUSZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL H. *. HAAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD C. *. HAASER, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN C. *. HADLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARC B. *. HAHN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS A. HALE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD S. *. HALL, xxx-xx-xxxx
RANDY L. *. HAMILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY E. *. HANSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELIZABETH J. *. HARDAWAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY B. *. HARGIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM P. *. HARRIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
EVERETT T. *. HART, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK E. *. HARVEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELIZABETH N. HASERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
NOEL C. *. HASKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JANET V. *. HAYS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE A. *. HAYTON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ERIC R. HELANDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. *. HENDERSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL *. HENRICKSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES P. *. HERLIHY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY W. *. HERROLD, xxx-xx-xxxx
BONNIE L. *. HEYER, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE L. *. HILLARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ERIC W. *. HIRSCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEO L. *. HISE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID P. HOCHSCHILD, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE F. *. HODGES, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID E. *. HOGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES A. *. HOLT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY P. *. HORAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL C. HOTARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
LISA M. *. HOVENGA, xxx-xx-xxxx
TRENT L. *. HOVENGA, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM A. HUGHES, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. *. HULL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL L. *. HUMPHREY, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILLIP M. *. HUTCHINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAROL A. *. HUTCHINSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
NANCY J. *. HUTNAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JORDAN C. *. ISERMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN M. *. JACOCKS, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK H. *. JAHNS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL A. *. JAINDL, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES P. *. JENKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN W. *. JESSE, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN C. *. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS C. *. JOHNSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES G. JOLISSAINT, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT E. *. KASPER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK J. *. KASSELIK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY P. KAVOLIUS, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK G. *. KEELEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD A. *. KELLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL G. *. KIDD, xxx-xx-xxxx
KAREN A. *. KIMBRELLWILMOT, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAX C. *. KINNAMAN, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFERY J. *. KIRLANGITIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM R. KLEMME, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS E. KNUTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEITH A. *. KONKOL, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE W. *. KORNFELD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFERY D. *. KROLL, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN A. *. KULIK, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
BETH L. *. KURTZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT J. *. LABUTTA, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD M. *. LACHIVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELLEN M. *. LACKERMANN, xxx-xx-xxxx
LLOYD C. *. LAGRANGE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN R. *. LAIRD, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
REED R. *. LAMBERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRYAN R. *. LARSEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JULIE M. *. LAWRENCE, xxx-xx-xxxx
LUKE P. *. LEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER D. *. LEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DEBRA L. *. LEEKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE A. LEIBERT, xxx-xx-xxxx
GILBERT A. *. LEIDIG, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
WAYNE D. *. LEVY, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOT M. *. LEWEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS A. LIENING, xxx-xx-xxxx
GRANT R. *. LINDEE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID C. *. LIPPS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE B. LISEHORA, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID S. *. LITTRELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT A. *. LOCASTRO, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK A. *. LOMBARDO, xxx-xx-xxxx
JUAN M. *. LOPEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN J. *. LORETTE, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
DOREEN M. *. LOUNSBERY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEFFREY D. *. LOVIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID J. *. LOYOLA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. *. LUETHKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS J. *. LUETKEHANS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID C. *. MACDONALD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN D. *. MACDONALD, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALAN J. *. MAGILL, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID MALAVE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAN S. *. MALLADA, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE J. *. MAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
NATALIE B. *. MANELICK, xxx-xx-xxxx
HARRY P. MARSHALL, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
BRYAN L. *. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL J. *. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. MARTIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT G. *. MARTINDALE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL J. *. MASON, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY A. MATHIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DALE L. *. MCCARTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID M. *. MCCOY, xxx-xx-xxxx
GLENN D. MCDERMOTT, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD B. *. MCWHIRT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID M. *. MEGO, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. MEIKLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL F. *. MELLEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
IVRI K. *. MESSINGER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHARLES E. *. MILLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS R. *. MINER, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD W. *. MOCZYGEMBA, xxx-xx-xxxx
BARBARA C. *. MOLINA, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK *. MOLLOY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. *. MONIHAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ELIZABETH A. *. MONTGOMERY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MAY M. *. MONTRICHARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY P. *. MOORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD A. *. MOORE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANN M. MORGAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOSEPH T. *. MORRIS, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONALD M. *. MOSCATI, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES C. MULLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT N. MURRAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN P. *. MURRAY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARY C. NACE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL E. *. NASH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT M. *. NASH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ANNETTE R. *. NATHAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
LONNY R. *. NATTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT B. NETT, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
ELIZABETH A. *. NEUHALFEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. *. NOLAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
RALPH S. *. NORTHAM, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK R. *. NYREEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRIAN W. *. OCONNOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
JUDITH A. OCONNOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
SEAN D. *. ODONNELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
RADAMES A. *. OLIVERQUINONES, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN L. *. ONDRA, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS P. *. OSHEA, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL R. *. OUELLETTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEE B. *. PADOVE, xxx-xx-xxxx
KELLY P. *. PALMER, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK S. PARMA, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARLOS M. PARRADO, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALFRED M. *. PASCUAL, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL S. *. PATANE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK E. *. PEELE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENIS E. *. PERCELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
FERNANDO J. PEREZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEPHEN J. *. PERKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAN J. *. PERLOFF, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT T. *. PERO, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES D. *. PETERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRI J. *. PHIPPS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES D. *. PIKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
KRYSTYNA I. *. PILECKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
DENNIS M. *. PLANTE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MCKAY L. *. PLATT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. POLLY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
SHIRLEY M. POLLY, xxx-xx-xxxx
JEREMY W. *. POOLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL B. *. PORTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID W. *. PURNER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES W. *. QUAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN L. *. QUIGLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
EDUARDO R. *. RAEZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE R. RAGARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEVIN M. *. RAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
LORRAINE L. *. RALPH, xxx-xx-xxxx
DARRELL W. *. RANDLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD J. *. RANDOLPH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK S. *. RANEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
NEIL W. *. RAWLINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MATTHEW W. *. RAYMOND, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM M. *. REDWOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH E. *. REESOR, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARCIA A. *. RELLIHAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
HENRI RENOMDELABAUME, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY M. *. RICHARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES R. *. RICHTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIS J. *. RIEKER, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS D. *. RINEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILFREDO *. RIOS, xxx-xx-xxxx
ABRAHAM *. RIVERA, xxx-xx-xxxx
JUAN A. *. RIVERADELEON, xxx-xx-xxxx
JERRY L. *. ROBERTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
DANIEL K. *. ROBIE, xxx-xx-xxxx
HECTOR A. *. ROBLES, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEVIN B. *. ROCHE, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROSEANN *. ROMITO, xxx-xx-xxxx
LELAND D. RONNINGEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY J. *. ROSENMEIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MIGUEL J. ROVIRA, xxx-xx-xxxx
CHRISTOPHER J. *. RYDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JUAN *. SANTIAGOMARINI, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL D. *. SCHANBACHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT *. SCHARSTEIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL R. SCHAUB, xxx-xx-xxxx
NOAH S. SCHENKMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES M. *. SCHERBENSKE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARGARET A. SCHLATTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID F. *. SCHMIDT, xxx-xx-xxxx
HOWARD J. *. SCHMIDT, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS M. *. SEAWORTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
WALLACE J. *. SEAY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD G. SEDLAK, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD T. *. SHAFFER, xxx-xx-xxxx
EVE C. *. SHANK, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAWRENCE P. *. SHANK, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOAN *. SHEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
BARRY J. *. SHERIDAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PEGGY E. *. SHOWALTER, xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG D. *. SHRIVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
PETER A. SILKOWSKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY E. *. SIMMONS, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY R. *. SIMONDS, xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL B. *. SIMPSON, xxx-xx-xxxx

DONALD L. *. SINDEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL R. *. SKLAREW, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS E. *. SLOAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
DARRYL R. *. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE R. SMITH, xxx-xx-xxxx
MATTHEW R. *. SMOLIN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT O. *. SNODDY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT D. *. SNYDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM D. *. SNYDER, xxx-xx-xxxx
KAREN L. *. SOUTHMAYD, xxx-xx-xxxx
DON P. SPEERS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
AMY M. *. SPRAGUE, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN W. *. SPURLOCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY W. *. STARCK, xxx-xx-xxxx
CARL S. *. STEINBERG, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM F. *. STODDARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRUCE G. *. STORRS, xxx-xx-xxxx
KEVIN B. *. STOUT, xxx-xx-xxxx
PATRICK STPIERRE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARGARET J. *. STRIEPER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM E. *. STRONG, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICKY H. *. STUGART, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAMES E. *. SUCHNICKI, xxx-xx-xxxx
LYNN S. *. SUDDUTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT H. *. SUDDUTH, xxx-xx-xxxx
JAY F. *. SULLIVAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
ERNEST E. *. SULLIVENT, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN W. SWANN, xxx-xx-xxxx
SIDNEY J. *. SWANSON, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
DAVID D. *. TEUSCHER, xxx-xx-xxxx
JOHN F. *. THEROUX, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM C. *. THOMEIER, SR., xxx-xx-xxxx
TIMOTHY A. *. TIERNEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARTIN H. *. TIEVA, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD J. *. TIMMONS, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
EDWARD W. *. TOBEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARIE J. *. TRENGA, xxx-xx-xxxx
DWIGHT R. *. TRIBELHORN, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARC P. TSUFIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAULA K. *. UNDERWOOD, xxx-xx-xxxx
LUIS A. *. URRUTIA, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN L. *. VAGNIER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM F. *. VARR, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS K. *. VAUGHAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
PAUL J. *. VINSEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT D. *. WADLEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
CAROLYN A. *. WAIT, xxx-xx-xxxx
DEBORAH A. *. WAITZ, xxx-xx-xxxx
PHILIP E. *. WAKEFIELD, xxx-xx-xxxx
BARBARA E. *. WALKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
TERRY J. WALTERS, xxx-xx-xxxx
BENJAMIN F. *. WALTON, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
DONALD G. *. WARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
THOMAS P. *. WARD, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM J. WATERHOUSE, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK D. *. WATKINS, xxx-xx-xxxx
SCOTT A. *. WEAVER, xxx-xx-xxxx
GEORGE F. *. WEBER, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARTIN E. *. WEISSE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GERALD M. *. WELCH, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBERT W. WELLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
ARMISTEAD L. *. WELLFORD, xxx-xx-xxxx
KENNETH W. *. WESTPHAL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARK D. *. WHITAKER, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIAM L. *. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD E. *. WHITLOW, xxx-xx-xxxx
TODD B. *. WHITSITT, xxx-xx-xxxx
TODD M. *. WIEN, xxx-xx-xxxx
GREGORY S. *. WILEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARIANNE *. WILLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
GUY P. *. WILLIAMS, xxx-xx-xxxx
FREDERIC B. *. WILSON, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JON J. *. WILSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN S. *. WILSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROLAND W. *. WONG, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN H. *. WRIGHT, xxx-xx-xxxx
IRENE I. *. YEVICH, xxx-xx-xxxx
KARL N. ZEFF, xxx-xx-xxxx
GRETA C. *. ZIMMERMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
CURTIS J. *. ALITZ, xxx-xx-xxxx

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be major

STEPHEN C. *. ALLISON, xxx-xx-xxxx
KAREN V. *. ARNOLD, xxx-xx-xxxx
DEBRA D. *. BERTHOLD, xxx-xx-xxxx
TRACY J. *. BRUDVIG, xxx-xx-xxxx
LEONARD I. *. CANCIO, xxx-xx-xxxx
LAURI M. *. COFFEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ROBBIE B. *. COURTS, xxx-xx-xxxx
JILL E. *. ECKL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MYRA J. ENDLER, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRENDA J. *. FORMAN, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK E. *. GAINER, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
JILL E. *. MCCOY, xxx-xx-xxxx
STEVEN R. *. ORD, xxx-xx-xxxx
JANET A. *. TINGLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
KAREN W. *. WISH, xxx-xx-xxxx

VETERINARY CORPS

To be major

NEIL W. *. AHLE, xxx-xx-xxxx
CATHERINE M. *. BANFIELD, xxx-xx-xxxx
RONNIE J. *. BARNES, xxx-xx-xxxx
CRAIG A. *. CALAMAIO, xxx-xx-xxxx
CURTIS A. COLLETON, xxx-xx-xxxx
WILLIE J. *. CROSBY, JR., xxx-xx-xxxx
JUNE A. *. ELLIS, xxx-xx-xxxx
NEWTON H. FOSTER, IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARC E. *. MATTIX, xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK J. *. MISKENA, xxx-xx-xxxx
DOUGLAS A. POWELL, xxx-xx-xxxx
MARIE B. *. STALEY, xxx-xx-xxxx
ALFRED P. *. VOGEL, xxx-xx-xxxx
BRYAN S. WHITE, xxx-xx-xxxx
DALE L. *. WILLIAMSON, xxx-xx-xxxx
SUSAN R. *. YANOFF, xxx-xx-xxxx
GARY M. *. ZAUCHA, xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED COMMANDERS OF THE RESERVE OF THE U. S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF CAPTAIN IN THE STAFF CORPS, AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

CONSTANTE UBAN ABAYA
ROBERT G. ALLEN, JR
ADALBERTO ARANA, JR
MANUEL FRANCI BAUTISTA
DANIEL EDWARD BOYLE, JR
ROBERT BRUCE BRIGDEN
ROBERT LESLIE BUCKLEY
ALDO ANTONIO BUONANNO
ROBERT J. BURNETT
HARRY PAUL CLAUSE, JR
TIMOTHY GARMAN COOK
ROBERT E. CREUTZ
JOSE SOTTO CRUZ
AUSTIN R. CUSHMAN
THEODORE ANTHON DAMICO
ROBIN IAN DAVIDSON
GLENN M. DAVIS
ILUMINADA HOLGADO DAZA
ERICO MALTAL DEIPARINE
JOHN ROBERT DOWNS
MELVYN GALEZA DREW
DAVID ROBERT DUFOUR
CHITTUR V. EASWARAN
LEOVIGILDO CABR GANGOY
JAMES R. HAGLER
EARL HERBERTO HARLEY
JOHN DENIS HAUGH
BOBBY JOE KENNEDY
GERALD J. KIVETT
OYOUNG KONG
RICHARD JOSE LABOWSKIE
KANG JEIH LAI
MICHAEL JAMES LAPENTA
TAURIN PYONGKAP LEE
FREDERICK EDWIN LUDWIG
EDWARD HERBERT MALTERS
L. WINNIE VAR MANECLANG
TERESITA LASC MISMANOS
RICHARD PAUL MORIARTY
VINCENT STEPHEN OHARA
ARLENE OLAISEN
HELEN PADOLI PAMINTUAN
JEAN PANAGAKOS
WILLIAM CLAYTON PETTY
RICHARD B. PHILLIPS
STEPHEN H. POWELL
RANDALL N. PRATT, JR
STEVEN GEORGE PRATT
DAVID CLINTON PRICKETT
TASNEEM ASAD RAJA
NARENDRAKUMAR M. RAVAL
NELSON JACOB REALO
CHARLES WILLI RENINGER
JAMES THOMAS ROBERTSON
GARY LEWIS ROBINSON
JAMES O. ROYDER
LARRY W. RUMANS
ASELA REYES SANFELIPE
CHARLES S. SETTLE
ROGER WHITEL SHEFFIELD
JOHN HARRY SHELBY
KENNETH LEE SISCO
GEORGE JAY WALKE SMITH
GERALD HARVEY SOKOL
DONALD ELDON SPRAGUE
THOMAS EDWARD STEFFEN
VAN J. STITT, JR
DANA D. STOMBAUGH
JAMES ROUZIE STONE
THEODORE R. SUNDER
GARY WAYNE WATSON
LARRY SCOTT WILLIAMS
WARREN TIMOTHY WILSON

DENTAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

GERARD JOSEPH BARNA
PHILLIP STANL BREULEUX
WILLIAM JARMAN DAVIS
MICHAEL VANICE ELLIS
JULIAN DOUGLAS FREEMAN
VERNON PAUL HARRISON
HUBERT ALLEN HENKLE
DENNIS DOUGLAS JOHNSON
KENNETH MICHAE KUCHARZ
JEFFREY LYND LOCKWOOD
CRAIG MICHAEL MARCELLO
JAMES WESLEY MUNN
JOHN STANDISH REEVER
JR THOMAS CULL ROBERTS
JAMES WEBB TAYLOR
ALBERT THEODORE TWESME
BRUCE MICHAEL WENY
JOSEPH HAMI WILLOUGHBY

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

JOHN ROBERT BOURNE
GENE BRONSON
DOUGLAS LEE JOHNSON
MELVIN EDWARD MUNG KAU
DYANN JORGENS MILLS
BRIAN MICHAEL ODONNELL
MELVIN DOUGLAS SHIPP
BETTY WATTLES STARR
JERRY DEAN WEST
PETER CRAIGE WIGHT

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

THOMAS E. ALBRO
RICHARD HARVEY ALLISON
HAROLD ERVIN ATHERLY
WOODROW HOBSON BARNES
GARY L. BROWN
JULIAN ALBERT J. BRYANT
JOSEPH TALMAGE CLARK
PAUL K. COSTELLO
LOWELL JOHN DOSCH
VICTOR FOX
ROBERT GORHAM J. FULLER
HOWELL JACKSON GREGORY
WILLIAM HAROLD HAUSER
THOMAS LEE JONES
IVARS ANDRIS JOZUS
MALVERN FRANCIS J. KING
DAVID TALBOT LANDERS
JAMES EUGENE LIVESEY
THEODORE GREENE MEEKER
RICHARD FRA MUTZEBAUGH
RUSSEL RAY OLIVER
WILLIAM JAMES RENTON
MICHAEL A. RIEPE
JOHN ALDEN STEVENS
CLIFFORD JOSEPH STUREK
JOHN E. TUTHILL
EDMUND THEODOR WEGENER

NURSE CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

CAROL MARIE BALLEW
PATRICIA LYNN BURNS
PATRICIA MARIA COLLINS
SARAH SHEPARD DAHLGREN
KAREN ELIZABETH DORIS
ANNE ELIZABETH GARTNER
LORETTA MARGARET GUISE
CAROLE RUTH JEWETT
MARY RUTH JOHNSON
JOANNE T. LEVINHOMME
GAYLE YVONNE LEWIS
ROBERTA MAE MCCOY
ROSE MARIE MCNAMARA
MARGARET JEAN NATION
BARBARA ANN SHELL
THOMAS PHILLIP SHERMAN
MARILYN ANDERSON SMITH
JUDITH SCHANTZ STAGG
PATRICIA JAMES WATSON

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

BRUCE LEROY ALLEN
MALCOLM EUGENE BASS
DWIGHT KEITH BOHM
GEORGE DAVID BUENNAGEL
ROBERT LYNN CORNIE
THOMAS EARLE CRELLIN
MICHAEL ROBERT HALL
RONALD SAMUEL HARRIS
JAMES PATRICK HARTY
WILLIAM GRANVILLE JAMES
THOMAS FREDERICK KINGEN
RICHARD THEODORE KNUDSON
DOUGLAS LUNDELL
PAUL VICTOR MAIER
WILLIAM BRIAN MARTIN
PATRICK JAMES MAYHEW
DAVID LEE MILLER
WILLIAM MICHAEL MURRAY
ELLSWORTH JAMES RANDALL
THOMAS LEE RUCH
JAMES ARTHUR RYAN
KENNETH DALE STOUT
STEVEN JOHN TAYLOR
RICHARD WILLIAM TUCKER
THOMAS ALLAN VORTMANN
KENNETH ALAN WILLCOX
JOHN LESLIE WILLIAMS
TERRY ALLEN WORSDELL

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICERS (TAR)

To be captain

DOUGLAS ROLAND PEARSON

CHAPLAIN CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

CHARLES RANDOLPH CONEY
ALLEN HOWARD PODET
DOUGLAS VERNON UNDERHILL
ALBERT PETER VUCINOVICH

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OFFICERS

To be captain

JAMES VINCENT BARTLETT, JR
LOUIE DEAN BATTLES, JR
ARTHUR NEAL BROOKS
DAVID LANE BURRUS
HOMER ALLEN CORBIN, JR
RICHARD FRANKLIN COWAN
JOSEPH JOHN DELCIOTTO, JR
DENIS JOHN FECK
JAMES ALBERT FOWDEN, III
ROBERT MASASHI FURUKAWA
TERRENCE JOHN HODNIK
THOMAS T. JOHNSON
ROBERT CHARLES MARLAY
EDGAR CASON MCGEE
DAVID EUGENE ROSENBAUM
JAMES EDWARD SHELTON
HARRY STCLAIR
GARY LYNN WAGNER
MICHAEL ERNEST WEYLER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS OF THE RESERVE OF THE U. S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF COMMANDER IN THE STAFF CORPS, AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

JAMES LESLIE AUSTIN
THOMAS SCHEELE BACKER
PATRICIA MALLINS BAEHR
JUAN RAFAEL BARALT
TODD LUCAS BEEL
GEORGE BERNSTEIN
CHARLES MULLINS BROHM
DANIEL C. BROOKE
JEFFREY FREDR BROOKMAN
CHARLES N. BROOKS
MARY JANE BROWN
DAVID JOHN BYLUND
TIMOTHY GEORGE CALL
PAMELA ANN CAMOSY
ODEST FRANK CANNON, JR
WILLARDLEON CHAMBERLIN
TOMAS JORGE CONCEPCION
GARY JOHN CONNER
GERRY A. COPE
CHRISTOPHER CURCIO
GERALD BIRCH DEMAREST
JAMES MICHAEL DEMASI
PEARSE DERRIG
JOSEPH LEONA DESTEFANO
ROBERT GERALD J. DUGGAR
CARL ERWIN DUKES
ELBERT ALAN DUNCAN
THOMAS CHARLES DUNNE
DIANE ELISE ENNIS
DOUGLAS L. EUBANKS

ROBERT KEVIN FERGUSON
ALAN MARK FIRESTONE
PAUL F. GIANNANDREA
WILLIAM BRIAN GLENN
RICHARD E. GOBLE
MICHAEL JOHN GRADY
MATTHEW C. GRATTON
RICHARD GRAYSON
RANDY H. GREENE
EDNA MAI GRIFFENHAGEN
TED DAONALD GROSHONG
JEAN ANN GRUETER
JOHN RANDALL HAGUE
STEPHEN FREDERI HANSEN
ALFRED LEON HARKLEY
ARTHUR COMMONS HAYES
KEVIN JOHN HEALY
EDWIN JAMES HEFFERNAN
WILLIAM THOMAS HERBICK
GEORGE LOUIS HERLIN
MICHAEL R. HERMANS
RICHARD P. HOLM
JOHN STUART HUGHES
THOMAS ALAN HYATT
WILLIAM JUBIZ
STEVEN JOHN KAMINSKI
ROBERT WENDELL KNUDSON
PETER STEPHEN KONCHAK
MARGARET KEAVEY KOZEL
FERNANDO ENRIQUE LAMAS
ROQUE ALEXANDER LANZA
DOUGLAS D. LEE
LOUIS W. LESSARD
RANDOLPH C. LESTER
MICHAEL GEORGE LICINA
WAYNE FRANCIS LITTLE
CAYETANO A. LOPEZCEPERO
GAMALIEL GO LOTUACO
DAVONNE SHERYL LOUP
JEFFREY RAYMOND LOZIER
JAMES PHILLIP MARRA
THOMAS J. MARSHALL, JR
FRANCIS MICH MCCAFFREY
MARION REYNOL MCMILLAN
PETER THOMAS MELLIS
CAROLYN FIELD MISCHER
STEPHEN ALEXA MITCHELL
DONNA SUE MULLER
LYNN MARIE NILE
BRIAN ORTH NYQUIST
BARBARA LOUISE OHARA
RALPH P. ORLANDO
DAYA JITENDRA PATEL
GEORGE G. PATTERSON
ROBERT CLYDE PATTON
JOSEPH DAVI PIORKOWSKI
STANLEY GENE PROUGH
JOE BILLY PUTNAM, JR
HAROLD B. REEDER
FRANK P. REYNOLDS
KURT R. ROEMER
DAVID B. ROGERS
GREGORY JOSEPH RUMORE
ROY FRANCIS SCALIA
NORMAN SCHLAGER
ARMIN SCHUBERT
DANIEL PAUL SCHWEICH
RANDALL E. SEAGO
WILLIAM DRIVER SHIPPEN
FRANCIS JOHN SINCOX, JR
MICHAEL JOHN SLESINSKI
JAMES EMERSON SMITH, II
RUBEN L. SMITH
JOHN MICHAEL SQUIRES
JAMES A. STANKIEWICZ
CHARLES MCL STIERNBURG
COY BARTON STONE
ROBERT ALLE STRICKLAND
JAROSLAW PETER STULC
PHILIP EUGE SUTHERLAND
JOHN H. TILLER
LAURIER JOSEP TREMBLAY
ANNE H. TROBAUGH
RAMON ANTONIO URDANETA
SANTIAGO VILLARREAL
WILLIAM GLYN WAGNON
LAWRENCE XAVIER WEBB
GRAHAM KEVIN WETHERLEY
JAMES K. WICKERSHAM
DAVID RANDALL WILLIAMS
HOWARD CLARENCE WILLIS
ROBERT MENZIES WIPRUD
DANIEL E. WOLF
ROBERT BRUCE WOLOV
VICKY LESTER TE YBANEZ
ELIZABETH BISH YOUNG

DENTAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

RONNIE W. ARRINGTON
RICHARD A. ASHTON
BYRON WYNN BENSON
DANIEL BOERS
RICHARD M. DIBELLA
DAVID JOSEPH HIBL
TONY HERSHEL HUGHEY
MICHAEL GAIL IRELAND
WILLIAM HARRISON KAAR
EUGENE EDWARD KELLER
THOMAS V. KELLY
KENNETH EDWARD LANDRY
GARY LOUIS LIVACARI
GARY A. MADISON
MICHAEL L. MIDDLEBROOKS
WILLIAM WILLKOM SCHELL
WALTER B. SHREWSBURY
NEAL STEWART SLUTSKY
MARK STEVEN SORIN
BARRY A. STITT
MICHAEL JOHN J. VASISKO
JEROME ALEXANDER WHITE

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

ROBIN BRUCE BROWN, JR
NOREEN CONSIDINE
JAMES ROBERT DILLON
DAVID KENNETH DODGE
WILLIAM HUNT ETHERIDGE
HARRISON TATUM FERRIS
LOUIS OCTAVIO GARCIA
MARCELLUS GRACE
SCOTT GREGERSEN
LYNN CURTIS GRISWOLD
RONALD DALE HALL
LEON CHARLES HARRIS
WENDY LYNN ME HARRISON
STEPHEN JOSEPH HENSKE
WILLIAM GRESBY HUGHES
CHESTER STEPHEN KATZ
WAYNE BERTW KIELSMEIER
DAVID LEE MASERANG
JACK ANDREW MAXWELL, JR
DONNA LYNNE PAVLICK
THOMAS TURNER PAYNE
PETER ROBERT RESEDEAN
FRANK COMPTON SHARP
GARY LEE STOKES
GEORGE EDWAR STRUDGEON
DONALD RAYMON THURSTON
SPANN MARLOWE WATSON
DANNY WEDDING
PATRICIA NAOMI WHITE

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

JONATHAN J. ANDERSON
ROGER BRYAN ATKINS
LAWRENCE B. BRENNAN
ROBERT S. BROCK
RAYMOND W. BUSCH
RICHARD STEWART BUSH
JOHN J. CHERNOSKI
STEVEN A. CURLEE
MICHAEL PAUL CURRERI
RICHARD K. DELMAR
ALLAN FRANK ELMORE
GREGORY J. GARNER
LAUREL CHESS GILLESPIE
DOUGLAS J. GLASSCOCK
KEITH F. GRAHAM
DONALD L. HAGENGRUBER
RICHARD R. HATTENHAUER
MICHAEL DEAN HOOD
MARK STEWART HOWELL
JOHN PARKER HUGGARD
FRANK ALLAN KREIDLER
SHARYN MARGARE LEONARD
FREDERIK SIMON LUTZ
LARRY DOBY MARTIN
KENNETH C. MCMANAMAN
ROY DAVID PETERSEN
ROBERT ERWIN RITTER
KENNETH M. ROBBINS
ROBERT KENNETH ROGERS
HERBIE LEE SOLOMON
JOHN DENNIS THEIS
MARTIN WEINSTEIN
SAMUEL F. WRIGHT

NURSE CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

DEBORAH ANN ATWATER
PATRICIA ELAIN BALDWIN
PAULA BARNES
DONNA J. H. BAUMGARTNER
JAMES ALLAN BLESSING
CHRISTINE MARIE CARLIN
JEAN ANN FEELEY
ANNE VIRGINIA FORSHA
PATRICIA MARY GILBERT
LYNNE LESAK HAMILTON
ELAINE SCHNOOR HOBBS
PATRICIA ANN KANE
YUKI KATO
RHODA LOUISE KEOWN
GWEN ELLEN FABER LANG
SANDRA A. MEADOWCROFT
ELIZABETH MCCLO MORRIS
LINDA JANET NIETMAN
JOAN MARIE NUTTING
MARY ELLEN MCHALE PATE
CATHERINE AN PATTERSON
BARBARA STEEL POLAK
VELDA ELIZABET SOLOMON
SHARON K. SUMMERS
SUSAN MARIE VARENHOLT
ODETTE PATRICIA WILLIS

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

KENNETH JOSEPH ADAM
CRAIG MICHAEL BENSON
DEANNA BERNET
ALONZO BRENTON BONNER, JR
ERIC MICHAEL BOURNE
PAUL HELLER BRENNER
DOUGLAS WARREN BROWN
ROBERT MICHAEL CLINTON
JOHN WESLEY DAGGETT
FRANCIS MICHAEL DAVIES
CHARLES CLARK DRISCOLL
DAVID FLOYD ENGLISH
THOMAS KONG MING FONG
OTTO LEON GAROT
JULIUS GOSTEL, JR
ROBERT CARL HAACK
ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, III
EDWARD HAROLD HILL
STEPHEN GERARD JUNG
WILLIAM ROBERT LAND, III
MICHAEL DAVID LANGOHR
RICHARD OGDEN LOOMIS
JOHN ADAM MORELAND
STEPHEN GWYNNE MORROW
PETER LOCKHART MULLEN
RICHARD FLOYD RAYBON
PAUL SEKULA
CHARLES SPURGEON SHARROCKS
NICHOLAS LYNN SPRATLEN
JOHN BURTON STROUPE
GROVE GEORGE THOMPSON, JR
WILLIAM CLARE WISMER
DOUGLAS ROBERT WOIKEY

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICERS (TAR)

To be commander

SHARON JOYCE MELTON

CHAPLAIN CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

RONALD KEITH AUSTIN
FLORIDA B. BATTLE
DAROLD FORREST BIGGER
GEORGE CALVIN GOODMAN
RICHARD THOMAS RONEY
DONALD ARTHUR TAYLOR
DAVID ARNE THOMPSON

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

KENNETH GILBERT BAER
DOUGLAS KIRK BARBER
DOUGLAS LEON BLOOMQUIST
JOHN JAMES CALAMARI, III
RONALD JOHN COMINSKY
PETER MICHAEL DEPRETER
KENNETH LLOYD DRAKE
KENNETH JOHN ENDRESS
JAMES ALLAN FRAZER
FLOYD FREEMAN, JR
JOSEPH JOHN FURCO
RAUL EDWARD GARCIA
GEORGE FREEMAN GILBERT, JR
LARRY RUSSELL GIVENS
ARTHUR BRUCE GOODWIN
RONALD BARRY HELSON
JOHN HENRY HOMIER, JR
ROBERT RAY HOOD
CHARLES ANDREW KLIMMEK
DANIEL FRANKLIN KNUDSON, JR
BENJAMIN STANLEY KONOPKA
GARY LEE KOPPS
CURTIS JULE KREKLAU
IRWIN RICHARD MARTIN, JR
CARL ROBERT NELMAN
OVA WAYNE RAMSEY
JAMES MICHAEL SMITH
DENNIS JOHN SOBOTA
MURRAY MICHAEL TILSON
HAROLD RICHARD WOOD, JR
WILLIAM DUNN WRIGHT, JR
WILLIAM RICHARD YATES

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANTS IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

To be lieutenant commander

JEFFREY R. ABEL
VICKI SUE ABEL
DONALD MICHAEL ABRASHOFF
RONALD CARL ADAMO
ROSE MARIE THERESA ADAMS
GLENN TAYLOR AIKIN
STEPHEN GEORGE ALBERS
MICHAEL HOWARD ALBRIGHT
FREDERICK MITCHEL ALEXANDER
TOWNSEND GRIFFISS ALEXANDER
DAVID ROBERT ALLEN
PAUL M. ALLEN
MICHELLE ROSE ALTMAN
JOHN JAMES ANAYANNIS
NORMA MARIE ANDERTON
PETER ALLEN ANDREASEN
CHRISTIAN WILLIAM ANDRIEU
DAVID STEVENS ANGOOD
DAVID GERARD ARCHAMBAULT
DANIEL J. ARCHER
LAWRENCE ERIC ARCHER
DAVID DEAN ARCHIBALD, II
GEORGE EDWARD ARGERAKE
JOHN JOSEPH ARNOLD
MARK REYNOLDS ARNOLD
RONALD RAY ARNOLD, III
THOMAS EDWARD ARNOLD
DANIEL DEE ATHEY
MARSHALL WINFRED ATKINS
ROBIN LYNN ATKINS
GARY DON ATKINSON
JOSEPH PETER AUCOIN
RUSSELL EARL AVERILL
DONALD E. BABCOCK
DAVID ANTHONY BACIOCCO
DAVID TERRY BAILEY
SHEILA GAIL BAILEY
RICHARD LEE BAINBRIDGE
WILLIAM ALLEN BAKER
JOE DAN BANKER
WALTER FRANCIS BANKOWSKI, JR
RORY KEN BANKS
CARL S. BARBOUR
MICHAEL JOHN BAREA
JOHN MURRY BARENTINE
EDWARD BARFIELD
JOHNNIE BAXTER BARFOOT, JR
THOMAS HENRY BARGE, II
DONALD WARREN BARNARD, JR
BRENT HERRING BARROW
MICHAEL AUSTIN BASS
CRAIG ARLEN BATEMAN
SARA ANN BATEMAN
MARK L. BATHRICK
ALAN ROSS BATTERMAN
CLETUS PAUL BAUER, JR
MARK ALAN BAULCH
HOWARD HINK BAYLESS
THOMAS MCDOWELL BAYLEY
SCOTT DAVID BEACH
RAY OLIVER BEARD, JR
DENISE LORRAINE BECHTOL
JAMES MICHAEL BECK
ROBERT WELCH BECK
JAMES MERLE BECKLEY
PHILIP GREGORY BEIERL
WADE HAMPTON BELL, III
DALE HAROLD BENSON
STEPHEN J. BENSON
JOHN K. BERGERSEN
DAVID JOSEPH BERGIN
ALLAN JEFFREY BERKE
ELLIOTT MICHAEL BERMAN
SCOTT ALEXANDER BERNARD
CHINA MAE BERRY
DAVID CHARLES BEYRODT
DOUGLASS TODD BIESEL
KAREN LOUISE BILDER
JAMES JOSEPH BIRD
JOHN LEE BISKADUROS
STEVEN BURCH BIXLER
HARRY VANCE BLACK
STEPHEN PETER BLACK
DONALD S. BLAKE
JEFFREY ALAN BLOOM
STEPHEN RORY BLOZIS
MARK WINSTON BOCK
MATTHEW GERARD BOENSEL
ANDREW THEODORE BOERSMA
WILLIE REGINALD CLAY BOGAN
LORI ANN BOLEBRUCH
DONNA CAROL BONDS
PETER BRYANT BONEM
EDWARD MORRIS BOORDA
CHARLES W. BOOTH
JAMES RUNYAN BOOTH
PATSY RAWLS BOOZER
EDWARD GUSTAVE BORN, JR
MICHAEL BOROWSKI
BRUCE HENRY BOSSHARD
ROBERT WESLEY BOUGHER
JOHN C. BOUMA
CHARLES PATRICK BOURNE
WILLIAM DAVIS BOURNE, JR
MILTON JOSEPH BOUVIER, III
ROBERT WAGNER BOWE
ROBERT OWEN BOWERS
PHILLIP OWEN BOYER
MATTHEW J. BOYNE
JOSEPH MATTHEW BRADLEY
ROGER STEPHEN BRADLEY
LOREN RICHARD BREMSETH
MARK R. BREOR
JEFFREY A. BRIGGS
JAMES B. BRINKMAN
STEVEN EADES BROOKS
DAVID MUNSON BROWN, JR
GEORGE S. BROWN
JAMES PATRICK BROWN
MICHAEL STEVEN BROWN
MICHAEL JOSEPH BROWNE
NERISSA BRUECKBAUER
ANDRES ARMANDO BRUGAL
GLENN MARTIN BRUNNER
TERRI EKELUND BRUTZMAN
DENNIS BRYANT
DOUGLAS BRUCE BUCHANAN, JR
GERALD W. BUCK
MICHAEL D. BUDNEY
JEROME L. BUDNICK
DEAN WILLIAM BUEHLER
KENNETH PAUL BUELL
ROCKY WADE BUNCH
VICTORIA LYNN BURCHETT
JOHN MONROE BURDON
ROBERT L. BURELL
KENNETH JAMES BURKER
BRIAN BURLINGAME
ROBERT JAMES BURRELL
KATHY MAHAFFEY BUSCHER
PAUL JAMES BUSHONG
GILBERT MORRIS BUTHLAY
DAVID GEORGE BUTLER
EDWARD ERIC BUTLER, JR
ALAN KIMBERLY BYRD
JOHN FREDERICK CAFFIERO
MONICA MATHERN CAIN
JAMES FRANKLIN CALDWELL, JR
STEPHEN CALLAGHAN
RICHARD STANTON

CALLAS
HIPOLITO LEON CAMACHO
STEPHEN JAMES CAMACHO
JOHN MICHAEL CAMERON
BONITA IRENE CAMPBELL
RICHARD SCOTT CAMPBELL
DUANE JOSEPH CANON
STEVEN ANDREWS CARDEN
CATHERINE CARLIN
RICHARD SEMMES CARLQUIST
GUSTAVE ERICK CARLSON
BRIAN CARMICHAEL
CARL ANDREW CARPENTER
THOMAS WESLEY CARPENTER, JR
JAMES DEWEY CARR
RICHARD D. CARR
GILBERT ANTWAN CARTER
PATSY LYNN CARVER
VIRGINIA RUTH CARVER
JOHN WELLS CASEY, III
LAURIE ANN CASON
RAUL JESUS CASTANEDA
JOSEPH M. CATOE
KATHLEEN OBRIEN CAUSARANO
WILLIAM M. CAVITT
PATRICIA ANN CERCHIO
CARL NELSON CHAMBERLAIN
MICHAEL CHAPLINE
DEREK ALVIN CHARACTER
CARLOS MIGUEL CHAVEZ
LEE ALLAN CHEEKS
CHARLES HENRY CHENOWETH
CHERYL ANN CHENOWETH
DAVID JOSEPH CHESLAK
R. D. CHRISTENSEN
JOHN NELS CHRISTENSON
SUSAN MARIE CHRISTENSON
KEITH ILIA CHRISTMAN
RICHARD J. CHUDAY
LAWRENCE VINCENT CIPOLLONE
TERESA CAROL CISSELL
DAVID EDWIN CLARK
EDWARD SCHUYLER CLARK
ROBERT JOSEPH CLARK
VALERIE PAGE CLARK
STEVEN M. CLARY
ELIZABETH K. CLINKSCALES
GEORGE PARKER CROY, III
WILLIAM PATRICK CULLEN
THOMAS JOHN CULORA
TIMOTHY CUMMINS
JAMES W. CUPP, JR
ALBERT NMN CURRY, JR
LISA ANE CURTIN
S. A. CUSHANICK
BARRY FRANCIS DAGNALL
MICHAEL KEITH DAHLMAN
SANDY LEE DANIELS
DAN W. DAVENPORT
SUSAN ANN DAVIES
WILLIAM COX DAVIS
DAVID PAUL DAVISON, JR
JEFFERY ALLEN DAVISON
JAMES FRANCIS DAWLEY, JR
DANIEL SCOTT DEALY
DALE L. DEAN
SCOTT MICHAEL DEAN
THOMAS MURRAY DEAN, JR
NANCY ANN DECKER
THOMAS PETER DEE
VINCENT PAUL DEKIME
MICHAEL ANGELO DELANEY
DAVID M. DELONGA
SCOTT WINFRED DEMARY
EDWARD L. DEMPSEY
FRAHNZ DENDY
KEVIN PATRICK DENHAM
JAMES DANIEL DENMARK
THOMAS WALTER DEPPE
TINAMARIE DERCOLE
DANA SCOTT DERVAY
STEVEN PAUL DESJARDINS
LAURA LEA DESROSIERS
CURTIS ROSS DICKERSON
JOHN DAVID DICKINSON
TERRY LEE DICKINSON
ROBERT LEONARD COBURN, JR
ERIC TALMADGE COCHRAN
MARK ALAN COCHRAN
ROBERT EDMONSTON COIL
FRANCIS RODOLFO COLBERG
ROGER WAYNE COLDIRON
CRANFORD RONALD COLEMAN, JR
GERARD T. COLEMAN
JOHN ALFRED COLEY
HAROLD HENRY COLLINS
MICHAEL A. COLLINS
LUIS ALBERTO COLON
JAMES JOSEPH COLTELLARO
MARK ALAN COMPTON
MICHAEL JOSEPH CONNOR
FERREL PHILIP CONYERS
HOMER CRAIG COOK
PATRICIA LYNN COOMBS
MICHAEL JOSEPH COOMES
GARY THOMAS COOPER
KENT LELAND COOPER
THOMAS HANS COPE
FLOYD RICHARD CORDELL
JEAN MCCULLOUGH CORNELL
WILLIAM A. CORRELLUS
BRUCE JOHN CORSO
LOUIS JOSEPH CORTELLINI
BRIAN ANTHONY COSGROVE
THOMAS FRANCIS COSGROVE, JR
DEAN J. COTTLE
JOSEPH MATTHEW COULTER
CYNTHIA ANN COVELL
BRIAN JACK COYLE
NEIL EDWARD CRAIN
MARY ANNE CRAWFORD
KEVIN J. CREAHAN
ANDREW THOMAS CREPEA
DAVID BRUCE CRILLY
RONALD WILLIAM CRITCH
KENNETH BURTON CROFF
MARK L. CROOK
CONSTANCE BROOKE B. CROUTER
WILLIAM W. CROW
ROY W. CROWE
TERRANCE LEE CROWLEY
FERDINAND DIEMER
KING HASTINGS DIETRICH
TED ALLEN DILL
DOUGLAS S. DILLNER
FREDERIK NMN DIMITREW
LAWRENCE THOMAS DIRITA
DAVID STURGIS DOBBS
ERNEST W. DOBSON, JR
BERNITA DIANNE DODD
LARRY WENDEL DODSON
ROBERT EDWARD DOLAN
MICHAEL CRAIG DOLES
CAROL ANN DONAHOE
ROBERT W. DONALD
MICHAEL JAMES DONCH, III
KEVIN MICHAEL DONEGAN
ROBERT WILLIAM DOTSON
MICHAEL DOUGHERTY
PETER J. DOUGHERTY
VANASSA HERMINE DOUGLAS
JAMES WALTER DOWNEY
ROBERT GERVASE DRAKE
KATHERINE ELIZABE DUCKWORTH
LENARD EARL DUFFY
ARMANDO VACIANA DUNCAN
HELEN FRANCES DUNN
MICHAEL R. DURKIN
DAVID CRAIG DYKHOFF
CATHERINE THERESA EADS
MARTIN STANLEY EARL
RUSSELL EUGENE EARLY
TIMOTHY CRAIG EASON
CRAWFORD ALAN EASTERLING, III
CHARLES EDWARD EBERLE, III
DANA EDWIN EBERLIN
JOHN JULIUS EBLEY, JR
REED ALAN ECKSTROM
CHARLES M. EDMONDSON
GARY WAYNE EDWARDS
GERDA WILLIE EDWARDS
JOE F. EDWARDS
DONALD WILSON EISENHART, JR
JERRY ALLISTER ELLISON
JOHN ELNITSKY, II
ELIZABETH ANN ENNIS
DONALD KIM ERSKINE
ALAN E. ESCHBACH
MARLOW DANIEL ESPINOZAHALE
RITA VILLAPANDO ESPIRITU
MURRY WAYNE ESTABROOK
MICHAEL GREGORY ESTRIN
LEONARD FRANKLIN EVANS
CHARLES EVERETT
JOETTE EVERIST
MANUEL E. FALCON
ANTHONY BYRON FARMER
PHILIP GAILLARD FARRELL
MAUREEN ANN FARREN
FRANZ E. FEDERSCHMIDT
THOMAS MICHAEL FELDMAN
PEGGY A. FELDMANN
JOEL DEAN FELLOWS
JOHN HENRY FENTER
TIMOTHY LESTER FERREE
BRIAN GOODWIN FINCH
KENNETH MICHAEL FINCH
KENNETH D. FINK
MARK GEORGE FISCHER
TRACEY ALAN FISCHER
ROBERT W. FISH
ROLLAND GEORGE FITCH, II
AMALIE RUTH FITE
DENISE DILLON FITE
M. J. FITZGERALD
STEPHEN JAMES FITZGERALD
SUSAN PATRICIA FITZGERALD
DAVID KENNETH FLAGG
GEORGE EDWARD FLAX
TIMOTHY BROOKS FLOYD
JOSEPH MICHAEL FLYNN
WILFRED JOSEPH FORBES
ALVIN NMN FORD
JENNIFER PORTER FORD
JOHN AINSLIE FORD
WILLIAM FEENY FOSTER, JR
MICHAEL JAMES FRANCIS
DALE THOMAS FRANKENBERGER
STEPHEN COLBY FRASER
RONALD FRANK FREEMAN
WILLIAM ALLAN GOSS
ZEVIE BAYLIE GOTTLIEB
THERESA DIGIOVANNI GOUGH
THOMAS RUSSELL GRAFTON
DENNIS EDWARD GRANGER
JAMES S. GRANT
FORREST LEE GRAWN, JR
DANIEL RAYMOND GRAY
MICHAEL ALLEN GRAY
ROSANNA LOUISE GRAY
JEFFREY EMERSON GREER
GAIL ALANE GRIFFIN
DAVID EDWARD GRIMMER
JOHN MICHAEL KENT GRITTON
BRUCE E. GROOMS
PAUL SCOTT GROSSGOLD
SCOTT GRUNDMEIER
JAMES GRUNEWALD
MARK GUADAGNINI
DANIEL MICHAEL GUTIERREZ
NORMAN ELLIOTT GUTZLER
KENNETH LARS HAGERUP
RICHARD EDWARD HAGY, II
KENNETH LEEBUTLER HAIZLIP
MILES EDWARD HALE
JOHN R. HALEY
KENNETH B. HALL
LEE JAMES HALL
ROSS KINNISON HALL
KENNETH EDWARD HALLOWAY, III
MICHAEL SCOTT FRENCH
LACINDA RENEE FRESE
NELS ARNE FROSTENSON
CHARLES ROBERT FRYE
WILLIAM LEE FRYE
DANIEL NMN FUSCO
SUSAN DUBRULE FUTOMA
PETER ALLEN FYLES
CASEY ANTHONY GAGAN
DANIEL IGNATIUS GALLAGHER
JOHN GREGORY GALLAGHER
JOHN JOSEPH GALLAGHER
GERALD STEPHEN GALLOP
GARY DAVIS GALLOWAY
GEORGE G. GALYO
ROBIN RAGSDALE GANDOLFO
HUGH FRANCIS GARDNER
JOHN HENRY GARNER, JR
DOUGLAS RANDOLPH GARRETT
SIEGFRIED PAUL EDWARD GATES
LOUIS JULIAN GATSKI
LYNNE DORIS GAUDREAU
EARL LENELL GAY
BRADLEY ROBERT GEHRKE
DOUGLAS JAMES GEIB
JAMES JOSEPH GEORGE
BARBARA ANN GERAGHTY
BRIAN JOSEPH GERLING
LEE BERRIMAN GERMAN
JEFFREY LAWRENCE GERNAND
MICHAEL CRAIG GERON
DONALD DWIGHT GERRY, JR
WILLIAM J. GIERI
ANTHONY PAUL GIGIOLI
DAVID JOHN GILBANK
DANIEL HILARY GILDEA
RICHARD CHARLES GILE
LLOYD ERIC GILHAM
KARL LEE GILLETTE
MARTHA CAROL GILLETTE
STANLEY PAUL GIZA
JOSEPH CASIMIR GLADYSZEWSKI
DAVID W. GLAZIER
LEONARD PAUL GMOCH
STEFANIE ELIZABETH GOEBEL
NIEL LEONARD GOLIGHTLY
MARK J. GONZALEZ
RICHARD PAUL GOODPASTURE
THOMAS PATRICK GOONEN
ALGERNON POPE GORDON, JR
JAMES LEE GOSNELL
RICHARD PATRICK HALTER
JANICE MARIE HAMBY
STEPHEN DWIGHT HANCOCK
DEBORAH GAIL HANNA
LYLE MARTIN HANSEMANN
DAVID CHARLES HARDESTY
RICHARD CALDWELL HARNED
GARY THOMAS HARPER
JOHN HENRY HARRINGTON, III
M. L. HARRINGTON
ROBERT MICHAEL HARRINGTON
WILLIAM GERALD HARRISON, JR
MARY ROBERTA HARTMAN
TOD CLARK HARTUNG
CHRISTOPHER ALLEN HASE
STEPHEN JOSEPH HAUSSMANN
STEPHEN LEONARD HAWES
PETER J. HAYASE
JOSEPH C. HAYDEN
TIMOTHY MARTIN HAYDEN
CHRISTOPHER C. HAYES
MICHAEL GORMAN HAYES
LARRY JOE HAYNES
BARRY ALAN HAYNIE
THOMAS V. HEAPHY
ERNEST JAY HEASSLER
R. HEATHERINGTON
EDWARD SCOTT HEBNER
TYLER DUPUY HEERWAGEN
MARVIN HERMAN HEINZE
CARL RITCHIE HELDRETH
DAVID JEROME HEMMER
ROBERT HENNEGAN
LESLEY JEANNE PAINCH HENSON
MARK AUSTIN HERSH
DEREK HANS HESSE
HARRISON ARTHUR HEUBLEIN
ROBERT MICHAEL HIBBERT
JAMES E. HICKEY
FLORAN MICHAEL HIGGINS
JOHN PHILIP HIGGINS
GREGORY NMN HIGHTAIAN
JAMES LEONARD HILDRETH
JAMES A. HILL, JR
JOSEPH FRANCIS HILL
MARY ELLEN HILL
CYNTHIA YVONNE HILTIBRAND
KATHLEEN M. HINES
DAVID LAWRENCE HINGTGEN
MARTHA HOLLOWELL HIRSCH
JAMES K. HISER
DAVID FRANK HITCHCOCK
QUINCY M. HODGE
KENNETH ALAN HODINA
WILLIAM F. HOEFT
WILLIAM PATRICK HOGAN
KEVIN PHILLIP HOLLAND
EARL T. HOLLEY
JAMES HENRY HOLT, JR
JOSHUA P. HOLTZMAN
STEPHEN E. HONAN
DIANA L. HOOKER
DANIEL P. HOOPER
THOMAS FRANCIS HORGAN
JOSEPH A. HORN
ALBIN L. HOVDE
ABIGAIL SUSAN HOWELL
TIMOTHY J. HOWINGTON
JEFFRY L. HUBER
STEPHEN H. HUBER
JAMES D. HUCK
JAMES ROGERS HUFF
AMY LEIGH HUGHES
JONATHAN WAYNE HULTS
STEPHEN MICHAEL HUNT
ROBERT CARL HURLEY
SHANNON MARIE LESLIE HURLEY
MARA CHERYL HURWITT
PAUL DEAN HUSCHER
JAMES RAY HYNES
WILLIAM ROBERT IGNACZAK
CHRISTINE MARIE IMGRUND
PAUL MACKY INSCH
SUSAN DEBORAH IVERSON
BRUCE ALAN JACKABON
WILLIAM HOWARD JACOBS
FERDINAND VILLACAMPA KIBIC
WILLIAM ROBERT KILLEA
WALTER PAUL KIRKLAND, III
JOHN D. KIRKPATRICK
TIMOTHY J. KISLEY
MARK DONALD KLATT
CRAIG STEVEN KLEINT
CYNTHIA NASH KNIGHT
TODD WINSLOW KNOWLES
WINFORD WESLEY KNOWLES
STEVEN D. KORNATZ
ALEXANDER EMIL KOVACH, JR
TERRY B. KRAFT
WALTER MARK KREITLER
PARKER CHARLES KULDAU, II
JEFFREY SCOTT KUNKEL
ROBERT JOSEPH LABELLE, JR
TIMOTHY DOUGLAS LABELLE
WILLIAM CHARLES LABERMEIER
WILLIAM EUGENE LABIAN
PAUL ANTHONY LAIRD
JAMES SHAVER LAKIN
DAVID ERIC LANCASTER
HARRY EDWARD LANDAU
DAVID WILLIAM LANDIS
JAMES CHRISTOPHER LANG
DOREEN ELLEN JAGODNIK
CHRISTOPHER JANUSZEWICZ
GREG EDWIN JAQUITH
SCOTT E. JASPER
PETER JAUNAIS
CHRISTY ANN JENKINS
NANCY KATHLEEN JENKINS
DAVID M. JENNINGS
DALE A. JENSEN
PAUL RAYMOND JENSEN
BRENT WARD JETT, JR
ANTHONY W. JILES
BRADLEY EUGENE JOHANSON
DAVID CONRAD JOHNS
JACOB DWIGHT JOHNSON
JOSEPH ANDREW JOHNSON
KATHY ANN JOHNSON
KEVIN ROBERT JOHNSON
LEAH DIANNE JOHNSON
ROOSEVELT JOHNSON
VANESSA OLIVIA HALL JOHNSON
JOHN P. JOHNSTON
THOMAS EDWARD JOHNSTON
JEFFREY CARL JOHNSTONE
DAVID ANTHONY JONES
FRANK THOMAS BRADFORD JONES
KEVIN ALBERT JONES
SCOT WILLIAM JONES
TERRANCE GREGORY JONES
WILLIAM B. JONES
JEP CRAWFORD JONSON
THOMAS ALEXANDER JONSON
BRENDA MATHIAS JORDAN
RICHARD LEON JORDAN
SUSAN STURM JORDAN
ROBERT LEON KALIS, JR
MICHAEL J. KANE
MARK D. KAVANAUGH
JOHN FRANCIS KEANE
MARTIN JOSEPH KEANEY
SUSAN CHARLOTTE KELL KEANEY
PATRICK DANIEL KEAVNEY
HOWARD CURTIS KEESE
FRANK EDWARD KELBE
PATRICK EUGENE KELLER
ANNE ELIZABETH KELLEY
THOMAS RANDOLPH KELLEY
JOHN SCOTT KELLY
DEREK BRIAN KEMP
CATHY LYNN WILLIAMS KEMPF
PETER REID KENDRICK
DAVID WILLISTON KENNISON
DEBORAH RUSH KERN
GIBSON BREWER KERR
KEVIN CHRISTOPHER KETCHMARK
JOHN RANDY LANGMEAD
RUSSELL GUY LANKER
JACQUELYN WALDIE LANSING
RAYMOND DONALD LARIVIERE, JR
VICTORIA MAGDALENE LARSON
WILLIAM FREDERICK LARSON
DAVID LEE LASHBROOK
PETER JAMES LATTA
JEFFREY JOSEPH LAUFF
JOHN EDWIN LAUGHLIN
S. J. LAUKAITIS
FRANK A. LAURIA
MICHAEL DELANE LAUZEN
ROBERT LOUIS LAWSON
DAVID L. LEACH
LEWIS WILLIAM LEARY, JR
MARTIN RONALD LEDGER
DAVID ALAN LEE
STANLEY KA CHEONG LEE
ERIC ALLISON LEFRANCOIS
SCOTT FERRER LEFTWICH
JOHN CHRISTOPHER LEGG
ANTHONY MURRAY LEIGH, JR
CHARLOTTE VIRGINIA LEIGH
DANIEL ARTHUR LEININGER

DIRK ERNEST LENTZ
WANDA FAYE LEONARD
RICHARD A. LEPPER
WILLIAM KEVIN LESCHER
CRAIG DOUGLAS LESHER
HARRY SIRWELL LEWIS, JR
MARK RICHARD LICHTENSTEIN
JOHN MATTHEW LILLARD
PAUL JACK LINDSEY
ERNEST ROBINSON LINEBERGER
CRAIG WESLEY LITTLE
STEVEN WILLIAM LITWILLER
JUDITH ANN LITZENBERGER
RICHARD C. LOCKE
JOSEPH CARL LODMELL
PHILIP EUGENE LOGAN
PATRICK ALOYSIUS LOGUE
DAVID BRUCE LOKKER
WILLIAM FRANK LONCHAS, JR
MICHAEL M. LONG
MICHAEL E. LOPEZALEGRIA
ALBERT FRANIS LORD, JR
JOHN EDWIN LOTSHAW
GILL WARREN LOTT
RENATA PAOLA YOCHUM LOUIE
DOUGLAS VANCE LOWRY
DALE A. LUMME
MARK D. LUNDGREN
CAROL LINDA LUNDQUIST
CHARLES DENNIS LYBARGER
KEVIN BRIAN LYNCH
JOHN PATRICK LYNESS
KENNETH STUART MACDONALD
DAVID STOKES MACESLIN
GEORGE BAILEY MACEWEN
DAVEN LYNN MADSEN
JEROME JOSEPH MAHER, JR
ANDREW ARTURO MAIMONI
JOHN MAITNER, II
EDWARD JOHN MAJEWSKI, JR
MICHAEL THOMAS MALINIAK
MICHAEL ANTHONY MALIS
ROY DALE MALMBERG
ROY WILSON MALONE, JR
KEVIN MALONEY
STEPHEN CHARLES MALONEY
MICHAEL MANAZIR
ALFRED SALVATORE MANCO
THOMAS FRANCIS MANOS
MICHAEL RAYMOND MARA
GERARD MARDIK MARKARIAN
ANN LINDSAY SMYTH MARSH
JOHN WILLIAM MARSHALL
SHELLEY SHIPPY MARSHALL
MARK MARSHFIELD
CHARLES PATRICK MARTELLO
ROGER DALE THORNTON
ROBERT MICHAEL THURMOND
THOMAS WILLIAM TIERNEY
MARYLOU KATHERINE TILLOTSON
MICHAEL PETER TILLOTSON
YVONNE TISDEL
GLENN STOCKTON TITLOW
DAVID WAYNE TODD
MARTIN E. TOHER
MARK C. TOMB
JEFFREY ALAN TOMEO
JOHN STEPHEN TOPPER
RAYMOND JESS TORRES
JOSEPH JOHN TRAINOR
CRAIG A. TRAUTMAN
DENNIS MICHAEL TREPANIER
ALBERT RICHARD TROTTER, JR
JAMES WILLIAM TRUEBLOOD
RICHARD TRUITT
JEFFREY TRUMBORE
JAMES STEWART TULLY
WAYNE A. TUNICK
CARL RAY TURNER, II
EDWARD B. MARTIN
EDWARD LEE MARTIN
FRANK KURT MARTIN
DAVID GLENN MASCARIN
MICHAEL MATTHES
JOSEPH PAUL MATTIS
STEPHEN D. MATTS
JEFFREY MAYNARD
JAMES EDWARD MCALOON
KELLY DEAN MCBRIDE
JOAN MARQUETTE MCCABE
LAURENCE LEIGH MCCABE
THOMAS EDWARD MCCAFFREY
CLYDE JACKSON MCCALEB, III
DENISE JACQUELINE MCCALLA
JEFFREY CARROLL MCCAMPBELL
TIMOTHY ANDREW MCCANDLESS
CHARLES ANDREW MCCAWLEY
RONALD AUSTIN MCCLELLAN
BRUCE HOWLET MCCOMBIE
THOMAS RAY MCCOOL
MICHAEL WAYNE MCCORD
JOHN JOSEPH MCCORMACK, JR
GAVIN GABLE MCCRARY
ROBERT GEORGE MCCULLOCH, JR
PHILIP CHARLES MCDANIEL
KEVIN GERALD MCDERMOTT
WILLIAM JOSEPH MCGAHEE
WILLIAM FRANCIS MCGOWAN, III
ROBERT IRVING MCGRATH, JR
KEVIN WILLIAM MCINTIRE
RICHARD DAVID MCKEE
FREDERICK PAUL MCKENNA, JR
JANET DENISE MCKENZIE
ALAN MALCOM MCLACHLEN
JENA HILARY MCLAUGHLIN
JAMES PATRICK MCMANAMON
HERBERT MCMILLAN
LANCE WILLIAM MCMILLAN
THOMAS ALAN MCMURRY
KATHRYN MCNAMARA
ROBERT ARTHUR MCNAUGHT
STEVEN L. MCSHANE
JOSEPH ALLAN MCSWAIN
RICHARD A. MEDLEY
WALTER ALVIN MEEKS
GRACE MEHL
MICHAEL EDWARD MEIER
JAMES MICHAEL MELESKY
CHRISTOPHER ALLAN MELHUISH
MICHAEL EMIDIO MELO
MICHAEL J. TURNER
MICHAEL FRANCIS TUZZOLO
D. W. TWORZYANSKI
ANNE KATHLEEN TYLER
NORA WINGFIELD TYSON
KEITH ALLAN ULLMAN
FRANK DAVID UNETIC, JR
RONALD JOSEPH UNTERREINER
CHRISTOPHER WILLIAM URBAN
ELLEN CLAIRE VADNEY
SAMUEL EUGENE VALDEZ
BARBARA FRANCES VALENTI
JOSEPH ANTHONY VALENTI, III
BIENVENIDO VALERIO
KURT WILLIAM VALKO
ANTHONY NMN VANARIA, IV
KERMIT LEE VANBROCKLIN
MARK ANTHONY VANCE
WILLIAM JOSEPH VANDERLIP, JR
STEVEN ELLIOTT VANDYK
HANS JOSEPHUS VANOEKEL
DORIS VIOLETA VANSAUN
GUY LESLIE VARLAND
CLIFFORD BRUCE VAUGHT
JAMES T. VAZQUEZ
JOHN EDWARD VESTERMAN
ANDREW JAY VINSON
THOMAS BLAKE VOSLOH
TIMOTHY CHARLES WACHTL
ROBERT MICHAEL WAGNER
HARRY WAIDELICH
DAVID WAYNE WALKER
JIMMY DALE WALKER
MARK HOLT WALKER
ROBERT MICHAEL WALL
BETTINA VENETTOZZI WALLACE
JOHN STEVEN WALLS
SUSAN ESTHER WALTERS
PETER BLAKELEY WANN
ALBERT JOHN WARD
JOHN DAVID WARD
WILLIAM EARNEST WARD
MICHAEL C. WARMBIER, III
BRUCE TIMOTHY WARREN
DENNIS GEORGE WATSON
FRANK LEONARD WEBB
WILLIAM T. WEBBER
RONALD EUGENE WEISBROOK
MITCHELL MONTGOMERY WELCH
ROGER DALE WELLS
RICHARD ALAN WENDLAND
PATRICIA MURPHY WENGER
SUZANNE KATRINKA SCHEL WEST
DARREL EDWIN WESTBROOK, III
ANNE LAURA WESTERFIELD
ROLAND WEYMAN
PATRICK RANDOLPH WHEELER
PAUL KENNETH WHITEAKER
GARY CHARLES WHITFIELD
JAY D. WHITLOCK
MARK Q. WHITTLE
TERRY SCOTT WICHERT
JOHN P. WIDAY
PETER IGOR WIKUL
CLAYTON S. WILCOX
BRIAN WILD
ROBERT HENRY WILHELM
JAMES EDWARD WILKIE
JAY COLVARD WILKINSON
BRYAN S. WILLIAMS
JOHN DAVID WILLIAMS
MARY EDITH WILLIAMS
MICHAEL DAVID WILLIAMS
MICHAEL JOSEPH WILLIAMS
NORMAN LEROY WILLIAMS
ROBERT GARY WILLIAMS
CRAIG A. WILSON
DAVID CABLES WILSON
DOUGLAS MITCHELL WILSON
JOHN GILBERT RANDAL WILSON
JOHN LEE WILSON, III
JOHN PHILIP WILSON
RICKY E. WILSON
WARD AMES WILSON, III
DONNA RENE WINER
THOMAS JOHN WINKOWSKI
ROBERT SCOTT WINNEG
DALE WAYNE WINSTEAD
EDWARD GRIFFING WINTERS, III
JOHN D. WITHERS
JOHN LOUIS WITTREICH
ROBERT LEE WOHLSCHLEGEL
RAYMOND WARREN WOLBER
BRIAN PHILIPS WOOD
GLORIA DARLENE WOOD
JOHN STEVEN WOOD
MICHAEL P. WOOD
JIMMY CLIFFORD WOODARD
SUSAN ELAINE WOODWARD
RICHARD CLARK WOOLDRIDGE
JAPHET POTENT WOOLSTON
THOMAS VICTOR WORKS
DEAN DALE WORTHINGSTUN
CYNTHIA JUNE PARSONS WRIGHT
JAMES MICHAEL WRIGHT
STEVEN WAYNE WRIGHT
WALTER JAMES WRIGHT
SAMUEL RADCLIFFE WRIGLEY
HAROLD DAVID WUNDER
HAROLD MITCHELL YELTON, JR
PHILLIP THEODORE YONTZ
NATALIE KWAI S. YOUNGARANITA
PHILLIP DOUGLAS YOUNGBLOOD
HENRI W. ZAJIC
SARA ANNE ZAK
MARY LUANNE ZAREM
TODD ALLEN ZECCHIN
JEFFREY N. ZERBE
NEIL GRAHAM ZERBE
LAURA JEANNETTE ZIEGLER
MICHAEL A. ZIESER
LINDA CROWE ZITO

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS

To be lieutenant commander

FREDERICK LEE BARBER
LAWRENCE RICHARD BAUN
DAVID KEITH BELL
PETER STANLEY BUCZYNSKI
DANIEL L. BURNFIELD
WILLIAM HARR BUTTERWORTH, JR
DAVID M. CECI
DAVID CHARLES CHAPPELL
ROBERT DANIEL CHILDS
MICHAEL ANDREW GOMORI
DENNIS KEITH GONYIER
GREGORY LAWRENCE GOODE
LARRY JOE HUME
JONATHAN CAREY IVERSON
DANIEL ARTHUR LAWRENCE
DAVID HUGH LEWIS
JERRY MARK LONGEST
GERALD KEITH MCGOWAN
MICHAEL EDWARD MCMAHON
STEPHEN MICHAEL MCMANUS
BENJAMIN MILLER
GARY M. MORLANG
RANDAL DENNISON NIVER
PATRICK JEAN REGIS
SCOTT J. SMITH
RICHARD LEE STAATS
WALTER ARNETT STARKEY, III
MANNING MARY TOWNSEND
JAY W. WALLIN
LEONARD EARL WEDDLE
KENNETH RAYMOND WIKSTROM
CHARLES LEE WOOD
STEVEN WAYNE WOODSON
CLEMON RAYNOR WORTHERLY
MICHAEL ALAN ZIEGLER

AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS

(AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING)

To be lieutenant commander

MARY COTTRELL DUNSTON
ALAN RICHARD KING
BRUCE DAVID SILBERMAN

AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS

(AVIATION MAINTENANCE)

To be lieutenant commander

ROBERT LEIGH ALLEN
TERI LYNN HOWE BLANTON
WAYNE P. BORCHERS
JOHN DOUGLAS BURPO
ROBERT CATALANO
FRED E. CLEVELAND
MICHAEL CLINTON COLDWELL
JEFFREY SCOTT COOK
MARK W. CZARZASTY
LEONARD BRET GORDON
THOMAS ROSS HAMMAN
JAMES LARRY KIMBROW
HARRY LEHMAN, JR
KENNIETH LOMAX LOWERY
WILLIAM ROBERT MCSWAIN
JOHN VALERI MOKODEAN
LARRY KEITH NEIL
MICHAEL PAUL OROURKE
KENNETH RAYMOND PEKIE
JOHN WILSON RANDOLPH, JR
MARK HENRY STONE, JR
STEVEN R. VOYLES
JOHN EDWARD ZEILER

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (CRYPTOLOGY)

To be lieutenant commander

JOANN MARIE AMMANN
MICHAEL A. BROWN
GERALD THOMAS BURNETTE
JOSEPH BRUCE CALOMENI
RICHARD GUERRERO
VERNON DEXTER INGRAM
STEPHANIE ANN MARKAM
JOHN B. MAYS, III
JAMES RICHARD MCGOVERN, JR
STEPHEN SCOTT MCKENZIE
JEREMY LYNN PANOFF
ELIZABETH EKKER CARSON
KEVIN FORREST DUFFY
JEFFREY S. GALWAY
JOHN WILLIAM GORDON
ALAN EDWARD PORTILLO
MARC D. POUSSARD
JEFFREY WARREN SCHMITZ
PAUL WILLIAM SCHUH
PAUL W. THRASHER
ROBERT ALLEN ZELLMANN

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (INTELLIGENCE)

To be lieutenant commander

EUGENE ADKINS, JR
LINDA JO BAHRANI
CHRISTOPHER DAVID BOTT
THOMAS EMMETT CARROLL
JOHN CHRISTAKOS
NANCY KATHLEEN CLARK
CHRISTOPHER A. COOK
ANNE M. DONOVAN
ROBERT DIXON ESTVANIK
JOHN MACRAE FOX
KEVIN KEASBEY FRANK
CRAIG E. FRENCH
CHRISTOPHER OLE GEVING
WILLIAM EDWARD GORHAM, JR
LLOYD RICH HILLIS
JAMES EDWARD JONES
WILLIAM MARCUS LUOMA
JERRY DOUGLAS MATTHEWS
LEE MEINIG
JOHN THOMAS MULLANY
RUSSELL S. NOVAK, JR
REBECCA C. OLDS
SUSAN M. PRESTO
STEVEN CARL PRINES
JOHN PETER RUBEL
WILLIAM D. SAS
JOHN ANTHONY SCALI
CRAIG LEIGH SCHNEIDER
ROBERT WAYNE SCHOLLE
VINCENT A. SHAHAYDA
WILLIAM RICHARD WATSON, II
DAVID B. WAUGH
STEVEN K. WESTRA
LAWRENCE WINKLER
ANN MARIE WYTZKA

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (PUBLIC AFFAIRS)

To be lieutenant commander

MICHAEL E. BRADY
ALAN PHILIP GOLDSTEIN
JOSEPH FRANCIS GRADISHER
JOHN LAWRENCE HOPKINS
DAVID BRADLEY KNOX
TERRY LEE MCCREARY

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (OCEANOGRAPHY)

To be lieutenant commander

JAMES W. ALLEN
ROBERT MARTIN BASSETT
ERIC J. BAYLER
EDWARD GEORGE BEALE, JR
ROBERT L. BEARD
JEFFREY S. BEST
RICHARD HARRY BOUCHARD
STEVEN RICHARD CAMERON
DIANE CAROL DURBAN
EDMOND MICHAEL FROST
MARK JOSEPH GUNZELMAN
JAMES ARTHUR HILL
GARY MICHAEL MINEART
JOHN F. OHARA
DEBRA LYNN POFFENBERGER

LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS (LINE)

To be lieutenant commander

LUTHER NMN ALBRIGHT
WILLIAM PLATTE AMSTUTZ
LEROY S. ANDERSON, JR
ROBERT W. ANDERSON
CARL EDMUND BAILEY
ROBERT H. BALCOM, JR
CHARLES E. BALDWIN
LAWRENCE B. BARTON
LUTHER L. BIGGS, JR
JAMES R. BIRCHFIELD
JERRY L. BIRDSONG
TIMOTHY P. BLACKIE
THOMAS BLANCHFLOWER
DAVID E. BOZMAN
SCOTT K. BRADLEY
LINFORD C. BROWN, JR
MICHAEL P. BRYCE
JAMES RUSSELL BURNS
ENNO F. CAMENZIND, JR
ANTHONY P. CARAMBIA
DAVID RICHARD CARLSON
WILLIAM H. CARNEY
RAMON F. CASTILLO
DAVID R. CHASSE
JOHN F. CHUTE
FREDERICK NMN CLEM
WILLIAM WOOD COMBS
JAMES M. CONDON, JR
TOMMY M. CULPEPPER
ALAN P. DANAHER
JEFFREY A. DAVIS
WELDON E. DEATHERAGE
ANTHONY V. DEBELLO
KENNETH R. DELL
CIPRIANO MASICAMPO DELUNA
DAL S. DONLEY
THOMAS LAWRENCE DONNELLAN
HERBERT R. DUFF
KENNETH L. EIDNES, JR

STEPHEN JAMES ELLIS
RICHARD JON ELVROM
STANLEY K. EUDY
MICHAEL L. FAIR
DONALD W. FIALA, JR
ROBERT J. FIEGL, JR
JOHN H. FOISSETT
CURTIS B. FORD, JR
LEONARD CHAR FRANCOEUR
DAVID NMN FUCITO
ARMANDO A. GALARPE
MICHAEL JOHN GILROY
JON K. GILSON
DARRYL S. GIRTZ
JOSEPH E. GLIEBE, III
JOHN D. HAMITER
BOBBY E. HAMMOCK
JOHN E. HANSCOM
WILLIAM R. HARRIS
JAMES A. HAWTHORNE
EDWARD J. HEIDLER
JOHN W. HIBBARD
THOMAS B. HINOTE
TERRY L. HOGSTON
JAMES D. HOLDEN
LAWRENCE EARL HUNT
STEVEN J. JAEGER
MICHAEL J. JEFFERS
ROBERT P. JERNIGAN
WILLIAM T. JOHNSON
BRUCE D. JONES
PHILIP A. JONES
ROBERTO NM KATEKARU
ARTHUR G. KELLY
GEORGE N. KOLLARIK
MAXWELL EDWIN KUSS
BRUCE JOHN LATHERS
DAVID PAUL LLOYD
RICHARD ALAN LOCKE
JEFFERY NMN LORD
MICHAEL J. LUX
JOHN H. MCCRINK
JAMES A. MCDOWELL
DANIEL J. MCGOVERN
JOHN P. MCGRATH
MARK D. MCNABB
JAMES G. MCNEILL
DAVID ADDISON MCQUOWN
JOHN A. MEYER
GLENN L. MILLER
THOMAS LAWRENCE MILLS
ROMEO HILBERO MOE
LEO MARVIN MORRISSETTE
CYRUS B. MURPHY
KERRY PHILIP MURRAY
FRANK W. NICHOLS
JAMES C. NICHOLS, JR
JACK H. NORRIS
JOHN J. ORDEMANN
JERRY B. ORR
ANTHONY P. PANNONE
WILLIAM NMN PAPPAS
NORMAN B. PETERS, JR
ROY CHARLES PETERSON
KENNETH A. PHELPS
DONALD RAY PRICE
GORDEN B. RATLIFF
ANTHONY B. RAYMOND
HERBERT L. REAVES
ROBERT K. REGULAR
DEL L. RENKEN
STEVEN L. RESCH
GARY L. RICHARD
NORMAN ECKLEY RICHARDS, JR
LOUIS S. ROEHM, JR
NICHOLAS J. ROSS, JR
THEODORE R. ROUGHT
ROGER MICHAEL SARTOR
FRANCIS G. SAUKEL, JR
LARRY E. SAWYER
MICHAEL J. SCHARF
HERMAN B. SCHIRMER
DAVID ROY SCOTT
THOMAS L. SEARS
RICHARD A. SHAW
MICHAEL A. SILEVINAC
WILLIAM L. SMOOT
DAVID H. SPENCER
ROBERT L. SPINDLE, IV
RICHARD A. SPON
IRA LYNN STOKES
MICHAEL W. STONE
RICHARD M. STRONG
JACKIE D. STUMP
GARY D. SUMNER
RONALD E. SWART
RONALD WAYNE TALLMAN
DAVID J. THOMAS
WILLIAM CHESLEY THOMPSON
CHARLES DAVID THREATT
WARREN E. TUTHILL, JR
ROBERT L. VANAUKEN
BUFORD RAY VANZANDT
IRVING NMN VELEZ
DANIEL M. WATSON
JACK LEROY WILSON, JR
HARVEY B. WOODMANSEE
JOHN E. WOOLARD
MICHAEL A. WULF

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 11, 1989:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CHIC HECHT, OF NEVADA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn by the President from further Senate consideration, July 11, 1989:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

ROBERT H. GENTILE, OF OHIO, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT, VICE JED DEAN CHRISTENSEN, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 3, 1989.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MICHELLE EASTON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE PETER R. GREER, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 3, 1989.

ACTION AGENCY

JANE A. KENNY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE ACTION AGENCY, VICE HENRY M. VENTURA, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 3, 1989.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

KATHLEEN DAY KOCH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE DENNIS M. DEVANEY, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 3, 1989.