United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1997 No. 114

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We know, gracious God, how we plan our lives and how we anticipate the fullness of all the days ahead, and we also know that our plans are not our own and that we experience broken dreams and shattered hearts. We remember this day all those whose lives are broken by pain and sadness and we look to Your word for comfort and solace. O God, creator of the world and author of salvation, from whom we have come and to whom we shall return, bless all who mourn and experience the uncertainty of life. May all Your people, O God, be strengthened in the knowledge of Your eternal hope and receive that peace that passes all human understanding, now and forevermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JONES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2160. An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2160) ''An Act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. INOUYE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 797. An act to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize the design and construction of additions to the parking garage and certain site improvements, and for other purposes;

S. 910. An act to authorize appropriations for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes;

S. 996. An act to provide for the authorization of appropriations in each fiscal year for arbitration in United States district courts; and

S. 1120. An act to provide for a consultant for the President pro tempore.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe—the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID].

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe—the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM].

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, August 1, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, August 1, 1997 at 12:00 p.m.: that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 584, that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1198, that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1944.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills on Friday, August 1, 1997:

H.R. 408, to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes;

H.R. 584, for the relief of John Wesley Davis;

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H.R. 1198, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Grants Pass, OR;

H.R. 1585, to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued U.S. postage stamps, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1944, to provide for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon ski area and other land in the State of Oregon;

H.R. 2014, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(2) and (d) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998; and

H.R. 2015, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 157 and the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, the Speaker on Thursday, August 7, 1997 announced the following Members of the House as members of the delegation attending the 50th anniversary of the independence of India and Pakistan: Messrs. GILMAN of New York; ACKERMAN of New York; HASTINGS of Florida; ENGEL of New York; and FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, August 1, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 4 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Mr. Jeff Trandahl, Deputy Clerk, along with Ms. Julie Perrier, Assistant Clerk and Mr. Ray Strong, Assistant Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 105th Congress or until modified by me.

Sincerely yours,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 4, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, The Capitol, H–232, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This missive comes as an official announcement of my resignation from the U.S. House of Representatives, effective October 15, 1997.

My duties and responsibilities as pastor of the Allen A.M.E. Church in Jamaica, New York, has grown to such a level that I am needed there on a more consistent basis. I have enjoyed the opportunities that you have given me to converse with you regarding my ideas for community, educational, and economic development. I hope that my leaving does not preclude our ability to, in some way, continue these discussions in the future.

With warmest regards, I am

Sincerely,

FLOYD H. FLAKE,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 1997.

Hon. GEORGE E. PATAKI,
State of New York,
Office of the Governor, Albany, NY

DEAR GOVERNOR PATAKI. This missive comes as an official announcement of my resignation from the U.S. House of Representatives, effective October 15, 1997.

My duties and responsibilities as pastor of Allen A.M.E. Church have grown to a level which necessitates my presence on a more consistent basis.

I have called your office, and hope to be able to speak with you in the near future.

With warmest regards, I am

Sincerely,

FLOYD H. FLAKE,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 11, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives. I have the honor to transmit correspondence received from the White House on August 11, 1997 at 3:12 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President pursuant to the Line Item Veto Act (P.L. 104–130) transmitting one cancellation with respect to the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (P.L. 105–33).

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

CANCELLATION OF ITEM OF DIRECT SPENDING WITH RESPECT TO BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105–115)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, pursuant to section 1025(a) of the Congressional Budget Act, referred to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 11, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel one item of new direct spending, as specified in the attached report, contained in the ''Balanced Budget Act of 1997'' (Public Law 105–33; H.R. 2015). I have determined that this cancellation will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachment, constitutes a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 11, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit correspondence received from the White House on August 11, 1997 at 3:12 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President pursuant to the Line Item Veto Act (P.L. 104–130) transmitting two cancellations with respect to the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (P.L. 105–34).

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

CANCELLATION OF TWO LIMITED TAX BENEFITS WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER RELIEF ACT OF 1997—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105–116)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, pursuant to section 1025(a) of the Congressional Budget Act, referred to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 11, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel two limited tax benefits, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the ''Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997'' (Public Law 105–34; H.R. 2014). I have determined that each of these cancellations will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachments, constitutes a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 25, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted on July 23, 1997 by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Copies of the resolutions are being transmitted to the Department of the Army.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER, *Chairman.*

Enclosures.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2532—NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NORTH CAROLINA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Neuse River Basin, North Carolina, published as House Document 175, 89th Congress, 1st Session, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of flood control, environmental protection and restoration, and related purposes.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2533—TAMPA HARBOR, FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Tampa Harbor, Florida, published as House Document 401, 91st Congress, 2nd Session and other pertinent reports, with a view of determining if the authorized project should be modified in any way at this time, with particular reference to deep draft anchorage.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2534—OWASCO LAKE SEAWALL, NEW YORK

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Owasco Lake Seawall, New York, published as Senate Document 133, 84th Congress, 2nd Session, and other pertinent reports, to determine if modifications to the authorized project as contained therein, should include the rehabilitation of the seawalls to prevent flooding and control water flows along the outlet, are appropriate at this time.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2535—ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LOUISIANA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project, published as House Document 308, 88th Congress, 2nd Session, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of flood control, navigation, wetland conservation and restoration, wildlife habitat, commercial and recreational fishing, saltwater intrusion, fresh water and sediment diversion, and other purposes in the area drained by the intercepted drainage system of the West Atchafalaya Basin Protection Levee, from Alexandria, Louisiana, to the Gulf of Mexico.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2536—SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Susquehanna River in Sunbury, Pennsylvania, published as House Document 366, 76th Congress, 1st Session, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time to construct conduits for the Susquehanna River in Sunbury, Pennsylvania in the interest of flood control and public safety.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2537—MASSACHUSETTS & CAPE COD BAYS, MASSACHUSETTS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Massachusetts and Cape Cod Bays, Massachusetts, published as Senate Document 14, 85th Congress, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable in the interest of environmental restoration and other allied purposes along the Massachusetts and Cape Cod Bay, coastal shoreline and associated waters.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, August 13, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR NEWT: Enclosed please find copies of resolutions approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 23, 1997, in accordance with 40 U.S.C. Sec. 606.

With warm regards, I remain

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER, *Chairman.*

Enclosures.

DESIGN: UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EXPANSION BUILDING, DENVER, COLORADO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations in the amount of $4,671,000 are authorized for the design of a 350,500 gross square foot expansion building, including 125 inside parking spaces, and connecting tunnel to the existing Byron G. Rogers Federal Building-Courthouse in Denver, Colorado, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

Provided, That any design shall, to the maximum extent possible, incorporate shared or collegial space, consistent with efficient court operations that will minimize the size and cost of the building to be constructed.

Provided further, That any design shall incorporate changes to the 1994 and 1997 *U.S. Courts Design Guide* including the implementation of a policy on shared facilities for senior judges.

DESIGN: UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, MIAMI, FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized in the amount of $6,100,000 for the design of a 498,912 gross square foot United States courthouse, including 50 inside parking spaces, in Miami, Florida, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

Provided, That any design shall, to the maximum extent possible, incorporate shared or collegial space, consistent with efficient court operations that will minimize the size and cost of the building to be constructed.

Provided further, That any design shall incorporate changes to the 1994 and 1997 *U.S. Courts Design Guide* including the implementation of a policy on shared facilities for senior judges.

DESIGN: FRANK E. MOSS COURTHOUSE/ANNEX, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized in the amount of $4,918,000 for the design of a 229,300 gross square foot annex building including 78 inside parking spaces, in Salt Lake City, Utah, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

Provided, That any design shall, to the maximum extent possible, incorporate shared or collegial space, consistent with efficient court operations that will minimize the size and cost of the building to be constructed.

Provided further, That any design shall incorporate changes to the 1994 and 1997 *U.S. Courts Design Guide* including the implementation of a policy on shared facilities for senior judges.

DESIGN: FEDERAL BUILDING—UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, FRESNO, CALIFORNIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized in the amount of $4,775,000 for the design of a 360,000 gross square foot Federal building-United States courthouse, including 112 inside parking spaces, in Fresno, California, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

Provided, That any design shall, to the maximum extent possible, incorporate shared or collegial space, consistent with efficient court operations that will minimize the size and cost of the building to be constructed.

Provided further, That any design shall incorporate changes to the 1994 and 1997 *U.S. Courts Design Guide* including the implementation of a policy on shared facilities for senior judges.

DESIGN: UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE ANNEX, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the

Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized in the amount of $5,703,000 for the design of a 351,500 gross square foot United States courthouse annex, including 250 inside parking spaces, in Washington, D.C., a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

Provided, That any design shall, to the maximum extent possible, incorporate shared or collegial space, consistent with efficient court operations that will minimize the size and cost of the building to be constructed.

Provided further, That any design shall incorporate changes to the 1994 and 1997 *U.S. Courts Design Guide* including the implementation of a policy on shared facilities for senior judges.

SITE ACQUISITION AMENDMENT: UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, ORLANDO, FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to Section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), additional appropriations are authorized in the amount of $748,000 for the acquisition of a site of approximately 3 acres for the construction of 235,050 gross square foot United States courthouse plus 35 inside and 200 surface parking spaces to be located directly across from the existing Federal Building and United States courthouse in Orlando, Florida. This resolution amends the Committee resolution dated May 17, 1994, which authorized size acquisition at a cost of $7,724,000.

REPAIR AND ALTERATION AMENDMENT: INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION—UNITED STATES CUSTOMS, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to Section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), additional appropriations in the amount of $3,722,000 are authorized for the repair and alteration of the 1,200,000 gross square foot Interstate Commerce Commission-United States Customs connecting wing, with 28 inside parking spaces, in Washington, D.C. This resolution amends the Committee resolution of November 16, 1995, which authorized repair and alteration at a total estimated cost of $138,512,000.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION: UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, ERIE, PENNSYLVANIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to Section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §610), the Administrator of General Services shall investigate the feasibility and need to construct or acquire a facility to house the United States District Court for Western Pennsylvania, in Erie, Pennsylvania. The analysis shall include a full and complete evaluation including, but not limited to: (i) the identification and cost of potential sites and (ii) 30 year present value evaluations of all options; including lease, purchase, and Federal construction, and the purchase options of lease with an option to purchase or purchase contract. The Administrator shall submit a report to Congress within 120 days.

CONSTRUCTION: BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND FIREARMS, SUBURBAN MARYLAND

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized for management and inspection at a cost of $3,330,000, and construction at an estimated cost of $52,536,000, for a 207,821 gross square foot Federal building to house the National Laboratory Center and a Fire Investigation Research and Education facility for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms; plus 113 surface parking spaces at a site in suburban Maryland, for a combined authority of $55,866,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

CONSTRUCTION: UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE, BELTSVILLE, MARYLAND

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized for design at a cost of $645,000, management and inspection at a cost of $821,000, and construction at an estimated cost of $6,734,000, for a 45,979 gross square foot classroom building for the United States Secret Service, plus 265 surface parking spaces, at the United States Secret Service Training Center in Beltsville, Maryland, for a combined authority of $8,200,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

In addition, That this authority may be combined with the authority provided in the Committee Resolution dated May 9, 1996, authorizing $2,400,000 for the construction of a 16,700 gross square foot administrative building for the United States Secret Service, plus 50 surface parking spaces, at the United States Secret Service Training Center in Beltsville, Maryland.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION: UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to Section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. §610), the Administrator of General Services shall investigate the feasibility and need to construct or acquire an annex facility for the United States District Court for Southern Florida, in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. The analysis shall include a full and complete evaluation including, but not limited to: (i) the identification and cost of potential sites and (ii) 30 year present value evaluations of all options; including lease, purchase, and Federal construction, and the purchase options of lease with an option to purchase or purchase contract. The Administrator shall submit a report to Congress within 120 days.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION: SITE, DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HEADQUARTERS, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to Section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized for the construction of a headquarters building (or buildings) for the Department of Transportation of approximately 1,100,000 net usable square feet (1,350,000 rentable square feet) of space plus 145 official parking spaces at an estimated design cost of $14,105,000, an estimated management and inspection cost of $10,541,000 and an estimated construction cost of $269,778,000, as set forth in a report pursuant to Section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, which is attached to and included in this resolution. The Administrator may use the South East Federal Center as the site for this headquarters, or may exchange land at the South East Federal Center, or other Federally owned property, for suitable land for the site or sites in the central employment area of the District of Columbia, under authority of Section 3 and Section 5 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. §§602 and 604).

Provided, That in the event that Federal funding is not available for construction of a headquarters building or buildings, the Administrator is authorized to enter into an operating lease not to exceed 20 years, and renewal options, plus options to purchase, for approximately 1,100,000 net usable square feet of space (1,350,000 rentable square feet), plus 145 official parking spaces, at an estimated annual cost of $57,375,000, plus escalations.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JAMES V. HANSEN, chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, DC, July 31, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule L of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has been served with a subpoena (for documents) issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts and directed to the ''Keeper of the Records.''

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, the Committee will make the determinations required by Rule L.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. HANSEN,
Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 6, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena (for documents and testimony) issued by the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California in the matter of *Oxycal Laboratories, Inc., et al.* v. *Patrick, et al., No. SA CV–96–1119 AHS (EEx).* The subpoena was directed to ''The Office of Congressman John D. Dingell.''

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that the subpoena appears not to be consistent with the rights and privileges of the House and, therefore, should be resisted.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BUD SHUSTER, chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 7, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has been served with a subpoena (for documents) issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts and directed to the ''Keeper of Records.''

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, the Committee will make the determination required by Rule L.

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 8, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer (''CAO'') has been served with a subpoena (for documents) issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts and directed to the ''Keeper of Records.''

After consulting with the Office of the General Counsel, the CAO will make the determinations required by Rule L.

Sincerely,

JAY EAGEN,
Chief Administrative Officer.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE LYNN N. RIVERS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable LYNN N. RIVERS, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
August 18, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER GINGRICH: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the Third Judicial Circuit Court of the State of Michigan in the case of *Marcus Management, Inc.* v. *Robert Marquess, et al.*, Case No. 97–715508 CK.

After consultation with the Office of the General Counsel, I have determined that the subpoena relates to my official duties, and that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

LYNN N. RIVERS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 12, 1997.

Hon.NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 2702(a)(1)(B)(vi) of Public Law 101–509, I hereby appoint as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress the following person: Mr. Roger Davidson, 3510 Edmunds Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE, *Clerk.*

□ 1215

HONORING AND REMEMBERING PRINCESS DIANA

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with the House, that on Thursday, the House will be voting on a resolution honoring and remembering Princess Diana. I think every Member of the House joins literally millions of people across the planet in grief for the Princess, for her family, for the others who were killed in the accident and their families, and for the unnecessary tragedy that ended her life.

She had been a leader, not only in charming everyone who met her, but in working on key charitable causes, working on helping those with AIDS, working on banning land mines, working with the Red Cross, working with the homeless, and working on breast cancer.

I think across the world people have been drawn together in a sense of grief and sadness at this absolutely unnecessary tragedy, and the House tomorrow will extend formally by resolution the feelings of the American people as represented by this body to her family and to the people of Britain.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER A MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of rule XXVIII, clause 1(c), I am announcing that tomorrow I will offer a motion to instruct the House conferees on the bill, H.R. 1119, to insist upon the provisions of section 1032 of the House bill relating to the assignment of Department of Defense personnel to border patrol and control.

JOIN THE MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN'S CAUCUS—THERE IS MUCH WORK TO BE DONE

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues how I spent part of my August recess. I spent several days searching in the woods of Galveston County, TX, looking for a young woman who was abducted. Seventeen-year-old Jessica Lee Cain was driving home from a party in the early morning hours on Sunday, August 16. She never made it home, though her truck was found by the side of the road with her wallet still sitting on the front seat.

Well, Jessica is still missing. Last week, she would have begun her studies at Sam Houston State College, just a few days after her 18th birthday. We pray that whoever is responsible for her disappearance will return Jessica unharmed.

Mr. Speaker, I founded the Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus this past spring when 12-year-old Laura Smither, also from my district, was found abducted and found murdered. That we could have two such tragedies in the same area within months is beyond comprehension. However, on behalf of the Smither and Cain families, we must work harder to protect our precious children.

I ask my colleagues to pray for Jessica and the Cain family and to join me in the Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus. There is much work to be done.

THE TIME FOR TALK IS OVER ON EDUCATION REFORM AND BETTER SCHOOLS

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, politicians love to make a lot of noise about education reform and better schools. Ever since the report, ''A Nation At Risk,'' came out in 1983, calls for education reform have been part of every politician's repertoire, but nothing seems to change, and parents with children in bad schools have the impression that reformers are more interested in rearranging the deck chairs than they are about serious changes.

Mr. Speaker, that is about to change. That is because more and more parents are insisting on real changes in the educational opportunities available to their children.

Two ideas that will not go away are school choice and education savings accounts. They will not go away because both ideas are as American as apple pie, freedom to choose and savings for the children's future, and because it is awfully hard to argue with the results. With Milwaukee and Cleveland leading the way, school choice is the wave of the future, and education savings accounts will become part of that movement for greater educational opportunities.

The time for talk is over; now is the time for real change.

HOUSE NEEDS TO CONDUCT HEARINGS TO EXAMINE ELEMENTS OF PROPOSED TOBACCO SETTLEMENT

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Congress should not rubber stamp the recently proposed tobacco settlement that benefits the tobacco industry more than the public. As I understand it, the settlement will give tobacco companies immunity from liability, enable companies to prevent disclosure of potentially revealing documents, provide a financial windfall for company executives through increased stock options, restrict future Food and Drug Administration regulation, and not adequately accomplish the goal of reducing teenage smoking.

Mr. Speaker, today my Senator from New Jersey, Senator LAUTENBERG, launched a campaign to gain access to tobacco industry documents that could remain under wraps if the agreement gains the approval of Congress. I support that effort, and I think the House also should support that effort.

Much work needs to be done, and I think that Congress, and particularly the House, needs to move forward with hearings to further examine the elements of this tobacco settlement. As it stands now, the settlement is a winner for the tobacco industry and a loser for our children. Let us work to change that outcome.

SUPPORT SCHOOL CHOICE AND EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, education funding has been on the rise for years, but we have not seen improvement in our public schools. SAT scores are down, and dissatisfaction is growing among teachers, parents, and students. Still we just keep throwing money at a broken wheel. It is time to fix the wheel and stop putting taxpayers' dollars in a bottomless pit.

Two reform measures, school choice and education savings accounts, can help get America's education system back on track. These ideas give parents the freedom to choose the best schools for their children's education and to save for their children's future. School choice and education savings accounts are the reforms we need to finally begin to fix education in America.

Mr. Speaker, these ideas are the free-market solution to a very serious problem. These solutions are right for parents and children throughout our Nation. For the sake of education in America, I urge my colleagues to support school choice and education savings accounts.

RIGHT ON, MRS. BARRON

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, on the advice of their accountant, the Barrons of New Hampshire took an $80,000 investment loss. Years later, the IRS came in, they said no, and they hit the Barrons with a $330,000 tag in penalties and interest; $330,000, unbelievable. The pressure was so great Bruce Barron killed himself. After the death, the IRS took the home, took everything they had.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

Under a new law, Mrs. Barron is suing the IRS, and I say, right on. I hope the IRS gets their assets kicked all the way up to their gestapo tactics. The IRS, after all, has deserved it; the IRS has earned it.

Think about it, Congress, and I yield back all the rest of that IRS loan sharking and ripoffs of interest and penalties.

OPPOSE H.R. 1270, THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, while Members of this House were in their districts during the August recess, ABC News reported to a national television audience just what I have been saying in this very well for the past 8 months, that despite numerous scientific evidence to the contrary, the Federal Government is going to find Yucca Mountain, NV, as a suitable site for nuclear waste storage.

The news report highlighted that despite problems with fragile rock formation, migrating groundwater, volcanoes, and active earthquakes, Federal agencies always find a way to ignore them first by lowering the standards and then by lowering the safety standards to the site suitability. More than $3 billion has already been spent on Yucca Mountain, and the site has been found to be scientifically unsuitable.

Later this year, Congress will consider a bill that proposes we spend billions more of taxpayer dollars to fund another study that will tell Washington bureaucrats just what they want to hear. This is not just a Nevada issue; this is an issue of safety for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to get the true facts and oppose the H.R. 1270.

KOREAN AIR FLIGHT 801 TRAGEDY

(Mr. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, while the rest of the Nation has turned its attention to other matters, we on Guam are still reeling from the worst air disaster of our island's history. On August 6, 1997, a Korean Air 747 en route from Seoul crashed into a hill 3 miles short of the runway of the Won Pat International Airport on Guam. The jet carried 254 people, with 227 having perished.

I rise today to express the condolences of the people of Guam to the victims' families. We share their pain most intimately not because the crash occurred on Guam, but also because the people on that plane were not entirely strangers. Amongst the dead, eight were returning Guam residents of Korean decent. Amongst the survivors, there were four returning home.

I would also like to draw this body's attention not only to the grieving families, but also to the men and women who spent countless hours in search and rescue efforts as well as family assisting actions. The NTSB's efficient investigation of the airline's crash is exemplary. However, a tragedy of this magnitude leaves many questions unanswered. I strongly urge a public hearing on the crash of KAL 801 to be held on Guam.

URGING CORRECTION OF FEDERAL JUDGE'S DECISION REGARDING FORESTS IN EAST TEXAS

(Mr. BRADY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, during the district work period this August, my wife and I spent a few days among the beautiful forests in our national parks, but I am deeply disturbed by a decision, another out test decision by a Federal judge in Beaumont, who decreed because he disagreed with how our Forest Service is managing parts of the lands in Texas, he called and ordered an injunction, halted all logging among our east Texas forests.

This action, irresponsible and damaging, not only causes the Federal Government to fault on our contracts to small businesses, it has stopped our small businesses in Texas affiliated with lumber and timber. It is hurting the counties, 12 east Texas counties. They rely upon that $4 million to help balance their budget every year. And, in fact, it is an impediment to those of us who seek a balance among our environmental assets, who seek to have a forest and parks and lands in our country that is properly managed. It is a disturbing action by a Federal judge and one we ought to take action to correct.

THE FAMOUS AVOIDANCE GAME ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM IS NO LONGER ACCEPTABLE

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no more important issue for this Congress to address in the waning hours than the need to reform our corrupt campaign finance laws.

As my colleagues will recall, many of us have called upon Speaker GINGRICH to schedule a vote this month on legislation to ban the large, unregulated financial contributions to political parties known as soft money. These contributions of $25,000, $100,000, and even $1 million from a single individual representing some particular special interest have helped to ruin our electoral and legislative process. Despite our repeated requests for a vote and despite the Speaker's own pledge of support, there has been no vote scheduled on a soft money ban or any other campaign finance reform.

My colleagues and our Speaker should be aware that we are prepared to use all our means at our disposal to force a vote this month. No more business as usual, Mr. Speaker. The famous avoidance game on this issue is no longer acceptable. Our ability to honestly represent our constituents depends on our success and reforming the campaign finance laws.

Already there is talk of adjourning the Congress as soon as possible to avoid addressing this issue. Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable. We will not accept such a cowardice position and the protectionism of special interests.

LEGISLATION TO ENSURE NO GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, very shortly now, September 30, the fiscal year, the current fiscal year, will end. For a decade now, I have been proposing legislation that when such an event occurs, and it has occurred too often without new appropriations taking their place, a new budget in place, a Government shutdown is in the foreseeable future.

The legislation that I have proposed would end that phenomenon by saying when at the end of the fiscal year no budget has been put in place, then last year's appropriations will automatically go into effect until a new budget takes effect.

We have had the Congress of the United States just a few months ago pass such legislation only to be vetoed by the President. It is now time to say, ''I told you so; we're facing another Government shutdown.''

The chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations will do all in his power, I am sure, to prevent such an event, but my legislation would provide insurance that no Government shutdown would occur.

□ 1230

RETURN POLITICAL POWER WHERE IT BELONGS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, in the first half of 1996, the tobacco industry donated over $1 million to the Republican Party. Last month Speaker GINGRICH and his Republican colleagues returned the favor. Republican Members snuck into the balanced budget bill a $50 billion credit provision for tobacco companies, my friends, not a bad return on their $1 million donation.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal reported from the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids that 83 percent of the Members from the other body took tobacco money last year, and they voted against increasing funding to crack down on illegal sales of tobacco to minors.

It is no wonder the American people have lost faith in their political system. It is time for Congress to ban soft money contributions to political parties and restore some integrity to our campaign finance system.

Democrats are asking Speaker GINGRICH to schedule a vote this month to ban soft money. The American people should not have to wait any longer.

We need to take this important first step. Let us take the influence out of the hands of the wealthy and the special interests. We need to return political power in this Nation to where it rightly belongs, in the hands of average working Americans.

BRING ABOUT CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM NOW

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, when I think of the unexplained delay in considering campaign finance reform, I am forced to ask myself the same question over and over again: Why is it taking so long to do what we promised the American people in 1996?

It is obvious that the American people want campaign finance reform. The President and the Speaker shook hands over 2 years ago committing themselves to reforming the system and, according to the rhetoric in Congress, many of my colleagues want the same thing. Yet, no campaign finance reform legislation is on the agenda, and many news reports indicate that after the consideration of the remaining appropriation acts, as early as October 11, the House will adjourn for the year. Roll Call says it will be the fastest session since 1965.

I think we still have time to consider this important issue. What we need is the commitment of the Republican leadership of the House. We can no longer tolerate the rhetoric without action on this issue.

The Speaker has left us no choice: We have declared September Ban Soft Money Month, and we will do everything in our power to raise this issue on the floor. We must do it before the 1998 election.

CLOSE SOFT MONEY LOOPHOLE

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed to read in Tuesday's Congress Daily the top Republican lawmakers were not going to make passing campaign finance reform a priority this session.

It is time to recognize there are no more legitimate excuses why this body has not acted on this issue. The American people want it, the political process needs it, and we have a good legislative vehicle to make it happen, thanks to a recently introduced bill by a bipartisan freshman task force.

Our Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act would take an important first step toward reforming the political process by banning soft money contributions. Soft money contributions allow individuals, corporations, and other organizations to give unlimited amounts of money to influence Federal elections.

It is time to close the soft money loophole and pass meaningful campaign finance reform.

TIME TO GET SERIOUS ABOUT BANNING SOFT MONEY

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before Congress departed for the August recess, I joined with 25 of my House colleagues in writing to Speaker GINGRICH demanding a vote this month on banning soft money contributions to political parties. In our letter, we warned that failure to schedule such a vote would cause us to use every tool at our disposal to force consideration of this all-important campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, it does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that our current campaign finance system is broken and needs to be fixed. Every day the newspapers are filled with stories detailing how unregulated soft money contributions have corrupted our political system and are threatening to undermine the very essence of our democracy.

Clearly, we need real, comprehensive campaign finance reform, and we need it now, but Speaker Gingrich has refused to give us a day to vote even on this most basic of reforms.

Mr. Speaker, give us a vote on real campaign finance reform, or at least give us a vote to ban soft money. It is the right thing to do; it is what the American people want.

LIVE BY LAWS PRESENTLY ON THE BOOKS

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I hear this call for campaign finance reform. We can pass all the laws in the world, but if some people are not going to live by the laws on the books, what point is it to change the law?

Now, it was not the Republicans that invited people into the White House at $50,000 a pop for the Lincoln Bedroom. It was not Republicans who dealt with arms merchants, foreign agents, and narcotics dealers, and had their pictures taken for massive amounts of money. All of those things are against the law. It was not Republicans that made phone calls out of the White House, against the advice of the counsel to the White House.

And yet they say they want to change the law. For what purpose? It is time they obeyed the law on the books.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2016, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2016) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2016, be instructed to insist on the House position with respect to funding for Family Housing, Dormitories and Barracks for military personnel serving worldwide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when the House passed the military construction bill, it included funding for many important projects for family housing, barracks, and dormitories. By a vote of 395 to 134, we agreed to place a high priority on the quality of life of our men and women in the military and their families as they serve us around the world.

The other body, however, does not seem to feel as we do; $145 million was cut for family housing and $65 million was cut from barracks. We give them the best training in the world, but with the lack of decent housing, we cannot get them to reenlist in the services.

These young men and women are sent to the far corners of the world, but we cannot provide proper care and a proper place for them to live. Whether it is a base near your district or in Korea or Germany, these people deserve adequate housing.

My motion, Mr. Speaker, provides specific direction to the conferees to make certain that in resolving the differences between the House and the other body, a high priority is given to the quality of life of the men and women serving us in the military.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2016, and that I may include tabular and extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on the motion to instruct, I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER]. We have made a very, very significant step forward in the House bill to emphasize quality-of-life issues, housing, barracks, day care centers, hospitals, dental centers, and a variety of other areas to make life more pleasant and agreeable for our men and women in the services. So we have built our bill, the House bill, around these basic concepts of emphasizing quality of life.

This motion to instruct simply restates what we agreed to do in our committee as we wrote and marked up our bill to this point. I deeply appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] to continue to emphasize these quality-of-life principles as we go to conference. I hope the Senate will agree with our concepts of what is important.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree with the motion to instruct and recommend that it pass.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs: PACKARD, PORTER, HOBSON, WICKER, KINGSTON, PARKER, TIAHRT, WAMP, LIVINGSTON, HEFNER, OLVER, EDWARDS, DICKS, HOYER, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2158, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2158) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the managers on the part of the House be instructed to insist on the position of the House regarding the total funding level provided for the Environmental Protection Agency's 'Hazardous Substance Superfund' account.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, nearly one person in four in this country lives close to a Superfund site. We know all too well what the result of that fact is: too many reported cases of cancer and other diseases caused by breathing, eating, and drinking too many hazardous contaminants.

This motion is pretty simple. If you want to be on record for doing as much as possible to clean up Superfund sites around the country and reduce the amounts of hazardous pollutants to which your constituents are exposed, you vote for this motion.

Supporting this motion does not bust the budget. Although the budget resolution assumed funding for the Superfund program at the enhanced level of $2.1 billion, the level called for by the administration as part of the so-called Kalamazoo initiative, the House level is still $600 million below that.

The total Superfund spending in the House-passed bill is $1.5 billion, compared with $1.4 billion in the Senate. The House amount is definitely superior to the Senate's recommendation in several ways: The House version provides $28 million, or 14 percent more,

for Superfund enhancement activities, $5 million more for research activities, and $12 million more for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

Mr. Speaker, much criticism has been lodged against the operation of the Superfund program since its inception. I think most Members would agree that reforms are needed. However, until the authorization committees are able to reach agreement on what these reforms should be, we should still be trying to do all we can to get Superfund sites cleaned up.

This administration has made good progress in getting Superfund appropriations spent on actual cleanup and not on litigation and administrative costs.

I strongly urge an ''aye'' vote to keep Superfund moneys flowing at as high a level as possible to clean up as many sites as quickly as we can.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not going to object to this suggestion by my colleague. By way of commentary, however, I must say that it was at least 15 years ago as a member of this committee I traveled to the northern part of the State of New York, and during that trip I visited a place called Love Canal. At that point in time we knew that the Superfund program had many a problem. The new Administrator indicated to us that this was a program and project that was very, very important but which was broken.

I certainly do hope that between now and the time we go to conference that my colleague will join with me one more time in asking the administration for their suggestion as to how we fix this program, for she has been talking about it publicly a lot, but I have seen no recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LEWIS of California, DELAY, WALSH, HOBSON, KNOLLENBERG, FRELINGHUYSEN, NEUMANN, WICKER, LIVINGSTON, STOKES, MOLLOHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2169, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2169) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that in resolving the differences between the House and Senate, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2169, be instructed to insist on the House position with respect to providing $200 million for operating assistance under the transit formula grants program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. This motion simply instructs the conferees to insist on the $200 million included in the House bill for transit operating assistance.

In my judgment, we have cut operating assistance too much already over the years. Unfortunately, the Senate has no funding for operating assistance, and this motion simply insists that the conferees stay with the decision adopted by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman's concern with regard to the operating assistance, and wish it could be higher, but I think that $200 million is certainly the bottom we should go. I think it is a good motion, and we certainly accept it. I commend the gentleman for offering it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLF, DELAY, REGULA, ROGERS, PACKARD, CALLAHAN, TIAHRT, ADERHOLT, LIVINGSTON, SABO, FOGLIETTA, TORRES, OLVER, PASTOR, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2203, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2203) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998 and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FAZIO of California moves that in resolving the differences between House and Senate, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2203, be instructed to recede to the Senate on funding levels provided for nonproliferation and arms control programs under the Department of Energy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for offering this motion to instruct conferees is simply that I believe the House would be advised to support the Senate figures on nuclear nonproliferation so we do no damage to our efforts to verify nuclear testing. The research and development account, which is very important to the Department, shows that we have taken a $20 million reduction in excess of what the Senate provided in this area. It seems to me these are very important funds to meet established milestones for the demonstration and delivery of state-of-the-art nuclear detection technologies.

In addition, the legislation that the House passed could well be determined to be inadequate in terms of funding the Department's threat assessment program, which is a core program which provides for our Government's full capability to assess nuclear-related domestic threats.

It also provides a central traffic point for DOE's nuclear agency and critical message traffic from overseas embassies. It would be, I think, something that all Members of this House could join together on. We are not anxious to restrict our capabilities to monitor potential proliferation of nuclear activities in countries, particularly in third-world countries, where we think the threat is most likely to occur.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCDADE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2203.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and I have discussed this issue. We are, as we so often are, in accord. I support the motion and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCDADE, ROGERS, KNOLLENBERG, FRELINGHUYSEN, PARKER, CALLAHAN, DICKEY, LIVINGSTON, FAZIO of California, VISCLOSKY, EDWARDS, PASTOR, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2159, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 27, 1997, and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2159.

□ 1302

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 30, 1997, the bill had been read through page 93, line 15.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, no other amendment shall be in order, except pro forma amendments offered for the purpose of debate, unless printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before Friday, August 1, 1997.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, just to bring the Members up to date, we are resuming our debate on the Foreign Operations bill, H.R. 2159. Just to refresh Members' memories, this bill was well under the allocation that was given to the subcommittee. In fact, it is some $87,000 under last year's appropriation and nearly $4.5 billion less than the Senate bill and the President's request.

So once again, as we continue this debate, we would like for our colleagues to keep in mind that final passage on this measure will actually mean another reduction in foreign aid, and I think it is very important that Members of the House understand this.

Once again, the American people are requesting that we be frugal in our efforts to assist the President and the executive branch in their efforts to have an effective foreign policy. But under the circumstances, the committee felt, and I feel, that the reduction is in order. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I will continue the effort.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California, the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, once again, I, too, want to remind our colleagues of the great leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] in bringing this bipartisan legislation to the floor. This is a difficult bill and there are many contentious areas that are covered in it.

We began the debate, as Members may recall, before the August district work period. At that time, I said that the gentleman from Alabama had resolved many of the contentious issues. One area of agreement that I have with the gentleman on the bill, of course, is the funding level. I hope to work on that in conference. But, again, in terms of the issue-by-issue consideration of the bill, I think a great deal was accomplished because of the gentleman's openness, accessibility, and spirit of bipartisanship.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman once again for his leadership and once again separate from the remarks about, yes, we must be frugal and prudent in all of our spending, subject all of it to the harshest scrutiny, but I support the larger number of the administration, a minor disagreement with the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her kind remarks, and it has been a pleasure working with the gentlewoman in her first year as ranking Democrat on our subcommittee. The gentlewoman has been a pleasure to work with, as has been her entire staff.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a joint effort, both Republicans and Democrats joining together, to bring to the floor what I consider a responsible bill. I know the gentlewoman is concerned that it is not sufficient, but nevertheless, under the circumstances, I certainly feel that it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 571. (a) Not more than $40,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' may be made available for Turkey.

(b) Of the funds made available under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' for Turkey, not less than fifty percent of these funds shall be made available for the purpose of supporting private nongovernmental organizations engaged in strengthening democratic institutions in Turkey, providing economic assistance for individuals and communities affected by civil unrest, and supporting and promoting peaceful solutions and economic development which will contribute to the settlement of regional problems in Turkey.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 76 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 572. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'', and increasing the amount made available for ''CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND'' (as authorized by Section 526(c) Public Law 103–306; 108 Stat. 1632), by $25,000,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would allocate 25 million additional dollars to the African Development Fund. The amendment is revenue neutral, budget neutral, and is

scored by CBO as neutral on all relevant points for budgetary purposes. It takes the $25 million that we would like to give to the African Development Fund from the Economic Support Fund.

The Economic Support Fund is the generic fund that is one of the largest components of this bill and is already funded at $57 million above the fiscal year 1997 enacted level.

So, there is no question that this money would not add to the size of the bill, the cost of the bill, or the size of the burden on the U.S. taxpayers from the deficit.

Why is it necessary to dedicate $25 million more into the African Development Fund? The United States investment of time, compassion, and dollars in Africa, in my view, brings the greatest return from the point of view of our national interests, our sense of compassion, and what we can do for people who are most in need.

The people who live in sub-Saharan Africa have the lowest life expectancy of any people on Earth. Americans on average live 48 percent longer, almost half a lifetime longer than the average person living in sub-Saharan Africa.

International relief organizations characterize sub-Saharan Africa as having one half of its population living in absolute poverty.

What does the African Development Fund do? Well, in combination with the African Development Bank, it assists those individuals, entrepreneurs, small businesses, who are able and interested in helping themselves to create the conditions for economic growth from which the alleviation of poverty will come in a permanent way.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a handout. It is an assist in becoming economically self-sufficient so that some day when we speak of these issues again on the House floor, we will not be referring to a life expectancy so short and infant mortality rate so high and absence of inoculation for childhood diseases that is so sadly widespread.

The United States has in the past funded the African Development Bank and the African Development Fund. The African Development Bank offers assistance for the more creditworthy borrowers. That is an important area, but it is not the subject of this amendment.

The African Development Fund offers assistance for the poorest of the poor. It offers loans on concessional bases. In the past, the United States has had some concern about the management of the African Development Fund and, for that reason, has not been putting any money into this for several of the last years. However, the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the Committee on International Relations, the State Department, AID, have all been studying the progress made by the African Development Fund and have come to the conclusion that it is appropriate to recommit United States resources to this very important area. The only issue now is the amount.

Mr. Chairman, here is why that additional $25 million is so important. Presently, the Senate bill, the other body's bill, has zero. The President has requested $50 million. The committee's bill requests $25 million.

If we can go to conference with a full $50 million, I would be very hopeful and prayerful that we could actually get $50 million, which is what the President has requested. It certainly puts us in a better bargaining position than if we go to the conference with $25 million, which is in the bill.

Several Members of the European Community have announced that their willingness to assist will be conditional upon the United States putting forward its commitment. Because whereas we have committed to assist with the African Development Fund, we have, in fact, not contributed for the last 2 years, when we said we would. The amount that is already overdue is $132 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for that today. I am asking for the additional $25 million so that we can make a good down payment on getting this fund started again and thereby engage our European allies in this most worthy project.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues out of compassion to care for those who are the most needy in the world, please to support this amendment. I am proud to say that it is supported by many colleagues, including the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Mr. Chairman, I conclude by saying for those concerned about our friends in the Middle East, that AIPAC has allowed me to say they do not oppose this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise, first of all, to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], chairman of this fine subcommittee, for his effort and his work, including his work with me over the years on many issues dealing with human rights, particularly in Africa.

I also thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her forthright and open presentation and commitment on human rights and issues dealing with foreign affairs in this world. I am proud to be associated with both of these fine colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, the effort of the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] today is one that I proudly support, and I join the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] to be able to stand today for what I think is a vital change and recognition in the policy of teaching someone to fish, rather than giving them a fish.

Interestingly enough, as the world mourns one of the most dynamic ambassadors that committed herself to the idea of helping those less fortunate, Princess Diana, who visited Africa on several occasions and was not fearful of working with the heads of State, but as well as the people of those nations in helping them to pull themselves up by their bootstraps, that we would come today to be able to support legislation that adds $25 million to the African Development fund.

Mr. Chairman, this does not cause for any increase in spending in this particular bill, but helps to raise the funding to a level of $50 million; a request made by the President and one that we have not met at this time.

It is extremely important to recognize what the African Development Fund stands for. It makes loans on market-based terms to creditworthy borrowers.

□ 1315

That is, while the AFDF lends to the poorest members on highly concessional terms, that means that what happens is those poorest nations, those poorest individuals, those poorest nongovernmental agencies are able to receive money that will help lift them and their constituents up by the bootstraps.

The interesting thing that we should note is that in fact this money does go to the poorest nations in sub-Saharan Africa. The African Development Bank concentrates its loans on smaller projects than the International Development Association, the concessional lending arm of the World Bank, in areas such as microenterprise, primary education, preventative health care, agriculture and basic infrastructure.

In fact, as I visited South Africa just a few months ago, I was delighted to see some of the very examples of what the African Development Fund is engaged in, complementing those participants in ideas and programs of which they initiated, which they were the idea persons for, and which they were able to draw from the very basis of their soul and see the success that was brought about by these matching funds.

The AFDF account is funded at 25 million, half of what the President requested. Interestingly enough, the ESF account is as a full 57 million above fiscal year 1997 enacted levels, which is good, but yet this does not answer the question when we find that countries like sub-Saharan Africa or in sub-Saharan Africa, India, and Latin America receive the lowest United States foreign aid per capita of any recipients in the world. This is particularly striking because these regions have the lowest GNP per capita in the world and the lowest life expectancy on earth. Sub-Saharan Africans die younger than anyone else by a huge margin.

I believe that there have been great strides in AFDF, particularly, as has been noted by this committee, that the

new management of the African Development Bank and Fund have made great strides in restructuring the whole infrastructure of the organization so that they have drawn confidence in the way that they handle the dollars that they were given.

Additionally, I think it is important that the moneys, such as the ESF funds, that they will not impact Israel or Egypt. This shows a true combined effort in those seeking to help sub-Saharan Africa to provide a grass-roots initiative, to enhance those grass-roots organizations who can show themselves proud and be able to draw in others who would draw with them and work on infrastructure and education and health needs. This is the kind of money that the United States can be most proud of rendering.

I believe that this Congress would do well to support this increase because this is worth 1,000 times what it is in actual dollars. This is worth people realizing that I can do something. This is worth people understanding that I do not have to ask for fish because I can learn to fish.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I rise to support this funding amendment and would ask my colleagues to join enthusiastically to help sub-Saharan Africa stand on its own feet.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment I am sure is well-intended, but it ignores the history of the institution that they are trying to help. Just to refresh the Members' memories as to the history of the African Development Fund, just 2 years ago this Congress rescinded the $60 million included in the bill for the African Development Fund because it was unneeded. There was no objection whatsoever 2 years ago.

Now, under new management, we feel like the fund is back on its feet, that they indeed are moving in a progressive manner by which to help the very people that the proponents of this bill wish to help. So we as a committee did insert $25 million to reestablish our confirmation that they are moving in the correct direction. And now for an amendment to come to the floor increasing the $25 to $50 million plays havoc with the entire bill.

The gentlewoman from Texas mentioned that this does not impact Israel nor Egypt, but she is wrong because it does impact Israel and Egypt because if we deplete the funds which are very limited in the economic support fund, we are going to deny the administration the opportunity to assist Jordan. And if Jordan is not assisted, then Israel and Egypt both will suffer. So it indeed does impact the Middle East, and I take issue with her indication that it does not impact either Israel or Egypt.

The Senate, we understand, has nothing in the bill. The proponents of this fund came to me early on and requested our assistance, and out of deference to them, we did include the $25 million to reestablish the fund. But to come at this moment and to say, let us double what the committee, I think very prudently and wisely has given, in my opinion, does great harm to our bill.

So it does impact Israel. It does impact Egypt. It denies Jordan the full funding that the administration has requested because it subtracts from a very, very small residue that remains after we give the moneys to Israel and Egypt. So I would respectfully request that the committee consider what we did in the Appropriations Committee. I would like for the proponents of this amendment to recognize that we came a giant step forward in trying to be of assistance to them. I would like to also remind the proponents of this measure that we included another $50 million in the Child Survival Fund which will indeed help the needy people in the country of Africa.

I respectfully request that the Members vote against this amendment because it just disrupts many portions of our bill and at the same time sends an indication that we are going to give a fund who just 2 years ago was deemed unacceptable by this Congress, that indeed we are going to fully fund it at $50 million instead of the $25 million.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the chairman and, as I said, his hard work on this issue. I think it is important to at least understand my commitment and my thrust behind supporting this increase.

Frankly, this $25 million increase provides the appropriation that was requested by the President of the United States. Under the President's discretion, it is clear that Egypt and Israel and Jordan, I might add, would not have to be impacted and the advocacy groups for Israel have conceded and feel very comfortable that this would be the right direction to go. It is worth noting that this is a full $57 million above the fiscal year 1997 enacted level, but I think the argument is strongest by noting how poor sub-Saharan Africa is and how low its GNP is and how it is, in the world's economy, the poorest, almost the poorest area, along with India and other parts of Latin America.

This infusion of capital under a newly managed African Development Bank would clearly be the right direction that this Nation should take in its new policies, or at least its stated policies of making sure that foreign affairs dollars have a return; that is, foreign affairs dollars are appropriately invested so that we get the full return. Investing in sub-Saharan Africa by giving to these nongovernmental agencies, these agencies that deal with the poorest of the poor, helping in infrastructure, health care, helping in education, has to be an investment for the 21st century.

With all due respect to the chairman's opposition, I might say that Egypt and Israel and Jordan would be protected. These additional moneys would be appropriately invested and we would get a return on our foreign affairs dollars that we could be very proud of in helping sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Michigan for his kindness.

Please, let us focus for a moment on this question. AIPAC, the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee, has informed me they do not oppose this amendment. It took goodwill on all sides and that is the position. It is not correct to say that this amendment would jeopardize the U.S. interest or the interests of our friends in the Middle East.

I would like, with my friend's permission, to call on the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, if he would be kind enough to engage me in a colloquy right now, if the chairman of the subcommittee would be kind enough to engage me in a colloquy.

With all respect and recognizing that we differ on this amendment, it is imperative that I lay out that there is no opposition from the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee to this amendment.

May I kindly ask if the gentleman has any information to the contrary.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, no, and I would not expect that they would be involved in any appropriation we make to any other country for any other purpose. It is not the role of AIPAC to be that involved.

My point is that we have a very limited amount in the economic support fund over and above what we traditionally have given to Israel and Egypt. If we allow the appropriation to Egypt and to Israel, then indeed it jeopardizes the possibility of Jordan getting the $100 million they have requested and the administration supports.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, an additional question, if I am laboring, it is only at pains to make it clear that the gentleman is expressing his understanding and not that of anyone else, but his own understanding of the impact.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I wrote the bill, and we know how much money is in the economic support fund.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I have one additional question, if I may. If the amendment to be offered later regarding funds for Cambodia is adopted, it is my understanding that will

free up $37 million presently allocated to Cambodia in the ESF account.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Let me correct the gentleman there. There is nothing earmarked in this bill. We do not earmark money for Israel. We do not earmark money for Egypt or Cambodia or any place else. There is nothing earmarked in the bill. We give to the administration a designated amount of money for the economic support fund. If the administration wants to give this money to the African Development Fund, they have that prerogative.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, my last question, is it not the gentleman's understanding and that of his committee that the total amount would include money adequate to spend for Cambodia? I completely grant no earmark and, hence, if today we restrict the amount of money that is going to Cambodia, that amount of money which was anticipated in the gentleman's total amount for ESF would be available to go to the Africa Development Fund without jeopardizing any other recipients?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the administration were to desire to do that, since there are no earmarks, we do not earmark money for Cambodia, we do not earmark money for anybody.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I am most grateful to the gentleman. And to the gentleman from Michigan, deep thanks for allowing me the chance to rebut.

Let me conclude, the clarity is apparent that we are not jeopardizing any of the U.S. objectives in the Middle East, that the total amount of ESF funds is more than enough to fund this very small amount of $25 million, that it will be even more so if the amendment to restrict spending in Cambodia is adopted at $37 million.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the Campbell amendment to increase the United States contribution to the Africa Development Fund [ADF] from $25 to $50 million.

With the exception of the World Bank the ADF is the largest source of capital for 39 of Africa's poorest countries. The fund, supporting largely the agricultural, health care, education and economic reform sectors, reaches the poorest levels of society by supporting macro-economic development, thereby staving off natural and man-made disasters.

The ADF has undergone necessary and significant internal reforms to make the organizations more efficient. Staff has been reduced by 30 percent the net income has increased by $150 million, and procurement reforms have increased transparency and decreased abuses.

The ADF is a success story. Please support this vital organization by passing the Campbell Amendment. Thank you.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the sponsorship of this important amendment to H.R. 2159, the foreign operations appropriations bill before the House today.

This amendment would appropriate an additional $25 million to the African Development Fund. This amendment is budget neutral and will provide the much needed support to the development of stable democracies on the continent of Africa.

It is important as we grapple with how best to assist the former republics of the Soviet Union to also provide assistance for the sustained development of Africa.

The African Development Fund is the largest source of capital for the 39 poorest countries, outside of the World Bank. It is the largest co-financing partner for IDA in Africa, and in 1997, the fund will lend 4 times more assistance than USAID.

This amendment would reduce the Economic Support Fund by $25 million in order to provide the level of support that Africa needs in critical areas of agriculture, primary health care, basic education and economic reform.

The help offered by United States taxpayers—not to dictatorships, but to non-governmental organizations like CARE and multilateral financial institutions under sound management like the African Development Fund—will go farther in sub-Saharan Africa than anywhere else on Earth.

As a supporter of this amendment I am interested in helping the poorest people in the world.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1330

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mr. YATES:

At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION OF ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia if that government relocates the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, who participated during the Holocaust in the mass murder of Jews, Serbs, and Gypsies, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member of the House for whom I have higher regard and greater respect than the chairman of the subcommittee and for the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the ranking member. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our chairman, has conducted our hearings in an outstandingly fair and rational manner. It is not easy to disagree with him on any subject, and there are not many that I disagree with him upon and I am sure that he and I do not disagree upon the purpose of our amendment.

Croatia's role during the Holocaust was a most despicable one. The Ustashe, Croatia's soldiers, were Hitler's shock troops to exterminate the Jews, with whom they came in contact in Croatia. Literally hundreds of Jews were killed and their remains were buried in the cemetery at Jasenvoc in Croatia. Now the government has indicated that it will bury Ustashe killers with their victims in the cemetery at Jasenvoc.

Why is this such an important issue? Elie Weisel has put it very well, and I quote. ''Such an act,'' he says, ''will kill the victims twice. The first time was when they were murdered. The second time was when we murder their memory.'' That is exactly what the Government of Croatia would do in the event that it undertook to bury the Ustashe in the cemetery with its victims.

The victims and their killers in death would be used to eradicate the crimes that were committed during World War II. All that we have to receive from the Government of Croatia is the absolute assurance that the Ustashe will not be buried with their victims in this cemetery. As I indicated, we have asked for such assurances from President Tudjman and we have not received them. All that we have received is a statement as vague as we do not plan to bury them together at this time. That is today, Mr. Chairman. Tomorrow they may decide to do so.

The amendment that I offer will hold up payments to the Government of Croatia until such time as it gives our Government the assurances that the Ustashe will not be buried in that cemetery. I urge support for my amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes that the gentleman from Alabama was on his feet seeking recognition when the gentleman from Illinois embarked upon debate. The Chair did not interrupt the debate from the gentleman from Illinois.

Without objection the gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CALLAHAN. My point of order I think can be resolved, Mr. Chairman, and indeed the gentleman I think is going to ask for unanimous consent to amend his amendment. The original amendment that was introduced I think would create a point of order, but it is my understanding the gentleman from Illinois has an amendment that he is going to request unanimous consent to submit.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is correct. I concede the gentleman's point of order, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT NO. 51, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amended version of the amendment I offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 51, as modified, offered by Mr. YATES:

At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia to relocate the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Without objection, the modification is agreed to and the point of order reserved by the gentleman from Alabama is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken in connection with my previous amendment. The statement that I made on the previous amendment I now ask unanimous consent to be made available for this amendment.

I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for their cooperation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON PROCUREMENT OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 572. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for procurement outside the United States or less developed countries only if—

(1) such funds are used for the procurement of commodities or services, or defense articles or defense services, produced in the country in which the assistance is to be provided, except that this paragraph only applies if procurement in that country would cost less than procurement in the United States or less developed countries;

(2) the provision of such assistance requires commodities or services, or defense articles or defense services, of a type that are not produced in, and available for purchase from, the United States, less developed countries, or the country in which the assistance is to be provided; or

(3) the President determines on a case-by-case basis that procurement outside the United States or less developed countries would result in the more efficient use of United States foreign assistance resources.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this was placed in the legislation the last several years. The essence of this is just simple, common sense. I was under the impression that we had an agreement worked out with the appropriators on it. It basically says that we give money to these foreign countries basically to help them in the form of aid, and they do make purchases with this American money that our taxpayers work hard to send here to Washington. The amendment says that, ''Look, we give you that money. If you produce a product in your country and you need some farm equipment and you have farm equipment, go ahead and buy from your own people. But when you do not produce a product and you have to go outside your country to make a purchase and you're using American taxpayer dollars,'' this amendment says to purchase items made in America unless they would be so prohibitively costly it would negate the purpose of our foreign aid to this country in the first place.

The appropriators allowed the amendment the last time it was offered. I thought we had an agreement on it. I believe that it is absolute madness that we continue to write checks and give money away and then they take our money and buy products from other countries. It makes no sense. We talk about authorizing, but we have not had a reasonable authorization bill that spoke to any merit or substance at all, and this is a limitation on the use of American taxpayer dollars when these countries buy a product that they do not make themselves.

This is eminent common sense. This is reasonable appropriation policy, it is a reasonable appropriation measure, and I would ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the subcommittee, if this amendment has been approved several times.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. This amendment has been approved several times. In fact, the gentleman from Ohio and I have talked about this amendment. I am not sure that we talked about the language as it is written, but conceptually I think that I and the committee agree with the gentleman, that in every instance where we are providing aid to any foreign country and they are going to purchase some commodity, then they ought to give preference to U.S. firms. That is the purpose of it.

My reserving the point of order was simply to give me the opportunity to read the gentleman's language which, as he and I discussed, was one-sentence, buy American language. This one is a little bit more complex. I am willing to withdraw my point of order but must advise the gentleman that we may have to work on the language that has been drafted in conference, but at the same time to preserve the meaning of the gentleman's amendment. We do insist that these countries that receive American aid ought to be, without us making it into law, buying American goods, anyway. As a matter of fact, it is already in the bill; the sense of the Congress is already in the bill. It says it is the sense of the Congress that to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this act should be American made.

I have not had time to thoroughly analyze the page-long amendment that the gentleman has presented and thus the reason I had voiced some concern.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to the distinguished ranking member, let me say this. That sense of the Congress speaks to some basic intent, but it does not really do that which should be done after all these years of foreign aid. I have a number of other amendments that I feel very strong about, but I have talked with the gentleman about authorizing and appropriating and I am pulling back all of those. But I have one sincere effort here in the Congress, I really do, and that is this type of language. I would be willing to have the gentleman work on this language. This makes certain specifications that go a little bit beyond that sense of the Congress, but I would urge the gentleman, knowing his record, in lieu of that, to accept this language in general and to tailor where he may need it but leave it to the point where it is more than that sense of Congress.

I appreciate his having inserted that through my efforts over the years, but this I think takes us into some policy that appropriators should be taking on a reasonable limitation in the use of our taxpayers' dollars on these expenditures.

Mr. CALLAHAN. If the gentleman will further yield, the appropriate place for this language would be in some authorization bill, not in an appropriation bill and thus my argument. I or anyone on my committee that I am aware of has any objection to the destination he is trying to reach. We all agree with him. Thus, we insert in our bill language that was a sense of the Congress. But as I have said, we are going to have to take a look at the language.

I withdraw my point of order, but with the understanding that in conference we are going to have to work

with the Senate to get language that is more compatible with an appropriation bill rather than an authorization bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TRAFICANT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California, the distinguished ranking member.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I support the statement of our chairman about the clarification of the language in conference but support the spirit of the amendment that is put forth by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] and once again call to the attention of our colleagues the refinement of the amendment, that the bill may be used for procurement outside the United States or in less developed countries only if such funds are used for purchases in the country receiving assistance and such purchases would cost less than procurement in the United States or less developed countries, and if such purchases are not available in the United States or less developed countries, and this is the important point that I think we will work on in conference, if the President determines that such purchases would result in a more efficient use of U.S. foreign assistance resources. The waiver language as well I think is a smart approach to the gentleman's leadership on this issue.

Again, I associate myself with the comments of our chairman.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement. Just let me close by saying this. These authorization bills sometimes never get an opportunity to see the light of day. This limitation is very important. I really thank the chairman for withdrawing his point of order, and I plan to work with and lean on and grab ahold of the chairman and see what I can do because he has done a great job.

□ 1345

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if we would keep the spirit and the intent in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point of order against section 539 of the bill found on page 66, line 15, through page 67, line 22, on the grounds that it violates 5(b) of rule XXI of the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, clause 5(b) of rule XXI states that it shall not be in the order of the House to consider a measure carrying a tax or a trade provision not reported by the committee of jurisdiction.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the measure on the floor would preclude the President from waiving certain import sanctions against Serbia-Montenegro which are imposed pursuant to certain codified Executive orders. The provision imposes a new requirement on the President that an Executive order lifting these import sanctions cannot be issued until the President certifies to the Congress that certain democratic reforms have occurred in Kosova. This change of authority over import restrictions falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and clearly constitutes a tariff measure for purposes of rule XXI 5(b) of the rules of the House.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the point of order applies, and I urge the Chair to sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, section 539 of the pending bill would prohibit the termination of sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro until certain conditions are met. This provision was included in the fiscal year 1996 Appropriation Act as a result of an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] on July 11, 1995.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I oppose the amendment; however, it was made in order under a rule approved by the House on that very same day by a vote of 236 to 162, and for the RECORD I might remind the Members that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means voted for that rule.

I agree with the gentleman that this provision does not belong in this bill. I would say the same thing about a number of other provisions. However, lack of an authorization act for many years has resulted in this bill being used for purposes other than the appropriation of funds. Since the House has specifically approved this provision in the past, I believe that it was my duty to include it in this appropriation bill.

The Committee on Ways and Means does not agree and believes this is a violation of the House rule, and the Parliamentarian agrees, and I will, of course, defer to them on this matter, and I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If no other Member wishes to be heard on the point of order, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] makes a point of order against section 539 of the bill on the grounds that it carries a tariff measure in a bill reported by committee, Committee on Appropriations, not having jurisdiction to report tariff matters in violation of clause 5(b) of rule XXI.

Under clause 5(b) of rule XXI, this point of order may be raised at any time during consideration of the bill for amendment in the Committee of the Whole even after section 539 has been passed in the reading for amendment.

In this respect, the standard of timeliness, this point of order is unlike those arising under clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI.

Current law authorized the President to waive application of certain sanctions to Serbia-Montenegro. Among these sanctions are import prohibitions which affect tariff collections. Section 539 of the bill constrains the authority of the President on these matters. It, thereby, carries a tariff measure within the meaning of clause 5(b) of rule XXI, and the point of order is sustained, and section 539 is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 32 offered by Mr. PAUL:

After the last section (preceding the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR ABORTION, FAMILY PLANNING, OR POPULATION CONTROL EFFORTS

SEC. 572. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for—

(1) population control or population planning programs;

(2) family planning activities; or

(3) abortion procedures.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is very clear. If the amendment passes, no funds in this bill could be used for population control, family planning, or abortion procedures. That will take in about $385 million that we could save by passing this amendment.

The most important part of this amendment would be that we would absolutely assure that none of the funding would ever be used for abortion. One of the ways that the funds get to abortion, to the use of abortion, is that the funds are granted for birth control, and then the funds elsewhere can be saved, and those other funds can be used for abortion. In other words, it can be the funds are fungible.

It is claimed that people have a need for birth control, and this may be true, but we have not been well received around the world. I am not quite sure exactly when the U.S. Government and the American taxpayer got involved in the birth control business overseas, but we have been doing it now probably for several decades. But there is a lot of resentment toward America imposing our will on other people.

For instance, we have sent over the use of Norplant, a very controversial medical procedure. I am a gynecologist, and I can attest to it. It is very controversial, yet it was used on hundreds of thousands of women overseas. When that procedure was finally brought to the United States, it was rejected by the American people.

I, as a gynecologist, spent more time taking these Norplants out than putting them in because of the severe complications with them, but nevertheless we, as taxpayers, have continuously sent more funding overseas to support these procedures.

But there is no moral justification for us in the U.S. Congress to go and

tax poor people in America, to go over and impose our ideas and our beliefs on other people's culture, and we have been doing this now for several decades, and a lot of resentment has been building up. There is no constitutional authority for programs like this. There is nowhere in the Constitution where we can find any justification for us imposing our will on other people in this manner.

But worst of all, if funds are used for birth control and other funds are saved and then they are used on abortion, it is in a way indirectly supporting abortion.

Later on we will vote on another amendment to curtail the use of funds for abortion, and I will support the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in this regard because we hope that that would at least help, but one way where we can assure and not worry about it would be to pass this amendment and not send any money over in the first place because it is not authorized, it is not permissible, it is not moral, and there is a lot of resentment toward us for these very, very reasons.

The issue that always comes up is that the people need help, but there are a lot of voluntary associations in this country that are willing to help. If we feel compelled to help poor nations in their birth control effort, it can be done through voluntary means, not through coercion, not taking by force money from people who have philosophic and religious and social beliefs against these programs that we are imposing on others.

So this is a program that should be just abolished. It should be stopped. We should not send any funds over there. This argument that we can control the way funds are being spent once they are overseas, we are kidding ourselves when we use that argument. We really lose control of these funds once they get into the hands of other governments or agencies that are dealing with these problems overseas.

Typically, programs that are run by governments and international governments do not work very well, and these programs have done very poorly. At the same time, there are poor countries around the world that have car loads, millions, of condoms sitting around that are not used. They cannot get surgical gloves to do surgical procedures. There are countries reported in Africa where they do not have penicillin, and yet they have all the birth control pills that they want.

So I argue that this program is unnecessary, unconstitutional, it is an abuse of the rights and beliefs of so many Americans, and it is not well received overseas. The best thing we can do is just take the money away from these programs, take the $385 million and return it to the American taxpayers. This would be a far better way to use this money other than aggravating, antagonizing people in other countries.

What would we think if some foreign government came over and decided that our inner cities were overpopulated and they wanted to impose some population controls and some birth control methods on the inner cities? I am sure there would be a strong objection to that.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the amendment, as proposed, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL]. If enacted, the Paul amendment would cause death and suffering for millions of women and children whose lives and well-being depend on the availability of family planning and health service supported under USAID's population assistance program. Over 580,000 women die annually, 1 woman every minute, of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth. Family planning can prevent 25 percent of all maternal and infant deaths by avoiding unintended pregnancies and spacing births.

The Paul amendment would close the most effective avenue to prevent abortions. Certainly we all consider abortion a failure, and if we want to reduce the number of abortions, we should support family planning.

The World Health Organization estimates that 40 percent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion. That is a tragedy. Family planning enables couples to prevent unintended pregnancies. Large declines in numbers of abortions have occurred due to the expansion of family planning services in many countries across the globe, including South Korea, Chile, Hungary, Russia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, Colombia, and Mexico. This amendment would end a 30-year program that is recognized as one of the most successful components of U.S. foreign assistance.

And this is not about the United States going to another country and forcing anything on anyone. This is a voluntary program that the countries asked for. And again, to reference the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL], we are not later going to be voting on any amendment that will curtail funds for abortion. The discussion in this bill is about curtailing funding for family planning.

More than 50 million couples in the developing world use family planning as a direct result of this program, and the average number of children per family has declined more than one-third since the 1960's. Three out of four Americans surveyed in 1995 wanted to increase or maintain spending on family planning for poor countries.

I urge our colleagues to reject overwhelmingly the ill-advised Paul amendment and to support international family planning.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while I have every respect for the philosophy of the gentleman from Texas, and I share his views on abortion, I do not think that is what this debate or this amendment addresses. Indeed, I feel like I have made a giant and major impact on the elimination of AID funds for abortion anywhere in the world. As a matter of fact, my bill says that none of the funds of this bill may be used for an abortion, period.

So this is not an abortion issue; this is a family planning issue, because some feel like that if they go into a country and through educational processes they will eliminate the need for abortions, and they well may be right.

So do not imply to anyone in this body or anyone in this audience watching today that the bill that I wrote permits abortion in any fashion because it absolutely restricts it. Abortions for family planning purposes cannot be performed with any of the money anywhere in this bill, period, flat no.

Now when I took this committee over as chairman several years ago, Mr. Chairman, if I had come to you and said to you and the proponents of the right to life, said, I am going to cut funding for family planning by up to half, then I would have been heralded as a hero.

□ 1400

Now I have done that, only to be addressed on the floor as a proponent of abortion, which I am not.

So I would submit to this Congress and to the gentleman from Texas, while I agree with his views with respect to the right to life, he is absolutely wrong in his allegation that any of this money for family planning purposes can be used for abortion. It does not, it cannot, it will not, and never will as long as I am chairman of this committee.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would oppose the gentleman's amendment, indicating to the Members that the restriction is already there and that we have cut family planning significantly over the period of time that I have used. If you use 1995 figures, we have cut $518 million from family planning activities.

So I think we have done an outstanding job, and I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to imply that the gentleman has permitted or endorsed or encouraged or the bill says directly there are funds here for abortion. I will concede that.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would answer my question, is there anything in this bill that leads the gentleman to believe that any of this money can be used for abortion anywhere in the world?

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I am addressing the fungibility argument.

Mr. CALLAHAN. The fungibility and the tangibility of what is in this bill, you cannot use any of this money for abortions anywhere in the world. If the

gentleman would concede to that point, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, that is true directly, but indirectly the fungibility argument is very important. If you use funds for other things, you say the governments and agencies can use them for abortion. So you do it indirectly.

Yes, it might be a little harder to comprehend the fungibility argument, but it is there. If we support a country or a government or an agency that does permit and endorse abortion and they can use these funds for birth control pills, they can use their other funds to do the abortion.

So, yes, the gentleman is correct that directly there are no funds in this bill that will provide for abortion. But indirectly it opens up some funds and makes them available for abortion.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, will the gentleman admit that we have done a very favorable job in moving in the same direction the gentleman would like us to move? Would the gentleman not admit that since when I took over this committee we have saved $518 million? And now we have reduced it, we have reduced it to a level of $385 million. I think we have made significant inroads and yet preserved the ability of agencies to go into a country with limited educational opportunities to give them advice.

Maybe it can be through a church, maybe it can be through abstinence programs, but I do think education in that manner actually denies the probability of abortions even being presented. But if they were presented, none of this money could ever be used under any circumstance for an abortion anywhere in the world for family planning purposes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, the efficiency of the programs are to be questioned. If you look at the Norplant program, they put this Norplant in hundreds of thousands of women. It is not a good medication. I have personal experience from it. Then they use that as an example of the reason to promote it in the United States.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TORRES. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I once again reiterate my opposition to the Paul amendment and support the statement of our chairman, Mr. CALLAHAN.

As this Congress should know by now, because it has been reiterated on this floor, no money in this bill can be used for abortion. That is the Helms language. That is the law of the land. Let us be clear.

So we want to take it to a fungibility place. I hope that Mr. PAUL will support the Gilman-Pelosi-Campbell Lowey-DeLauro-Slaughter-Greenwood proposal on the floor tomorrow, which addresses the fungibility issue very directly.

First of all, I do not think it needs to be addressed. But for those who need that comfort and clarification, I am pleased to be a supporter of that amendment. In that amendment it says that none of the funds would go to organizations that do not promote abortion as a method of family planning and that utilize these funds to prevent abortion as a method of family planning. It puts these conditions on receiving the funds; also, it says, except in the case of organizations that do not promote abortion as a method of family planning.

So there is nothing about fungibility here. This is about organizations that promote family planning and discourage the use of abortion for family planning. So fungibility is not a principle that applies here.

But if we are going to use the principles of fungibility, we are opening a door for many issues across the board in this bill and every other bill that comes along. I do not know that this Congress wants to go down that path.

But I am pleased to say that the amendment that will be offered tomorrow as an amendment to the Smith amendment will clarify, once and for all, this is not about fungibility. It is about family planning, and none of the money goes to any organization, unless they are promoting family planning and discouraging abortion as a tool for that.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would also go on record opposing the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. I want to reiterate, as the gentlewoman from California has said, that I will support her amendment tomorrow.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL].

There are so many reasons to support this amendment, an amendment whose time has come. This amendment will eliminate funding for all population control activities overseas. We have spent hour upon hour in this Chamber debating the many issues surrounding foreign aid, which includes the funding for international family planning.

There are many problems with the U.S. taxpayer spending nearly $400 million every year for international population control activities. One very obvious and practical problem that cannot be ignored is that the taxpayer simply cannot afford this type of program any longer.

I wish I could count the number of times I have come to the floor to speak out in one way or another against excessive Federal spending and Government intervention. Every time I implore Members of this body to consider how we are sabotaging our children's futures, how we slowly but surely chip away at any prospects for a solid financial foundation every time we vote to spend more and more tax dollars on inappropriate and unconstitutional programs without any regard to the reality of our Federal Government's financial situation.

But there is an even bigger problem than one simply associated with dollars. This problem is more fundamental to the appropriate role of the Federal Government as defined by the Constitution.

Some might say that many provisions of this appropriations bill fall outside of the guidelines given to us by the Constitution. Some might say that a debate of that nature goes beyond the scope of this amendment.

I think we should talk about the Constitution more. I think that every time we consider a bill, an amendment, a motion to instruct conferees, every time we take any legislative action, we should remember our oath to uphold the Constitution. This means that sometimes, even when things sound like a great idea or the perfect solution to a problem facing our constituents back home, or faceless and nameless individuals suffering thousands of miles away, we have to show some restraint, if only because we are not empowered to act outside the legislative walls erected for us by our Founding Fathers.

Furthermore, I believe that international population control funding is not even a good idea. What concerns me greatly is that it appears that many of my colleagues have simply accepted the assertions of the population control lobby when they constantly and unfailingly contend that overpopulation is the cause of nearly all of the world's human suffering.

For decades, we have heard doomsday predictions that the Earth's population is growing so much, to the point that we will soon be unable to sustain this rate of growth. Make no mistake about it and do not be misled. This is not an overcrowded planet. Too many people are not the problem.

I would assert, however, that those more interested in redistributing wealth and power have everything to lose if the myth of an unsustainable population explosion is debunked. I would further contend that sound public, policy based on real science, not misguided public and political maneuvers and schemes based on radical environmentalism, is the answer to the world's hunger and environmental problems. Flooding Third World developing and developed countries with potentially harmful contraceptives and family planning information, while appearing to meet a very humanitarian need, is such a misguided policy.

There have been numerous reports about the atrocities many women have suffered, all under the auspices of family planning. We have seen women in the slums of Bangladesh and Haiti who

are part of experimentation with Norplant. We have heard accounts of women in Turkey who were told by volunteers that ''family planning'' is more important than husbands, tradition, culture or God, and that sterilization is better than children.

Surely even those who advocate dollars for responsible population control policy would be alarmed at this information. Surely we should not force our constituents to contribute to these programs that undermine the cultures of our neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply conclude by expressing once again that we need to reevaluate our priorities, our financial situation, and most importantly, our constitutional obligations, and support this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which will eliminate USAID funding for international family planning.

The need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile. Last February, both the House and the Senate showed their commitment to the USAID International Family Planning Program by voting for the early release of the funds for this program.

Eliminating family planning will deeply hurt millions of women and children.

Nearly 600,000 women die each year of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth; 99 percent of these women live in developing countries. In many countries, women are the primary caregivers of children and a mother's survival is crucial to the survival and well-being of her children. Our international family planning programs are working to reduce maternal deaths and illness due to childbirth.

The ability to control the timing and spacing of childbearing helps mothers, infants, and children thrive. Infants born less than 2 years after a sibling are more likely to have low birth weight, making them more vulnerable to illness and death. One in five infant deaths alone could be averted by the better spacing of births.

In addition, the health of the mother is also put at risk when couples cannot control the number and timing of births. For example, very young women and women who have births very close together are at greater risk for postpartum hemorrhage, a leading cause of maternal death. And for every woman who dies during childbirth, many more face injuries and infections, leaving them permanently disabled or infertile.

This amendment will prevent us from eliminating these tragedies. Simply put—this amendment will end our family planning programs. Period.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. We cannot let them eliminate international family planning—there is too much at stake. I urge you to continue this vital investment in the reproductive health and safety of women and children.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. FOX OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41 offered by Mr. Fox of Pennsylvania:

Page 94, after line 3, insert the following:

Sec. 572. None of the funds made available under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' may be used to directly support or promote trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, elephant hides, or rhinoceros horns.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Fox-Miller amendment, which would restrict funding of the CAMPFIRE program used to directly support or promote trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, elephant hides, or rhinoceros horns.

Mr. Chairman, for the past 8 years, the Communal Areas Management Programs for Indigenous Resources, otherwise known as CAMPFIRE, has implemented many valuable programs which have helped improve the quality of life for the people of Zimbabwe. Our amendment would do nothing to interfere with these beneficial programs.

Unfortunately, too much of the funding, however, from the U.S. Agency for International Development is used to promote the killing of the African elephant, which remains on the endangered species list.

The organizations to my left, over 200, have supported our amendment, as well as over 20 newspapers from around the country.

The CAMPFIRE program, instead of becoming more sustainable, has become increasingly dependent on foreign subsidies from USAID other international sources. In 1989, USAID spent an average of $1.3 million per year over 6 years on CAMPFIRE, whereas in 1995, USAID pledged to spend an average of $5.12 million per year over 4 years on the program.

Additionally, CAMPFIRE relied on funds from countries such as Japan, the Netherlands, Germany, Norway, Great Britain, the European Commission, Sweden, and Canada, which in 1995 totaled in excess of $1.4 million and which has no ban on its use for the promotion of trophy hunts.

We are very concerned that U.S. taxpayer dollars have been used by CAMPFIRE implementing agencies to lobby the U.S. Congress in an ongoing effort to advocate the ivory trade and the weakening of the foreign species provision of the Endangered Species Act.

We believe it is inappropriate for the U.S. Government to supply funds to foreign entities which then use those funds to launch special-interest lobbying efforts to Members of Congress.

□ 1415

American taxpayers have footed the bill for these agencies to open and maintain offices in Washington, London, Brussels, and Johannesburg in support of these lobbying efforts.

American tax dollars were used to help CAMPFIRE agencies overturn the ivory trade ban, which undermined the U.S. negotiating position at the June 1997 Convention of International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

Since 1989, the United States has officially opposed the resumption of international trade in any elephant parts, including ivory. At the same CITES convention, the elephant was downlisted from appendix I to appendix II.

The American position has been so resolute because the devastation of the elephant during the 1980's was so severe. There were 70,000 to 100,000 elephants slaughtered a year by poachers feeding the international demand for ivory. The continent-wide population dropped from 1.3 million to 60,000 in just a decade's time.

Elephants are still in peril throughout much of their range, and the resumption of the ivory trade is a grave threat. The Fox-Miller amendment is pro-CAMPFIRE, maintaining existing funding levels and allowing USAID to invest in a wider range of revenue-generating activities that have thus far received insufficient attention. USAID has provided funds for CAMPFIRE implementing organizations for more than 9 years. More than $25 million American tax dollars have been used to a very significant degree to promote trophy hunting and the international trade in ivory.

Our amendment places a restriction on the use of taxpayer funds for the 10th and final year of funding. It is past time that a greater share of USAID funds be used to promote other revenue-generating activities such as ecologically-sensitive wildlife tourism.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for offering this amendment. I think this is an important amendment. I rise in strong support of this legislation to prohibit the use of taxpayer funds to promote or support the African elephant ivory trade or trophy hunting.

Contrary to what Members may have heard, this amendment does not prohibit and will not prohibit trophy hunting within the Communal Areas Management Programs for Indigenous Resources, known as the CAMPFIRE Program. Nor is the Fox-Miller amendment in any way inconsistent with the recent decision of the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora to permit the limited resumption of the ivory trade.

The issue here is whether or not United States tax dollars should be used by organizations and agencies implementing the CAMPFIRE program in

Zimbabwe to Promote activities that are clearly opposed by the vast majority of people who pay taxes, our constituents.

A poll completed earlier this year found that 88 percent of Americans opposed the resumption of the ivory trade. That was also the position of this administration. That is nearly 9 out of 10 Americans who oppose the activities that are funded in the bill as it currently exists. That is why we need this amendment.

This amendment is not aimed at CAMPFIRE, whose programs I have visited in Zimbabwe and whose mission of rural economic development is highly admirable. To this point, much of the revenue that CAMPFIRE has generated for local economic development has come from trophy hunting. Very wealthy hunters pay $12,000 or more for a permit to shoot elephants and other exotic animals, and much of that money is repatriated to these villages for economic development.

CAMPFIRE officials told me over and over again that they are committed to moving away from trophy hunting as a major source of revenue for the Program. These officials recognize that while trophy hunting may provide large amounts of quick money in the start-up phase of CAMPFIRE, that we are now beyond that stage and a more diverse program of economic development is needed.

Moreover, there is no need to use U.S. taxpayer money to promote trophy hunting. That is already done through international hunting groups, magazines, and others. There has been no difficulty in attracting a sufficient number of hunters to satisfy the annual quota of elephants. We certainly do not need to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to convince hunters to do that which they are already prepared to journey halfway around the world and pay $12,000 plus all of their expenses to do; that is, to hunt elephants.

Some might suggest withholding all U.S. aid from the CAMPFIRE program. I think that would be unwise. I think it would be an unfortunate action and would deprive the program of critical funds to assist rural development in Africa.

Instead, what we should do is we should assist the development of a more diversified economic program promised by CAMPFIRE involving nonhunting activities such as camping, photo safaris, local craft sales, lodges, and much, much more. We should target our U.S. tax dollars to these meritorious and noncontroversial efforts, rather than to continue to squander our constituents' tax dollars on promoting big game hunting by very wealthy individuals. That is the goal of this amendment, to diversify and to stabilize the CAMPFIRE Program.

Our amendment would also end the unacceptable practice of using United States tax dollars to fund organizations like the British-based Africa Resources Trust, that lobbies CITES to overturn the ban on the international ivory trade, that lobbies Congress to weaken the Endangered Species Act. We should not be sending taxpayer dollars to these organizations to lobby against positions of the U.S. Government and to lobby within this Congress for those tax dollars.

Do not let anyone tell you that this amendment would injure CAMPFIRE or the struggling villages and populations for whom the program holds so much promise. This amendment puts our tax dollars exactly where CAMPFIRE is headed, in economic diversification, not a program heavily dependent upon shooting elephants to generate revenues.

Do not let anyone tell you that the Fox-Miller amendment will interfere with the recovery of the African elephant promoted by CAMPFIRE; 8 out of 10 elephants in Zimbabwe do not live in the CAMPFIRE areas. It is not trophy hunting and culling that has allowed for the growth in the African elephant herds; it is the international ban on hides and ivory, which has been weakened due to the vigorous lobbying of CAMPFIRE and groups it supports with United States taxpayer money.

CAMPFIRE, the local villages, the Zimbabwean Government can all continue their hunting and culling operations as necessary for trophy hunting, species protection, and human safety. CITES can go forward with the limited sale of ivory from existing stockpiles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, these limited sales from existing stockpiles can go forward, but not with the dollars that nearly 90 percent of the Americans do not want expended for that purpose.

For 8 years U.S. taxpayers have supported CAMPFIRE, and I would hope that that support would continue. This is a program of merit. But let us not let it jeopardize our participation in the CAMPFIRE Program itself by continuing to fund with American taxpayer dollars those hunting actions that are not acceptable to those very same taxpayers, and that, if continued, will eventually sour the support for the entire CAMPFIRE rogram.

I want to say to my colleagues that I had an opportunity to visit these programs, and a number of other Members of Congress have visited these programs. It is a very, very exciting program and a program of merit to bring about economic development in incredibly, unbelievably poor rural communities.

This money is being used to develop wells for drinking water, to develop granaries to grind corn into food, and to provide for electrification in some cases of these villages; the bare, bare necessities of any kind of semblance of adequate livelihood.

This program is of merit. But what is not of merit is continuing to use the very few dollars we have to lobby, to come back and to pay for trips to Washington, DC and to Europe, and to set up offices throughout Europe to lobby on behalf of GATT and WTO and weaken the Endangered Species Act; and what is not acceptable is to continue to funnel those monies into activities that the very participants in trophy hunting are fully capable of paying for themselves. These are, for the most part, very wealthy individuals who pay huge amounts of money to go out and to get a trophy elephant or some other animal.

We ought not to be using these moneys. We ought to be using these moneys for economic diversification of the CAMPFIRE Program, so it will have a lasting effect. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the Fox-Miller amendment to H.R. 2159. This amendment, which prohibits the use of American tax dollars for the purpose of supporting and promoting the international trade in ivory or rhino horn, is a sensible restriction on activities that many Americans find offensive.

This amendment is modest. It will not stop Zimbabwe or other nations from authorizing or conducting trophy hunting, which is their sovereign right in accordance with international treaties. Our Government has very sensibly opposed the international trade in elephant ivory and hides for many years. This amendment will ensure that taxpayer funds will not be used to undermine that position.

Mr. Chairman, the wildlife of Africa is one of the greatest treasures of our planet. Accordingly, I urge our Members who care about preserving these resources to support the Fox-Miller amendment. More than 80 percent of our constituents throughout the country oppose the hunting of elephants, according to a recent survey. This amendment prevents their hard-earned tax dollars from supporting this practice.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Agency for International Development has been sponsoring a program in Zimbabwe known as the CAMPFIRE Program. This project, implemented in cooperation with the government and local authorities, is designed to help rural farmers and others develop a self-sustaining economy based partly on tourism.

The project helps curb the illegal poaching of African elephants by providing the people of the area with an incentive to conserve these elephants. Part of the incentive is to allow limited legal hunting, although U.S. funds are not used, and let me repeat, U.S. funds are not used for this purpose.

Funds generated from the hunting are used to support economic development.

Concerns have been expressed that the project has promoted efforts to allow international trade in elephant ivory. Although that does not seem to be true, the committee bill includes bill language prohibiting, and I reiterate, prohibiting the use of any funds in contravention of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species.

Concerns have also been raised about possible illegal lobbying activities. The AID general counsel has found no evidence that U.S. funds were used for lobbying activities, and our committee report reiterates the obvious: the use of taxpayer funds for lobbying is prohibited.

We worked with those on the committee, especially the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who had concerns about this program, and I believe we addressed these concerns. I looked to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] on this issue due to his vast knowledge of foreign aid issues and due to his position as ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations. We negotiated with him in good faith to produce both a good bill and report language that represented a responsible approach to this issue.

The author of the amendment does not seem to want the U.S. Government to be involved in any way, directly or indirectly, with a program that involves wildlife management. However, the people of Zimbabwe have no choice but to deal with the facts of their existence. Failure to implement a responsible wildlife management program in that country will inevitably lead to an irresponsible program, since the people of Zimbabwe will be forced to deal with the increase in the elephant population.

The end result will be an increase in poaching and further conflicts between subsistence farmers and the elephants. This will lead to more elephant deaths, the exact opposite of what the sponsor of the amendment is seeking.

I reiterate, the bill prohibits any funds from being used to circumvent the prohibition on the illegal trade in elephant ivory. It is a responsible approach. I might add, and we bring this out in the report language on page 11, since this program has been started the elephant population has increased from 43,000 to 67,000 in just a few short years.

□ 1430

I urge the House to support the committee position and to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Fox amendment. Mr. Chairman, I must say at the outset that I have been in this House for over 12 years, and I cannot think of a more important conservation measure than that which is referred to as the CAMPFIRE Program. And I cannot remember a time when a program has been more grossly and greatly misrepresented than this one has in the last few minutes. Let me explain where this program came from, why it is important, and why it ought to be retained as is.

First, let me say that the point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] that it is funded through the use of funds that the gentleman objects to, in an earlier news release this month, the gentleman indicated that 90 percent of the funding for this program came from the sources that he objects to. Therefore, the gentleman's argument falls of its own weight, because if we are going to remove 90 percent of the funding, there will be no CAMPFIRE Program. It is pretty simple.

Therefore, if we are going to have a CAMPFIRE Program, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania purports to support and at the same time purports to withdraw 90 percent of the funding, it seems like a fairly ridiculous proposal.

Mr. Chairman, in the early 1980's this program was born. It was born because of concern which came to fruition in 1988 with the passage of the African Elephant Conservation Act of that year, and that came about because the population of elephants in the African countries was dropping substantially.

In 1979, for example, there were about 1.3 million elephants in Africa. By 1988, there were less than 750,000. In 1973, there were 130,000 elephants in Kenya, and by 1987, there were only 20,000.

In 1977, in the Selous Game Reserve in the United Republic of Tanzania, there were 109,000 elephants. By 1988, there remained only 55,000.

So the subcommittee which I served on in the old Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Subcommittee on Fish and Wildlife, studied this situation and recommends some changes in law which we thought would be beneficial. And, in fact, the African Elephant Conservation Act of 1988 was passed in that year and it provided broad authority for our country to unilaterally take action to save elephants. We did that under the Bush administration and the same policies have been followed by the Clinton administration.

Also, the Convention on International Trade and Endangered Species, known as CITES, has enacted international regulations which essentially do three things: First, Outlaw the international trade of ivory; second, permit the continuation of trophy hunting as a fund-raiser; and third, the moneys resulting from conservation efforts such as tourism and hunting would be used for conservation by African countries.

Huge successes have come from this program which the gentleman from Pennsylvania would defund. We have seen the African elephant population increase from 4 to 6 percent a year; a huge springback in the years since 1989 when this law became effective.

We have also seen a number of very important conservation groups endorse this program and, in fact, four have written to me, in some cases as late as today, supporting my position. Those organizations include the African Wildlife Foundation, the International Union for Conservation of Nature, the National Wildlife Federation, and the World Wildlife Fund; all support my position and oppose the Fox amendment.

Mr. Chairman, they do so for a number of reasons. For example, 7 million people in southern Africa have directly benefited from programs like CAMPFIRE. In Zimbabwe alone, 5,000 to 10,000 jobs have been created and 33 percent of the land in that country is devoted now to conservation and wildlife management, which benefits African elephants. Mr. Chairman, I am beside myself trying to figure out how the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my friend, wants to defund this program.

The population of African elephants has also increased from 4 to 6 percent, as I said earlier. In Zimbabwe alone, increasing from 45,000 elephants to 66,000 elephants over this same period of time, the program the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to defund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SAXTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, in addition, the number of households participating in CAMPFIRE has grown from 9,000 in 1989 to 105,000 in 1996.

Our Nation's support for the CAMPFIRE Program is without question, and it is a misrepresentation to say that CAMPFIRE moneys were used in opposition to the U.S. position on sport hunting, because our law provides for the recognition of sport hunting and our negotiation position has provided for the recognition of sports hunting.

Our Nation's support for the CAMPFIRE Program allows thousands of people to improve their livelihoods and has created a situation for the comeback of the African elephants. This is not a program that we should be trifling with.

Congress, this Congress, is criticized over and over again for doing things that do not work, and yet this amendment brought to the floor today would defund one of the most successful programs that we have had in the area of conservation.

It is not a coincidence that elephant populations have increased under CAMPFIRE, and it would be a terrible mistake to end the Agency for International Development's essential involvement and investment in this program.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the Committee for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, let us make it real clear here. I understand how there may be two sides to the issue, but I want to be very clear. Whether my colleagues embrace the position of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], my friend, that the program is fine and we should allow lobbying money to promote hunting and illegal trade in ivory, the fact is that no one wants to defund this program. To say otherwise is an absolute misrepresentation of my position and those who are advocates for elephants and endangered species across the globe.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that we are all for maintaining the funding of CAMPFIRE. To say otherwise is an absolute misrepresentation and not correct. The fact is we want to make sure the funds get to the people of Zimbabwe, in fact get to the CAMPFIRE Program, and are not used for the purpose of promoting illegal trade of ivory or illegal hunting.

The fact is that funds are being used to lobby and that is what we object to, the lobbying portion, and not to anything else. Because Zimbabwe decides for itself whether there is hunting and whether there is trade.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I rise in support of the Fox amendment. We should not force the American taxpayer to directly pay for promoting the international ivory trade or elephant trophy hunting. I believe that the Fox-Miller amendment is a very smart approach to this very complicated challenge before the House today.

The Fox amendment bars the use of American tax dollars for the purpose of supporting or promoting the international commercial trade in ivory or rhino horn. The Fox amendment does not stop Zimbabwe, or any other nation, from authorizing or conducting trophy hunting.

The Fox-Miller amendment is pro CAMPFIRE maintaining existing funding levels, allowing USAID to invest in a wide-range of revenue-generating activities that have received insufficient activities in the past. When one U.S. agency, USAID, undermines the work of another U.S. agency, the Department of Interior, taxpayer dollars are wasted and U.S. policy positions are undermined.

The Interior Department has maintained a firm stand against renewing the international trade in elephant ivory and hide since 1989. Again, the Fox amendment bars the use of American tax dollars for the purpose of supporting or promoting trophy hunting. It does not take the funding away from CAMPFIRE, but directs it away from lobbying efforts and into conservation efforts.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her statement and for her support of this amendment and for her clarification.

The suggestion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] that somehow this is an effort to defund CAMPFIRE is just outrageous in the sense that the gentleman understands, if he reads the amendment, it is a very simple amendment and that is not what it does.

What this amendment suggests is we should not be using taxpayer dollars to fund an activity that over 88 percent of the taxpayers in this country find abhorrent and do not agree with. They would agree with the CAMPFIRE Program, but what they do not agree with is using their dollars to support trophy hunting of big game. That program, that component, that part of CAMPFIRE can stand on its own, because it has centuries of tradition, if you will, and a constituency of people who seek to do it. More people apply to do it than are allowed to do it each and every year.

Mr. Chairman, what we ought to now be taking is this risk capital in USAID and putting it into diversification of these rural economies so that more and more people in these economies can participate and these economies hopefully can prosper and increase the standard of living within those rural economies in Zimbabwe and other countries.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey cannot come here and suggest that somehow this is about defunding CAMPFIRE. That amendment will eventually come if we keep funding trophy hunting, because the American people do not want anything to do with trophy hunting with American taxpayer dollars. Or if CAMPFIRE continues to lobby, then we will have an amendment that will wipe out the whole program.

What we are trying here to do is to preserve the best of this program and the use of taxpayer dollars and let that very strong part, that is a very strong constituency, trophy hunting, stand on its own and then get on with the diversification of the program.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I once again commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the chairman of our committee, who was very sensitive to the concerns of many of us on the committee. The bill language is an attempt to correct this situation. I think that the Fox-Miller amendment goes the committee one better, and I support the perfecting amendment that my colleagues have put forth.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very wise and smart and addresses the problem appropriately to stop the U.S. taxpayer from funding trophy hunting, from subsidizing lobbying efforts to support trophy hunting, but still maintains the funding for CAMPFIRE. I urge my colleagues to support the Fox-Miller amendment. It is pro-CAMPFIRE and pro-environment.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and there are a number of reasons why. I think importantly, if we look at the issue of taxpayer funding and the whole issue of foreign aid, we are in a period of time where we are declining the amount of money that we are going to spend, and I support that. I think that we should spend less money on foreign aid than we currently are.

But then we have to look at, if we are going to spend money, what are we going to spend it on? I would argue that we should spend it on programs that have proven to be successful. This program happens to be one of the few that has proven to be extremely successful.

Mr. Chairman, I recently had the opportunity to visit Africa and to visit one of these CAMPFIRE sites. I was amazed at how little I actually knew about how this CAMPFIRE Program worked, until I was there on the ground and had the opportunity to see it. We get this romantic vision of what it is like from TV, and we think the big game hunter is going out there and hunting elephants and all this stuff.

It is not like that. There are people living in huts who have to erect big fences around their houses to keep the elephants out. They are terrified that these elephants are going to kill them. Some wonder why then we have declining numbers of elephants in Africa. It is because the people did not care about them. They were killing their children, they were destroying their farmland, there was no economic incentive, there was no social incentive for them to maintain a high number of elephants.

So then we had to come up with a program that actually would give them that financial incentive and social incentive to protect those elephants, and this program was devised where a limited number of elephants would be hunted and it would bring money into these communities. Then all of a sudden we saw the numbers, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] said earlier, we saw the numbers go from 44,000 to 67,000 in Zimbabwe alone.

□ 1445

And why? Because there was an economic incentive. There was a social incentive for them to protect these elephants. Now, all of a sudden, instead of looking the other way when a poacher came in and shot an elephant, they went after the poacher. They wanted to

keep them out because these elephants were important to them.

I had the opportunity to visit a school while I was over there. It was a little three-room school, but those people were so proud of that school. How did they pay for it? They do not have any money. The average income is $400 a year. How did they pay for the school? They paid for it with moneys that came from this CAMPFIRE Program. They paid for it with the help that we were able to give them. We saw wells that were put in, and for the first time these people had fresh drinking water out of a well. These things were important to them. They may seem like everyday life to us, but when we are looking at the outback of Africa, these were very important issues to them.

I want to talk a few minutes about endangered species and about the program that was created. The program that was created in this circumstance created an economic incentive for these people to promote more African elephants. They were hugely successful at it.

If you want to look at our endangered species program, you can see everything that we are doing wrong. We want to look at some of the good ideas that have come out of this program and we look at a way of conserving our wildlife that I think we have something to learn from. It has been hugely successful.

I have also heard Members talk about the CAMPFIRE Program somehow promoting the illegal trade and poaching of elephants and ivory. There is nothing that could be further from the truth because what this has done has stopped the illegal poaching of elephants in these areas, areas where we still have illegal trade, and illegal poaching of elephants and ivory are coming from the areas where they do not have this program. So if we want to do what is right for the wildlife, it is to vote against this amendment because this program has been successful. If we want to do what is right for the people of Africa, we have to vote against this amendment.

We have heard earlier in the debate Members talk about the idea of getting away from hunting and getting into photographic safaris and ecotourism, and they are doing that. In fact, while I was there, I had the opportunity to visit one of the sites where they were conducting the photographic safaris, and in the safaris they had several camps that were set up and it was like a mini hotel that they had to set up. And they had to bring in fresh water and they had to bring in sewer facilities and they had to somehow develop an electrical system, all of this in the name of conducting a photographic safari.

And if you contrast that with the hunters that come in where you pitch a tent out in the middle of nowhere, what is best for the environment? The development of a hotel on the edge of a river somewhere so people can come in and take pictures of the animals, or a small tent that is set up and the people do not do any destruction to the environment at all?

But they are getting into the photographic safaris and in the future, maybe some day, that will be a major source of income for them. They would like to see it go into that and have a greater income and diversify. But currently that is not there, and 90 percent of the money that is coming in from this is coming in from the hunts. If we do away with that, we have killed the program. And whether our intention is to kill the program or not, that is exactly what we are doing is killing the program.

I think that even though I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] had good intentions going into this, I believe that there were some mistakes made. I believe that this is going in the opposite direction of what we need to do. I think this is the kind of program we need to look at and learn from, of some of the right things to do and the wrong things to do.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I do not claim to know as much as some of the previous speakers, but from what I can tell, this has been a successful program that has encouraged conservation and has actually reduced poaching and improved the situation in Zimbabwe. As I understand it, in Kenya what they have done is, they have eliminated this type of hunting and the poaching has increased and conservation efforts have decreased.

And really, Members need to understand what this is about. This is really about eliminating hunting. It would be the same thing if we said in the United States that we are going to take the Pittman-Robertson money and we are going to take the Dingell-Johnson money and we are going to say that it cannot be used for anything that has to do with hunting.

And what would happen if we did that? Those programs would fall apart. They have been some of the most successful programs that we have ever put together in this country.

Everybody understands that without hunters, without their contribution to conservation in this country, we would not have the kind of wildlife that we have at the present time. If we eliminate hunting in Zimbabwe, which is what we will do with this program, we will have the results that we have seen in Kenya.

I think we should be very clear about what this is about. This is about eliminating hunting. And if Members are for that, I guess they want to vote for this amendment. But if they believe in conservation, if they believe in approaching this the right way and they believe hunting is a good way to manage our natural resources, they will oppose this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided amendment to restrict the ability of the Agency for International Development [AID] to fund the CAMPFIRE program [Communal Area Management Programme For Indigenous Resources].

While I am not normally an advocate of foreign aid, CAMPFIRE has been one of the most successful programs ever funded by the Agency for International Development.

In fact, it has been so successful that the program, which started in Zimbabwe, has been adopted by other African countries, including Botswana, Namibia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia.

What is the CAMPFIRE program? In short, it is an initiative to improve the standard of living among Africa's poorest rural farmers by giving them an economic stake in the wildlife resources of their country. Under CAMPFIRE, villagers receive a direct economic benefit from their wildlife and, therefore, a powerful incentive to conserve those resources.

In some rural areas, CAMPFIRE provides up to 90 percent of the money villagers use to build and maintain their homes, hospitals, and schools. Without CAMPFIRE, many Africans and numerous wildlife species, including elephants, face a bleak future.

Under the CAMPFIRE program, a village receives a percentage of the money collected from the proceeds from wildlife management. For instance, if a sport hunter wants to shoot a Cape buffalo or an African elephant, it will cost him thousands of dollars. Prior to CAMPFIRE, all this money went directly to the central government in Harare. Today, a significant percentage of those funds remains at the local level and the villagers themselves, in a democratic process, decide how this money will be spent. This is the essence of the CAMPFIRE program is local control of wildlife and financial incentives, which result in effective conservation programs.

The CAMPFIRE program is strongly supported by not only the Clinton administration but also such major conservation organizations as the African Wildlife Foundation, International Union for the Conservation of Nature, International Union for Conservation of Nature, National Wildlife Federation, Safari Club International, the World Wildlife Fund, and the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. These entities enthusiastically support this program because they recognize that:

Seven million people in Southern Africa have directly benefited from programs like CAMPFIRE.

In Zimbabwe, 5,000 to 10,000 jobs have been created and 33 percent of the land in that country is now devoted to wildlife management.

The population of African elephants has increased in Zimbabwe from 45,000 to more than 66,000 today and poaching in CAMPFIRE areas has been stopped.

The number of households participating in CAMPFIRE has grown from 9,000 in 1989 to about 105,000 in 1995.

The number of elephants shot in CAMPFIRE areas has decreased since its introduction from 300 per year to 130 in 1996.

Our Nation's support of the CAMPFIRE program allows thousands of people to improve their livelihoods, to provide education and the most basic health care for their children, and to effectively manage their wildlife resources.

In addition, it encourages the growth of democratic ideals.

It is not a coincidence that elephant populations have increased under CAMPFIRE, and it would be a terrible mistake to end AID's essential investment in this innovative program. In the final analysis, CAMPFIRE and programs like it are Africa's best hope for conserving its wildlife resources and providing its population with a bright future.

I urge a no vote on the Fox/Miller amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my strong support for the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] and my distinguished colleague and fellow Californian [Mr. MILLER] to eliminate the use of U.S. taxpayer funds to promote or support the trophy hunting of elephants under the USAID sponsored program called Communal Areas Management Programs for Indigenous Resources [CAMPFIRE]. This amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of 1997 echoes the sentiment of the American people to eliminate trophy hunting and to prevent the use of taxpayer dollars to lobby for and to promote trophy hunting.

As elected officials, we are duty bound to uphold the will of our constituents, the wishes of the American people. A 1997 Penn & Schoen survey found that 84 percent of Americans oppose trophy hunting, domestically and abroad. Despite this overwhelming opposition to the practice of trophy hunting, the USAID-funded CAMPFIRE program uses trophy hunts to generate funds for the majority of its projects. A recent study of the CAMPFIRE program showed that 90 percent of the funds generated from CAMPFIRE districts intended to help the indigenous populations came from trophy hunting. While CAMPFIRE funds may be used for the development of many successful and positive programs in Africa, we cannot condone the methods which are used to generate these funds.

The U.S. Government has consistently supported the international ban on trade in ivory in order to prevent the destruction of endangered species. United States conservation policy should remain consistent. Our foreign assistance should not be funding elephant hunts for ivory at the same time that we are also supporting an international ban on trade in ivory. Not long ago, our Government rightly spoke out at the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species [CITES] to express strong opposition to the down-listing of the African elephant from appendix I to appendix II of the convention. This down-listing would further dilute the international ban on the ivory trade. The bipartisan Fox-Miller amendment would bring our foreign assistance into line with existing United States conservation policy toward preserving the African elephant.

Mr. Chairman, another disturbing effect of the CAMPFIRE program is the lobbying efforts undertaken in a number of capitals in support of expanding the program. CAMPFIRE plans to expand beyond Zimbabwe and has opened offices in Washington, London, Brussels, and Johannesburg for the principal purpose of lobbying. CAMPFIRE is a sustainable development program and should not be engaging in the process of lobbying on its own behalf with taxpayer dollars.

The argument has been made that the CAMPFIRE program benefits the people of Zimbabwe, and therefore, we should continue our assistance because it helps the impoverished villagers of that country. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the assistance has limited impact upon the population of rural Zimbabwe. Only 5 cents out of every dollar generated actually benefits rural households in Zimbabwe.

The comments from my constituents in San Francisco and San Mateo County speak volumes about the public's view of this trophy hunting program that is supported by the CAMPFIRE program. Mr. Chairman, I would like to share a few of the comments of my constituents with my colleagues:

The CAMPFIRE program is an outrageous contradiction that flies in the face of a government continually professing its concern for nature and the environment on a global basis.—Carol Kemski, San Bruno, California.

This cruel and destructive government program should not be supported by our tax dollars.—Ron Scheinberg, San Francisco, California.

I am aghast by the fact that the USAID is diverting our tax dollars into CAMPFIRE in order to enable trophy hunting of elephants.—Mary Larkin, San Francisco, California.

Mr. Chairman, the Fox-Miller amendment will not stop trophy hunting in Zimbabwe. The government of that country has the sovereign right to do what it chooses to do in this regard. But this amendment will stop U.S. taxpayer funds from being used to support trophy hunting, which 84 percent of the American people oppose.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment and stop the outrage of U.S. taxpayer funding of trophy hunting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. TORRES:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

PROHIBITION OF FUNDS FOR SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

SEC. 572. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for programs at the United States Army School of the Americas located at Fort Benning, Georgia.

(Mr. TORRES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface my remarks about this amendment by first thanking the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for his efforts to work with me on how we address the funding elements that are provided in this bill for the U.S. Army School of the Americas. And while I do appreciate what has been done on this subject that is reflected in the language in the bill before us, I am compelled to offer this amendment together with my colleagues on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] which prohibits any of the funds of this bill being used for the school.

I think it is important to note that in last year's bill, this committee directed the Departments of State and Defense to submit a report no later than January 15 on a number of concerns that the Members had expressed about the school, such as the screening process for applicants and monitoring of graduates. This approach was agreed upon at that time despite our inclination to cut off those funds. This year, this report was received at the ''eleventh hour'' just prior to the subcommittee's markup on June 25, nearly 6 months late.

The report, 3½ pages in length, does not represent what I believe to be, nor the committee, many of the committee Members, a serious effort to be responsive to the issues that were addressed. It merely details how screening is intended to be carried out and contains no evaluation of how this process is carried out.

It further states that the school, that neither the school nor other U.S. personnel have the capacity to monitor graduates. The lateness of the report and its brevity indicate that the school and the Defense Department have failed to take reforms seriously.

I am offering this amendment today because I believe it is time to forge a new relationship with Latin America, to mark a new era in U.S. support for democracy in this hemisphere. The cold war is over, Mr. Chairman. Rooting out Communist insurgents is passe. Human rights violations in the pursuit of eliminating the enemy cannot be condoned.

The School of the Americas cannot deny its dismal connection with the worst human rights violators in the region. The school's graduates who are human rights violators are not just a bunch of bad apples. The list of human rights violators connected with the school is long and is getting longer as names of violators are matched up with those of graduates.

The Salvadoran Truth Commission cited 19 out of 26 officers for the massacre of Jesuit priests; 100 out of 246 Colombian officers cited for war crimes; 6 Peruvian officers involved in the killing of 9 students and a professor; Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega. The list goes on and on and on and cannot be dismissed as just a few exceptions.

Throughout Latin America, the School of the Americas is seen as a training ground for repressive militaries and dictators; and its record, its

record, I underscore that, cannot be ignored. The recently declassified training manuals used at the school as lesson plans and reading materials show that something indeed was wrong with the school's curriculum. These manuals taught armies to violate human rights, to use physical abuse, to use blackmail, to use blacklists, to use censorship, to spy on civilian organizations like student groups, like trade unions, like community organizations and opposition political parties, to confuse the boundaries between civilians and combatants and to ignore the rule of law.

Over and over again the school has tried to downplay rather than fully acknowledge these problems with its training. It is good that the school has added 4 hours on human rights in its courses, but this hardly makes the School of the Americas a school for human rights. These changes are just far too little, too late.

Let me emphasize that cutting off funds to the school does not prevent the many forms of conduct and cooperation between the United States and Latin American militaries. This year alone, over 60,000 military troops will rotate throughout Latin America on various training missions and assignments. Additionally, the international military education and training program for military personnel will come to the United States and study at many of our U.S. institutions. The School of the Americas is just but one of those.

But it does make an important break with the past. It shows Latin Americans who have worked valiantly for human rights and civilian control over militaries in their countries and U.S. religious orders whose missionaries and priests were killed by militaries trained at the School of the Americas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TORRES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I repeat again, the priests that were killed by militaries trained at the School of the Americas, and that the United States now is fully determined to chart a new course. We want to do that. The school represents an outdated approach to a fragile region that is struggling with democracy, and we only have to read and watch television every day to see what is happening.

Cutting off funds to the school in this bill sends a clear signal. It is an important step in forging a new relationship with Latin American militaries based first and foremost upon adherence to civilian authority and the respect for human rights.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the School of the Americas was established to heighten the professionalism of the military establishments throughout the Americas. Approximately 60,000 young Latin American and Caribbean officers have graduated from the SOA since its creation in 1946, the vast majority of whom have served their nations honorably and responsibly.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of the School for the Americas focus on the excesses of a few notorious graduates. This Member is the first to acknowledge that some very unsavory characters have managed to attend the school. But such criticism overlooks the overwhelming majority, well over 99 percent, of honest, capable, intelligent officers who study at the School of the Americas. They return to their homes and serve their nations honorably and with distinction. And this Member would remind his colleagues that graduates of the SOA are personally responsible for the return of democracy in nations such as Bolivia and Argentina, and many of the school's graduates have lost their lives while combating drug lords in Colombia and Peru. Focusing on a few bad apples does a disservice to the commissioned and noncommissioned officers who have attended the School for the Americas and who subsequently fought terrorists and narcotraffickers in the jungles of Latin America.

□ 1500

While the early focus of the institution was on combating Soviet-backed insurgencies, in recent years the school's emphasis has shifted toward combating drug trafficking and responding to rural disease and environmental degradation. One very positive result of the recent attention to the school has been a much greater emphasis on human rights. Every student at the school is now exposed to a rigorous formal and informal training program in basic human rights. Specific classes and case studies are used to enhance the training and to make U.S. concerns unambiguously clear. The roles and rights of civilians, clergy and human rights observers and U.N. personnel are integrated into the training program.

While the SOA has rightly increased its emphasis on human rights, this Member believes that there is a basic value in encouraging military officers from Latin America and the Caribbean to study and to train in the United States. An institution such as the SOA, which annually hosts approximately 1,300 students from almost 20 countries, provides a level of professional training that is not otherwise available. Moreover, exposure to the U.S. lifestyle, values, and ideals offers important lessons for the future military leaders of Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, opponents have pointed to three manuals that were for a short time used by the school. It is true that these manuals had short passages, in one instance less than a sentence, that were inconsistent with U.S. Army doctrine. When discovered, these manuals were immediately withdrawn and destroyed. The school now employs U.S. Army training manuals that are appropriate and which are now being translated, and have been translated into Spanish.

This Member would tell his colleagues that the School of the Americas does not employ confidential torture manuals, nor does the SOA in any way engage in such heinous exercises as training its students to keep their shock victims alive for interrogation as some have alleged. This body should not participate in this wrongful demonization of the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, the training at the School of the Americas does far, far more good in encouraging appropriate human rights practices than any possible harm which could come from even a perversion of such an education program that some former student might practice. It is time to end this misguided attack on the SOA.

This Member wishes he could guarantee to his colleagues that no future graduate of the SOA will ever abuse human rights or undermine civilian government, but obviously this is impossible. What this Member can guarantee is that every effort will continue to be made to fully indoctrinate the students on respect for human rights and democracies. The training at the school undoubtedly does far, far more good than any hypothetical harm which would come from even a perversion of such an educational program some future student might practice.

This Member must say, therefore, that it is time for this body and for certain organizations outside of this body to abandon this misguided attack on the School of the Americas. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and send a message to the organizations, get your facts straight, catch up with reality. It is time to stop and get off this hobby horse. The School of the Americas is an important institution for the United States and for democracy throughout the hemisphere.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give a specific example of how the School of the Americas helps America, the United States of America. The Colombian National Police, which is one of our frontline combatant units against the drug cartels in Colombia, gets a great deal of training from the School of the Americas. The first 40 hours of their training is in the area of human rights. General Serrano and the Colombian police because of that have a stellar human rights record. Our State Department has told us in committee that the Colombian National Police, which is a recipient, a beneficiary of the School of the Americas, has an almost 100 percent human rights record. I believe it is because of the School of the Americas, because of the training they are getting there.

The thing that is interesting about this is these people who are trained in the School of the Americas, the Colombian National Police that are fighting

the war against drugs, against the Colombian drug cartel, lay their lives on the line every single day not just for their people in their country but for our kids in America who are the recipients of the drugs that are coming out of Colombia and Latin America and Central America. For us to close down the School of the Americas and to cut off funding would be a giant step, a giant step in the wrong direction.

The last point I want to make very briefly is this. We know for a fact that the people in Colombia who are suffering human rights abuses go to the Colombian National Police, who have been trained in how to deal with human rights abuses for protection. I think it would be a terrible mistake for us to cut off funding for this very important program if for no other reason because of the Colombian National Police who are fighting so hard every single day to protect our kids from drugs and to stop the flow of drugs coming into America.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. I want to commend the gentleman for focusing attention on the narcotics training that they receive at the School of the Americas. They receive first rate instruction on a variety of subjects, but included very out-front and very positively is their training countering the illegal drug threat. I am pleased to join my colleague in opposition to the gentleman from California's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from General Barry McCaffrey, our drug czar and the former Commander in Chief of the U.S. Southern Command, in support of the School of the Americas, stressing the important role in countering the illegal drug trade, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY,

Washington, DC, July 16, 1997.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CALLAHAN: My purpose in writing is to ask for your support of the U.S. Army School of the Americas. The Appropriations Bill for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs being considered today contains language that, if enacted, would make this important institution ineffective.

As Commander in Chief of U.S. Southern Command, my responsibilities included furthering the development of professional Latin American armed forces that promoted and protected human rights and that were supportive of democratic governance. The School of the Americas was, and continues to be, the Department of Defense's preeminent military educational institution for accomplishing these goals. The soldiers, sergeants, and officers that come to the School of the Americas interact with our own soldiers. They are systematically exposed to the principles of military subordination to civilian authority and the rule of law. They also receive first rate instruction on a variety of subjects including countering the illegal drug threat.

The School of the Americas is closely supervised by the U.S. Army and U.S. Southern Command. Its curriculum is beyond reproach. Indeed, it has been at the forefront of the effort to incorporate human rights training in all military instruction. It is deserving of your support. Your leadership will be important in ensuring that this important vehicle for effective military-to-military relations remains viable.

Respectfully,

BARRY R. MCCAFFREY,
Director.

Mr. Chairman, the war on drugs in Latin America is real. Professional training to fight narcoguerrillas is critical. The School of the Americas helps meet that need. General McCaffrey does point out that the school is closely supervised by the U.S. Army and the U.S. Southern Command. Its curriculum is beyond reproach. Indeed, it has been at the forefront of the effort to incorporate human rights training in all of its military instruction. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Torres amendment, and I wish to speak briefly but from the heart on this issue. I have seen firsthand the work of many of the graduates of the School of the Americas who served as officers in the Salvadoran Armed Forces during the recent conflict in that country. I had the privilege of working with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the honorable dean of our State delegation, on the House investigation of the brutal 1989 murders of six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper, and her 15-year-old daughter. For those unfamiliar with the case, units of the Salvadoran Army surrounded the university where these eight people worked. Soldiers entered their home, forced the six priests out of bed, and then outside into the yard. The soldiers then forced the priests to lay down on the ground, put high-powered rifles to their heads, pulled the triggers, and blew their brains across the grass. These same soldiers then went back inside the house and found and killed the terrified housekeeper and her teenage daughter.

Mr. Chairman, I knew these priests. I was privileged to call them friends. They all had names and family and parishioners, students and colleagues who loved them. When the 26 Salvadoran military personnel cited for these murders were identified, 19 were graduates of the School of the Americas. If this were the only horror story associated with the School of the Americas, we would not be having this debate today. But there are hundreds and hundreds of such stories. And tens of thousands of men, women, and children throughout Latin America have been tortured or have perished on the orders of or at the hands of these graduates.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman. The little we do know about actions and atrocities committed by the School of the Americas graduates does not come from information or surveys carried out by the school itself. It comes from the hard, often dangerous investigations undertaken by human rights groups, U.N.- and government-appointed truth commissions and other dedicated individuals. The school has always taken a posture of denial, that ignorance is better than knowing the truth.

Mr. Chairman, nothing can bring back my friends to life. Nothing can fill the intellectual, spiritual, and visionary void left by their murders. But I have walked on the ground where they died, and I will not support one more single tax dollar being used to keep open a school that helped to shape and train these killers.

I want to thank my fellow colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], and members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations who support this amendment for their leadership on this issue. I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Torres amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in this debate, but I do have an active interest in this matter and have had occasion in the past to get myself involved in it in one way or another. As a matter of fact, my long history goes back to what we then called Benning School for Boys, which I had the honor of attending in my own training to be a second lieutenant of infantry. It hurts me to see that school associated with the kind of record which we now hear with regard to the School of the Americas. I am not trying to point the finger at everything the school does. I commend the effort to improve the training and improve the sensitivity to human rights of the officer corps of our neighboring nations. But it has not succeeded in accomplishing that goal in the way that I would like.

It is unquestionably true that over these past 50 years of the school's existence, a large, very large number of the graduates have been involved in human rights violations. I would not want to characterize all of the graduates as being some kind of evil persons. I am not sure that if we did not have the school, we still would not have violations of civil rights in those societies which are conducive to or organized in a way that encourages violation of civil rights. We have instances in this country of where commissioned officers and noncommissioned officers are guilty of violating the civil rights of individuals, both within the ranks and outside the ranks. We do not blame the entire establishment for those few cases.

But here is a situation where over 50 years, it is undeniable that the graduates of this school have been involved

in this kind of practice. I would suggest that the time has come to acknowledge that we assisted in perpetrating these atrocities through the training that we gave to these officers. While we should continue to offer assistance and to provide training, if necessary, in other ways, we ought to abolish the school and start with a clean slate. Some of these same officers could be eligible to go to West Point or some of our other academies. We train the elites from many of these countries in our most prestigious universities. We should continue to do that. For those who seek a military career, we could give them the ROTC course at Harvard possibly or some other alternative to what they are getting at the School of the Americas. But we need to put this past behind us. We cannot continue as a nation to condone the fact that graduates have engaged in the sort of practice that have been described here, the slaughter of priests and nuns and the disappearance of thousands of people throughout Latin America.

Let us put that behind us. Let us discontinue the funding of this school. If we feel it necessary to continue to assist in the development of an improved military, let us find improved methods to do that job if it does indeed need to be done.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment which amounts to a step backward in the war on drugs and two steps backyard in our support of freedom, democracy, and human rights in our own backyard. In July, both General McCaffrey, the drug czar, and General Shalikashvili, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, highlighted the importance of the School of the Americas in the war on drugs. The frontlines of this war are found throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. Colombia, Panama, and Bolivia serve as prime examples of countries whose drug interdiction strategies would be crippled without the benefit of United States equipment and, most importantly, United States training at the School of the Americas. The school is a key to preserving democracy in our hemisphere.

Since 1946, the U.S. Army has trained the Latin American military leaders who have turned back dictatorship, returning political power to the people and yielding military authority to civilian institutions.

□ 1515

In 1972, there are only six democracies in Latin America. Today, thanks in part to the school's instruction, there are 19.

As civil war in the region has given way to peace, and democracy has taken hold, the U.S. Army School of the Americas has developed a military human rights training program that is unmatched anywhere in the world today.

Just over 1 month ago, I joined almost every other Member in this body in passing legislation congratulating El Salvador, and much has been said about El Salvador during this debate, for recent elections and the country's progress toward full democracy. The resolution passed overwhelmingly, 419 to 3.

What my colleagues probably do not know is that one of the Salvadoran government's top officials, a Minister of Defense, Major General Guzman, is a former School of the Americas instructor. General Guzman is typical of the vast majority of the school's 60,000 graduates and visiting instructors who in one very important way, has returned home to apply his human rights training to remedy his country's problems of the past.

General Guzman institutionalized human rights training in the Salvadoran armed forces. Before his program was initiated, human rights violations numbered more than 2,000 each month, but after 5 years, that number has dropped to less than 20 per month, and today, under General Guzman's zero tolerance program, violations almost never occur.

The School of the Americas is not the answer to all Latin America's problems. There is still work to be done. But I urge my colleagues to consider the lives that the School of the Americas has saved. Every year, the school graduates thousands of men and women who return to their countries to apply the lessons they have learned in a Latin American environment still plagued by instability and violence.

The stories that we do not hear are those heroes. These are the military leaders who fought for democracy and yielded military control to civilian authorities. These are the police officers fighting the drug lords in the street. These are the men and women who have returned control of the governments of Latin America to the people of Latin America.

This is not simply a matter of foreign assistance. It is critical to our own self-interests to maintain democracies in countries so close to our borders. The School of the Americas allows us to do so without deploying our own troops.

The State Department, the Salvadoran and Honduran Ambassadors to the United States, the President of the Committee of Presidents of the Central American Legislative Human Rights Commission, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the acting Commander in Chief of the United States Southern Command, the Under Secretary of the Army, the Director of the National Office of Drug Control Policy, the authorizing committee on both sides of the Capitol, and the last Presidential administration have argued that the school serves vital national interests through its counterdrug operations and its counterdrug cadet leadership development courses, its professional military training program, including unique peacekeeping instruction, and its one-of-a-kind human rights training initiative. Through these programs, the school allows the United States to support and defend Latin American democracies and to encourage responsible government policies without forward deployments such as those used in Bosnia and in Haiti.

I, for one, am not ready to surrender Latin America and the Caribbean to drug lords and dictators. I urge my colleagues to take responsibility of the human rights leadership by opposing this amendment which would close the School of the Americas, diminishing opportunities for the expansion of democracy in Latin America.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I agree with my distinguished colleague's last words about the necessity to fight against drugs. In Latin America, and around the globe, wherever we find that problem, I think it is important that all of us in this Congress take a stand against the drugs which are infecting this country and the entire world.

So I am glad that there is that kind of support, and it is bipartisan support for fighting drugs. However we are called upon, and looking at the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], to make an assessment of a school that is operated out of Fort Benning, GA, which does more than just train people to deal with drugs, and we all agree that we want drugs dealt with, and there are many ways in which they can be dealt with, but that is not what the School of the Americas is about.

The School of Americas in Fort Benning, GA, has a roster of graduates that reads like a Who's Who of human rights violators:

Nineteen of the twenty-six Salvadoran officers accused in the 1989 massacre of the six Jesuits and their housekeeper and the housekeeper's daughter were graduates of the School of the Americas.

Ten of the twelve cited in the El Mozote massacre where an entire village was wiped out without a trace; men, women and children, wiped out; 10 of the 12 people involved in that were graduates of the School of the Americas.

Two of the three officers cited in Archbishop Romero's assassination were graduates of the School of the Americas.

The School of the Americas; of what America is this the school of? Certainly not the United States of America, because the people of the United States of America do not support murder, do not support rape, do not support torture. Yet this is called the School of the Americas, and its graduates are involved in rape, murder, torture, genocide. The School of the Americas indeed.

The people of the United States do not support the kind of conduct which

has come from this school and which is being done in the name of Americas.

Four churchwomen, including Sister Dorothy Kazel, a nun from Cleveland, OH, and someone who happened to be a friend of mine, were raped and brutally murdered in El Salvador. The U.N. Truth Commission investigating the murders verified that the School of the Americas trained three of the five officers responsible for the churchwomen's deaths.

Now Sister Dorothy was more than a friend to me. She was a friend to humanity. She went to El Salvador to bring about peace and justice for those who desperately need it, and she was brutally murdered for her efforts, along with Jean Donovan and two other nuns. Sister Dorothy Kazel's sister-in-law asked me to deliver this message to my colleagues in the United States Congress, and I quote:

''Congress needs to act now. The women were killed by officers trained at the School of the Americas. I just don't understand why we are training human rights violators on our own soil. Why does this school still operate?''

Mr. Chairman, those who oppose closing the School of the Americas defend it as a haven for human rights protectors. The inversion of meaning is an ongoing problem in political philosophy. It is something that the writer, George Orwell, well understood where wrong becomes right and worse becomes the better reason and where murderers and rapists become human rights protectors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KUCINICH was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Where wrong becomes right, where worse becomes the better reason and where people who have murdered become human rights protectors.

Well, I think the American people are well aware of the record of the School of the Americas. We owe it to them, and we owe it to the memory of Sister Dorothy Kazel, the other nuns, the Jesuit priests, the civilians who have been murdered, and to everyone else who has ever been terrorized by the School of the Americas, to see that this school be shut once and for all. This is the Congress of the United States of America, and it should not let anyone defile the name ''America'' in our own name on our own soil with our own tax dollars. Close the School of the Americas.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Oh, the outrage is becoming palpable now. The do-gooders are out there. Pass out the rose-colored glasses, Mr. Chairman. The cold war is over; we are hearing that today.

Every American citizen ought to grab up their children, close their doors and take out their weapon, if it has not been taken away every time the do-gooders get out there and start saying the cold war is over, because we know what is coming next, another piece of legislation, another diatribe that we must cut back, cut back, cut back, cut back.

Well, the cold war may be over in a formal sense, Mr. Chairman, but there are many very good, productive, positive reasons to deny the do-gooders this latest opportunity to prove to the world that we can be more namby-pamby than some other country somewhere in the world at some point in time.

Mr. Chairman, one thing that escapes me in this latest round of do-good-ism that we are hearing today is what these folks think would happen if the School of the Americas were closed and if we then, as they would have us do, then search out every other program in which we provide some sort of training, control over foreign military officers. Do they think that all of a sudden magically, as they had been anointed with this vision of the universe, that every one of these other officers would all of a sudden adopt their view of the world, their view of so-called human rights, their view of what is right and wrong in the world, their view of what we must do in the world? I do not think so.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the School of the Americas provides a very valuable tool not only for this country to influence foreign officers in a positive way as we have heard from opponents of this measure today already, but it also provides an important outlet for the yearnings that these foreign officers have to learn about this country and what we do that is so good that these other folks herald and then break down.

There are, Mr. Chairman, other countries more than willing to step into the breach should we retreat. Communist China; now there is a country with a stellar human rights record. They are already obtaining a foothold in Latin America. Perhaps they would step into the breach and create a School of the Americas.

Would that make the do-gooders happy? Perhaps, I do not know. Some other country, perhaps Cuba, would step into the breach wanting to increase its influence in Latin America.

The fact of the matter is, though, Mr. Chairman, somebody would be there to step into the vacuum that would be created if we were to suddenly pull out from the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, over the years, and even currently, these officers that are out there fighting for our kids on our streets in the United States of America are trained, many of them, both directly and indirectly, through the process of talking with the other graduates who come back to their country, and they do teach and they do talk with their fellow officers. They do learn, and they are equipped, better equipped, with the tools to fight the terrorists.

Now the cold war may be over, but terrorism is not over. The cold war may be over, but the war against narcotics traffickers is not. The cold war may be over, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, there are narco-terrorists out there in Latin America, and we need to use every legitimate tool at our disposal, and this is a legitimate tool at our disposal and the way that we can reach out and influence for the better these officers.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1530

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize for having to run off the floor to a meeting, but the points that the gentleman are making are so well taken. We are fighting a battle today of terrorism. We are fighting a battle of illegal drugs in this country. These officers that are trained at the School of the Americas are doing a service by going back to their countries and teaching people what it is all about as far as decent human rights for people.

I just wish I had more time to participate in the debate, but I hope everybody comes over here and votes against this ill-conceived amendment.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman, who knows whereof he speaks.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me mention the whole process here is rather bizarre. We see the folks on the other side saying, well, because these people went to the School of the Americas and sometime in the future, after that point, they committed these bad acts, therefore we must close the doors of the School of the Americas.

How preposterous. Should we search out and close the doors of every school in the United States of America because one of them may have produced at some point in time a Ted Bundy or somebody else that goes out and commits an act? Blaming the school for the bad acts of its graduates in this instance is ill-conceived.

This is nonsense, Mr. Chairman, and it ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BEREUTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BARR was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio just made a very impassioned statement. It is understandable, given his personal knowledge of a victim.

But I just would like the gentleman to think about the fact that the noncommissioned officers and officers that come to this school do not come with a

table that has nothing written on it. They come bringing some values themselves.

What we are attempting to do with the School of the Americas is, in some cases, a very difficult task of changing the whole culture of a military in a government. If you had visited Guatemala or El Salvador like this gentleman in the early 1980's, you would understand about the progress that has been made and the great difficulty we had in getting the right kind of people to come to the school in the first place.

I would just like to suggest we have made dramatic progress, and in the absence this, we are going to have a much deeper problem in the hemisphere.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to get into this debate until I heard the previous speaker's comments, and they compelled me to say what I am going to say now.

I would much rather be a ''do-gooder'' than a stand-byer, while a school which is supposed to teach American values instead consistently produces graduates who defile the very values that that institution is supposed to support and promote.

I do not mind being called a ''do-gooder'' at all in comparison to being a do-nothinger. I also do not mind being called ''namby-pamby'' because I happen to be offended by the fact that, time and time again, graduates of the School of the Americas have engaged in conduct that would make every decent American gag.

If being ''namby-pamby'' is being opposed to instruction manuals on torture, if being ''namby-pamby'' is being opposed to the consistently failed record of this institution in turning out graduates who understand democratic values, if it is being ''namby-pamby'' to object to the fact that graduates of this institution have systematically in a number of countries around this hemisphere wiped out innocent women and children, then call me namby-baby. I do not mind it at all.

You are doggone right, we are opposed to this institution continuing. This institution has been given the opportunity year after year after year to demonstrate that it can turn out a different kind of military for Latin America. So far, there is very precious little evidence that in fact it has done so.

The gentleman from Nebraska is right: What this institution is charged with doing is a very difficult thing to do. It is very difficult to take people from the kind of culture which has produced many of them, bring them to this country, and in a very short period of time inculcate the kind of values that we would like to see those graduates represent.

But the fact is that you have to make a judgment sooner or later about whether that institution has succeeded or not, and there are a lot of us in this institution who do not think that it has succeeded.

So I would suggest that to call people ''do-gooders'' or to call them ''namby-pamby'' because we happen to object to the fact that thousands of individual innocent civilians have been slaughtered by the graduates of this second-rate institution, is, I think, to do something to the dialogue in this House that you ought not to do.

I would say one other thing: For years we have heard every justification dragged up that it is possible to drag up in order to defend the continued funding for this institution. Now the latest argument we hear is, ''Oh, they are necessary to prevent the drug traffic from succeeding in this hemisphere.''

Well, I just have to tell you that drug program administrators who cannot run an antidrug program without relying on this kind of institution ought to find themselves another line of work.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate being recognized to speak in favor of the School of the Americas. Not everything is perfect. Unfortunately, the folks who support this amendment are correct in that in the past there have been graduates of this school who have abused human rights and caused all sorts of pain and suffering.

That has been a very, very small minority of student participants, and the things that they did, they did not learn at the School of the Americas. They certainly were not trained with that intent by the School of the Americas.

That was many, many years ago. Some debates, Mr. Speaker, are timely, and some debates are timeless. This debate seems to be timeless in that once the side who opposes the School of the Americas has got their point across and the changes have been made, it is time to stop. But, instead, we are continuing year after year, rehashing the same ground, regurgitating the same arguments over and over again.

This debate, rather than being timeless, should be timely, and the time to debate it was properly in the early 1990's under Secretary Cheney. Under Secretary Cheney many, many changes were made that threw out some of the offensive materials which the supporters of this amendment keep referring to.

It is not the case any more. What we are doing is we are debating Model T's in the era of 1997 automobiles. It is just that there is a photograph there. We are looking at the moving picture here, and the moving picture has gone on and times have changed.

But to be on the safe side, the committee this year has put in some very strong safeguards. One, the Secretary of Defense must certify that the instruction and training provided by the school are fully consistent with training and doctrine provided to U.S. military personnel, especially, Mr. Chairman, regarding human rights.

Number two, the Departments of Defense and State have improved the guidelines for screening and admitting students to better avoid students with records of human rights violations or who may have tendencies in that direction.

Number three, the Department of Defense completes a comprehensive report on training activities of the school and an assessment of the performance of the graduates.

These are three things that are in the bill right now. This amendment is not necessary.

The abuses that they are referring to that happened are horrible, and I certainly agree, but they happened many years ago by graduates that would not be admitted to the school today.

Now, let me say this on a personal basis. I have visited the school. It is disturbing, greatly disturbing to me, that most of the supporters of this amendment have not taken the time to visit the school. In fact, I would challenge my colleagues, if you have been to the school and you support the amendment, when you speak, please let folks know, and tell us about the terrorists you saw in the classroom.

I am not going to tell you that I could tell terrorists from a nonterrorist sitting in a classroom, Mr. Speaker, but I can tell you this: I talked to young idealistic men and women from South America who had lots of ideas on democracy, lots of enthusiasm about the American system of government, and lots of enthusiasm for freedom and its noble concepts.

I have visited them, and I have talked to the students. It makes a tremendous difference in your opinion of an institution when you have been there and talked to the students.

If you do not go, maybe if you support this amendment, you should make it a priority to visit it. I would be glad to help any of my colleagues who would like to go down to Columbus, Georgia. We could probably get you in and out of there in a day. It would mean so much to the students down there, it would mean so much to the institution, and perhaps it could mean a whole lot to the great cause that we share of freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to please vote against this amendment, and support the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the School of the Americas and in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that most of us here do not oppose international military training in general. The amendment addresses only the military training provided at Fort Benning because of a negative image, or stigma, remaining from a relatively very few problems from the past. This makes this issue a self-feeding problem to a large extent because the negative stigma is perpetuated by the very groups who use it as justification to close the school.

The negative propaganda and baggage that continues to follow the school is just not a valid argument to shut down the only school of this kind in the world with such devoted attention to teaching professionalism, respect for

rule of law and civilian leadership, and human rights to young officers and soldiers of Latin America who would not otherwise get this critical training. In fact, the School of the Americas provides much more of this kind of training to its students than our own military men and women receive.

We also often hear lists of human rights abuses committed by Latin American military personnel who may or may not have received some varying level of training at the School. These cases—while horrible—are very rare when compared to the large number of students trained at the school. To close the school simply because less than one percent of its graduates haven't successfully applied what they've learned is inappropriate, shortsighted, and counterproductive.

Let me just ask everyone: If the United States set up a program to teach Latin American militaries to reject repressive behavior, to respect human rights, and advance the cause of democracy in our own back yard, would you support it? What if it were only 99 percent effective? That's what we're dealing with in plain English. No exaggerations, no distortions, no feel-good hype. Why would we throw away the opportunity to teach hundreds of Latin American military officers to respect human rights just because a few don't get the message?

I challenge all members of this committee to visit the school before you take active action, such as this amendment, to close it. With all due respect, I know very few members here today, including Mr. TORRES himself, have actually visited the School down at Fort Benning. If it's not possible for you to visit, Colonel Trumbel, the School's Commandant, is available to meet with any Member one on one here in Washington to discuss any and all concerns you may have. I ask that you please get the facts, investigate the school for yourself rather than relying on second-hand propaganda, before you vote to close this school.

What can we do here today to improve the school?

The language in the bill regarding the School of the Americas takes major steps to address remaining concerns of Congress. I remind you that the bill as it currently stands denies all funds from the school until: First, the Secretary of Defense certifies the instruction and training provided by the school are fully consistent with training and doctrine provided to U.S. military personnel, especially regarding human rights, second, DOD and State have improved the guidelines for screening and admitting students to better avoid students with records of human rights violations, and third, DoD completes a comprehensive report on training activities of the School and an assessment of the performance of its graduates.

These are very significant steps to improve any remaining problems. I ask that you support the very reasonable compromise language currently in the bill and oppose this amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise as a do-gooder to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, American values are based on doing good for people. That is the purpose of this bill. This bill proposes to do good for the less fortunate people of the world and for less fortunate nations.

My good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], talked about reality. Reality is the story told by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] as to what happened in El Salvador at the hands of graduates from the School of the Americas. Reality is what was described by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] as to what happened to his friends at the hands of graduates of the School of the Americas.

The fact is that graduates of the school went forth to engage in activities that were totally inimical to the values of the people and of the Government of the United States.

Sure, there are some students who are graduates who are good, but they are not the ones who were in power in the countries to which the graduates went.

The impression is given that if you close the school, all training will stop. That is not true. All the universities in this country are available for training, and a course can be set forth that will permit this to be done.

The fact is that this school has failed. Its record is one of failure. The record cannot be dismissed by saying that critics of that record are do-gooders.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here that was received by the National Security Archives, the government library of George Washington University, dated July 17, 1997, fairly current, signed by the current Ambassador from the Embassy of Honduras. This is what he said:

> Thank you for your fax regarding the letter that was distributed to Members of Congress quoting four Latin Americans, including myself, on the issue of funding for the School of the Americas.
>
> In that letter I am quoted extemporaneously. My statement was geared toward the need to enhance the school's program to deal with today's challenges, narco-terrorism, violation of human rights, extreme poverty, suitable development, elements I consider valid.
>
> Nevertheless, at the time I made that statement, I wasn't aware of allegations or evidence of the school's programs that led to violation of international human rights. Otherwise, I would have mentioned my government and I deplore any activities undertaken there or anywhere else that would encourage officers to carry out violations of international human rights norms.
>
> The negative effect of the school's academic programs have, unfortunately, been felt in my country, where at least five military officers trained in the school have been requested to come before our courts for violation of human rights.
>
> The Honduran Government clearly does not condone any such activities and is opposed to any academic program the school had or has in that regard. I hope this letter clarifies our position.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. There is still the opportunity for training of worthy students from the Latin American countries, and they should be given that opportunity for training, but not in the School of the Americas.

□ 1545

The record justifies the closing of that school.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Torres-Yates-Foglietta amendment to close the U.S. Army School of the Americas.

I want it to be clear that I do not oppose military to military, or civil military training, but, I believe the school has too many negative implications, baggage—as it were—to be an effective tool of U.S. foreign policy.

I believe the school to be a relic of the cold war. It represents a severely outdated approach to a fragile region struggling to attain real democracy and civilian control of the military and should have been closed years ago.

Some members have told me that the Latin American military respect our Armed Forces because of the work the school has done over the years.

Yes, but what about the civilian population of Central and South America. What about those civilians who refer to the school as the school of assassins. What do they think of the United States and our military assistance? Are we really fulfilling our national security and foreign policy objectives by alienating the civilian population of Latin America?

I am proud of the young men and women serving in our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. I am proud that their colleagues from Latin America think so highly of them. But, I do not see how closing the School of the Americas will diminish this respect.

Closing the school will not put a halt to military contact between our Armed Forces and those of Latin America.

In fact, I believe closing the school will allow for a more rounded education. One where the soldiers of Central and South American countries participate alongside their counterparts in the U.S. military in the full range of U.S. military training.

Closing the school will allow the students to become exposed to the total American experience instead of being isolated in one region of our country.

Additionally, these future leaders will be better prepared to work with, and more importantly communicate with, our military should we become engaged in joint military operations sometime in the future.

It would send a clear message to the people of Latin America that we care about their civil and human rights and are trying to support their democracies.

In closing, although I have been an opponent of the school for many years, I have attempted to work with the Army and the Departments of State and Defense through the Foreign Operations Subcommittee to resolve the numerous complaints surrounding the curriculum at the school.

I wanted to come to some kind of positive resolution to this matter, but, in just the past year it has become very clear to me that my good faith efforts were to be unrewarded.

The committee previously instructed the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations no later than January 15, 1997, a report on the School of Americas at Fort Benning, GA.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Ohio started out listing the who's who of human rights violators in the hemisphere, the school's roster of graduates. I would like to continue that for a moment.

One hundred of 246 Columbian officers cited for war crimes by an international human rights tribunal in 1993; six Peruvian officers involved in the killings of 9 students and a professor in 1992; Colonel Julio Alpirez, linked to the cover-ups and the murders of Efrain Bamaca and United States citizen Michael DeVine in Guatemala; ranking officers in notorious Honduran Battalion 3–16; Argentina dictator Leopoldo Galtieri and Panamanian strongman Manuel Noriega.

Let me just stop at this point and say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I am absolutely surprised and appalled at the energy that they are expending to defend the School of the Americas.

I do not know why those who posture themselves as law-and-order policymakers, I do not know why anybody who gets up time and again talking about how tough they are on crime and criminals and human rights violators, would expend so much time and energy defending this U.S. Army School of the Americas.

We know the list of violators who have been the graduates of this school. How can we defend them? It is not enough to say, oh, some of them made mistakes, some of them were not right, some of them killed some people. What are Members talking about? We are talking about people who are trained in the School of the Americas who go back to these countries. They become our direct contacts. These are the ones we support. We support them in the leadership of those nations.

I cannot believe that some of the Members have forgotten about Haiti already. We spent a lot of hours in this body about trying to right the wrongs of Haiti. It took a great threat by the President of the United States, ready to move in with our own military unless we got rid of the graduates of the School of the Americas: General Cedras, have Members forgotten him already? Have they forgotten Mr. Francois in Haiti, who headed the police force, a graduate of the School of the Americas?

These two gentlemen, if they can be called that, in Haiti were the ones who built the airstrip where the drug runners were able to come in and bring their dope into Haiti to be shipped out to America and other places. These places on the globe that we are discussing are the locations for the transshipment of drugs right into the United States.

The Congressional Black Caucus has made it absolutely clear that getting rid of drug trafficking and drugs is our number one priority. We do not take kindly to those who would call us do-gooders because we have decided that there must be, at some point in time, a real war on drugs.

Are Members not tired of the failure of this government to deal with drugs and the drugs that enter this country? Are Members not tired of the relationships we have with the Noriegas of the world? These become our partners in crime. Whether it is Noriega or Cedras or Francois, they were all supported by our government while they were dealing dope into our communities.

We are sick and tired of you simply going out on the street corners of America locking up these young black and Latino males, and even white, with small amounts of drugs. We want to stop drugs and the big dope dealers, and those who are allowing their countries to be transshipment points to bring drugs into the United States. You cannot defend Noriega and Cedras and these graduates of the School of the Americas. These are dope dealers who we embraced, that we trained and sent back.

What is wrong with the School of the Americas? Once they make the contact in this country they become our leaders. They become the people we rely on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WATERS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, we train them and we send them back. Then we rely on them. We support them. Guess what? Members cannot be concerned about drug dealing and drug trafficking as long as they are supporting the very ones who are dealing the dope back to us.

When are we going to be serious about a war on drugs? Yes, we may be do-gooders over here, but we are do-gooders who are challenging Members to wake up and smell the roses and stop this nonsense, and get about the business of getting rid of drug traffickers. Get rid of the work and manuals and training of the School of the Americas, and that will go a long way toward getting rid of the real dope dealers in this hemisphere.

I challenge Members today to stop the nonsense of defense of a school that you can no longer defend. How can Members get up on the floor year in and year out and say they are going to do better, leave them alone for now, give them the American taxpayers' dollars.

It is shameful, it is unconscionable, and Members need to stop it and support this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, while I have great respect for all of the opponents as well as the proponents of this amendment, let me say that most of the debate is not taking place on what the true issue is. I do not think there is anyone in this entire House, this entire body, that condones human rights violations. I do not think there is a single person on either side of this aisle or either side of this debate that agrees with some of the atrocities that took place.

That is not the point. The point is because some people who are opposed to the School of the Americas today have brought to the attention of this body some misdoings, some wrongdoings that have taken place as a result of some of the graduates returning to their countries and creating some atrocities, no, no, we do not condone that, nor will we ever condone that.

The point is, we are now trying to educate, and this Congress and this subcommittee has dispatched people to the school, to Central America, to South America, to make absolutely certain that they are taught to respect human rights. When these graduates return, the percentile in the high nineties do exactly what we envision that they would do. They go back and they make themselves leaders in their communities. They respect human rights as a result of the education they have received at Fort Benning.

So the debate is not over whether or not we ought to continue teaching people to go back and commit atrocities, because that is not the debate. That is over with. The Secretary of Defense must confirm to the Congress before he can spend one dime that they are not going to teach anybody to go back and to do harm to any individual.

I took our subcommittee to Armenia and to Azerbaijan and to Georgia and to Turkey. On the way back we had conversations about, how fortunate we are in this hemisphere. We have wars that are taking place between Armenia and Azerbaijan, and happily they are at peace right now, trying to work out an agreement. We have problems in Cyprus, we have problems in the Middle East, we have problems in Africa, problems in Bosnia, but not one war is taking place in this entire hemisphere.

So we are working ourselves into a position of a peaceful community, where human rights are respected by all people.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with the gentleman. There is a war going on in this hemisphere. Is the gentleman not aware of what is going on in Mexico? Is he not aware of the drug wars that are going on? Is he not aware of the war that is going on against our young people in our neighborhoods and our American cities?

I want to tell the gentleman, this is the war. The war is drug trafficking in this hemisphere that is killing thousands of people, that is causing our prisons to explode, that is causing people to be shot down on the streets of America.

It may not be, in the gentleman's estimation, sir, a war, but this is the most devastating kind of war. This is the worst kind of war. It is the kind of war that we are going to have to come to grips with and begin to see it as a war. As long as we think we are lucky——

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the

gentlewoman's concern. The definition of war is maybe something we could debate one afternoon when we have more time. The debate that is taking place today is whether or not we are going to fund the School of the Americas.

When we have the President of the United States who sends me a message and tells me, Mr. Chairman, will you please continue to fund this; when we have the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who calls me and says, do whatever you can possibly do, because this will help to create a peace, this will help to solve the war on drugs that the gentlewoman is talking about; and when we have Mack McLarty call, all of these very distinguished people that the President of the United States has placed in a position of responsibility, pleading with me, a Republican, ''Sonny, go over there and convince your colleagues to continue to fund this school, because we have corrected every problem that they contend existed. They have made great progress. We have done everything this Congress has suggested that we do with respect to this school.''

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CALLAHAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have done every conceivable thing we can do to ensure that we do not permit any educational process that would lend to the availability of people going back to their country and creating any human rights violation.

Certainly, God forbid, even the University of Alabama, one of the greatest educational institutions in the world, has graduated some people, probably far below the national standard when we consider Alabama and California, but nevertheless, we, too, have probably graduated some people who have gone on to perform some heinous acts, but we do not close down the university.

Some of our educational institutions that we revere, such as our academies, have had some problems. When they had their problems, did we say, close down the institution? No, we said, correct the problems. That is precisely what the President of the United States has done. That is precisely what the professionals in Georgia have done. They have corrected it. They are not teaching these subjects that these people are referring to. We are doing it in a positive manner.

I know we have not resolved all the wars on poverty, all of the wars on crime, all of the wars on narcotics, but we are moving in the right direction, because we are bringing these people to America, we are teaching them the value of human rights, of civil rights, of free elections. We are instructing them how to go back and be leaders in their community, and we are doing it with the only vehicle we have, and that is the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, I would plead with my colleagues to go along with their Commander in Chief, to go along with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, to go along with all of the people in the administration that have written to us telling us all of these problems have been addressed, we are moving in the right direction. Let us preserve the perceived peace that we have in this hemisphere.

□ 1600

Let us not turn into a hemisphere of wars. Let us educate our allies, our friends in this hemisphere. Let us continue this school, teaching democracy, teaching human rights, teaching men and women how to go back to their respective countries and to be great citizens.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, let me make it absolutely clear that if the President of the United States wrote to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], called, and insisted on funding the School of the Americas, then I am opposed to the President and the President is wrong.

Let me make it abundantly clear that if Mr. McCaffrey called, he should be the first one to understand that it is a war. His life just got threatened when he was down in Mexico among the drug traffickers who sent him a message in no uncertain terms. I think he knows it is a war now.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Torres amendment and commend him for his leadership, as well as the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his leadership, on this important issue. I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] for bringing this amendment to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard all different points of view about versions of the story of our interpretation of what the School of the Americas has accomplished. Whatever good it has done, it seems that it is more than just a coincidence that some of the worst violators of human rights in this hemisphere were educated at that school.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our chairman, has made a very fine effort in the legislation to recognize that there is a problem that still exists at the School of the Americas, and I was very pleased to hear the gentleman say in his remarks that not one dime could be spent on the School of the Americas unless the Secretary of Defense confirmed certain things, which I would like to read into the RECORD, because I believe it is time for us to understand what the choice is before us today.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, just to briefly say that not only is it in the RECORD, but if this bill passes as it is written, it is in the bill, in the bill on page 29 where it requires that before any money can be spent in violation of any of the efforts that my colleagues are contending, that the President must certify that it is not going to be used. It requires further that the Department of Defense do exactly the same thing.

So, we have for the first time in history in our bill, under title II on page 29, implemented into law the prohibitions against the teaching of anything that would lead to any type of atrocity.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman making that statement and for the work that the gentleman did to get that language in the bill. But I repeat again that that language in the bill recognizes that there is a problem. To those who say, ''What is the problem?'' There is a problem.

Because of the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama, the bill says that,

> None of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to support grant-financed military education and training at the School of the Americas unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the instruction and training provided by the School of the Americas is fully consistent with training and doctrine, particularly with respect to the observance of human rights.
>
> Further, that the Secretary of Defense certifies that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, has developed and issued specific guidelines governing the selection and screening of candidates for the instruction at the School of the Americas; and, further, that the Secretary of Defense submits to the Committee on Appropriations a report detailing the training activities of the School of the Americas and the general assessment regarding the performance of its graduates during 1996.

The reason I part company with my chairman at this point is because we had the request for this study in last year's bill and, unfortunately, it took a great deal of time for us to get the report back to our committee. Indeed, it did not even show up until the day our subcommittee was meeting, and I think that that was long overdue.

We asked for a report on ethics to correct the problems. The report sat in DOD for months and was delivered the day of our subcommittee markup. The report itself failed miserably to address our concerns about the school.

Mr. Chairman, this leaves me no choice but to support this amendment. I say that with a great deal of respect for our colleagues on both sides of this issue. I do want to call to the attention of our colleagues that a problem exists and that this solution that the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] is advancing is a reasonable one. It takes the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] one step further.

Mr. Chairman, I call this to my colleagues's attention. It is a letter from the Jesuit Conference. The Jesuit Conference calls for the closing of the School of the Americas. It does so because it says:

> Jesuits know all too personally the violence perpetrated by graduates of the School of the Americas. In 1989 six Jesuits, their housekeeper and her daughter were murdered on the campus of the Jesuit University in El Salvador. Nineteen of the Salvadoran officers whom the United Nations cited for these murders were graduates of the School of the Americas. This is a celebrated case. However, the death and disappearance of hundreds of ordinary civilians, such as those of the village of El Mozote in Salvador—

And I visited that location myself.

> Overwhelm our consciences and elicit outrage at the impunity of the School of the Americas graduates. Their families silently know, better than we, the effects of State sanctioned terror.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I agree with the statement in the Jesuits' letter that it is time to send a strong message that the United States will no longer sanction or tolerate militaries which declare war upon their own civilian populations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. PELOSI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, the point is that the Jesuits are calling for the closing of the School of the Americas. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is asking for a study, a good faith request for a study and certification. The gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] splits the difference, and I think it is a very wise proposal.

The amendment of the gentleman from California just cuts off the funding that is in this legislation. The School of the Americas receives about $4 million from the U.S. Congress. As the Chairman knows, $1.2 million comes out of foreign operations and the rest out of the DOD appropriations bill.

This is not about closing the School of the Americas. This is about cutting off this funding. It is about sending a strong message that when we ask for a report, we want it in a timely fashion and we want it to be appropriate.

I look forward to visiting, at the invitation of Mr. COLLINS and Mr. BISHOP, the School of the Americas to impress upon them that Congress does, as the gentleman from Alabama says, universally support human rights; that we do not associate ourselves with or condone any of the atrocities that have been performed by people who are graduates of the School of the Americas, but that indeed the terms that the chairman put forth in this bill are terms that we expect to be met.

Mr. Chairman, this is what we did last year and they did not come through. That is what made the Torres amendment necessary. So the choice that our colleagues have is the status quo, which I believe is unacceptable and unsatisfactory in light of the response that we received, or better yet did not receive from the School of the Americas, and even a better solution than calling for the closing of the School of the Americas. This is a compromise. This is a smart approach to it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. And I say in good faith to my colleagues, I look forward to joining them to visit the School of the Americas to help in any way that we can to promote the education of people who will promote human rights in this hemisphere.

Indeed, even if the school were to be closed, there are many other institutions where military can be trained to promote human rights values and other democratic freedoms. Mr. Chairman, with that I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, let's decide here and now what we are going to teach the world.

We have so much to say. For little more than two centuries, we have shown the world the way to true democracy and most of the world has followed. In Denver, last month, our President had the opportunity to show the world's economic leaders the way to the economic boom we are enjoying.

That's the central message that our School of the Americas should be teaching.

I am one who believes that instead of the enduring message of the School of the Americas, we should be helping our Latin American neighbors follow the course of Oscar Arias and Costa Rica, where the people there live safely, securely, and economically prosperous with no military, with no military. I am concerned that this school, as it is constituted, encourages a culture of growing militarism instead of growing economies. Some of the students of nations of this school simply cannot afford its persistent lesson. I am one who believes that, when resources are scarce, we should be making more butter, rather than buying more guns. But I respect our disagreement on this issue.

But of course, our neighbors in Latin America are sovereign nations and it is within their province and power to decide on their own security needs and military training needs. It is good policy, then, to have a modest program to help their militaries professionalize and be respectful of human rights. The School for the Americas is not achieving that policy.

The lessons we taught in the baddest of bad old days of the School of the Americas—terrorism, torture, and strong-arm police tactics—were exactly the wrong ones for our hemisphere. Despite the laudable improvements of our chairman in the bill, I remain convinced that this school has no place in the Americas.

Yes, there have been improvements, but not enough.

The school still holds 47 weeks of courses on things like psychological operations, commando missions, and battle tactics, but added only two 2-hour lectures on human rights. When our subcommittee asked for a report on how the school screens applicants and monitors graduates, the school showed its disrespect with a meager 3-page report that was 6 months late.

The Torres-Yates-Foglietta amendment proposes to delete the bill's $815 million for the school. If we want to teach the right message to help professionalize their militaries, let's focus on that mission, and also help them grow their economies and fortify their democracies and teach the sanctity of human rights.

So, as I said at the beginning, we can decide today what America will teach the world, what message our people have to send to our neighbors. The mission of this school has flunked. Support the Torres-Yates-Foglietta amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, many of the abuses in Latin America can be traced back to graduates of the School of the Americas.

The opposition has circulated dear colleagues highlighting quotes from several Latin American officials, but we have also heard from the people. Their voices are smaller and their speeches not as polished, but these are the people who have suffered from this scandalous school and they deserve to be heard.

The fact that there are provisions that call for the Secretary of Defense's approval should not make us feel secure but suspect.

I would hope that we would only fund 50-year-old programs that have already proven themselves, not ones that need special scrutiny.

We spend billions of dollars on our defense interests, and when that money is used to keep our military strong and our troops safe, it is money well spent. But we mock our brave men and women in uniform who work for peace and justice in our world when we spend even one penny on this scandal.

The school is not a creative solution to downsizing our military and it is more than just a waste of taxpayer dollars. Many graduates have been involved in some of the most brutal atrocities in Latin America and it is a national disgrace and a blotch on our military history.

If we are to support democracy we must stop the killing of those people whose welfare we claim to support and the School of the Americas must fall into the oblivion it so richly deserves.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, 50 years ago, the U.S. Army School of the Americas opened its doors in Panama to a class of Latin American and Caribbean military officers to receive training in the art of war.

Half a century later it's time to shut the school down.

Last September, the Pentagon revealed what activists opposed to the school have been alleging for years—that foreign military officers were taught to torture and murder to achieve their political objectives.

According to the Pentagon's own excerpts, School of the Americas students were advised to imprison those from whom they were seeking information; to ''involuntarily'' obtain information from those sources—in other words, torture them; to arrest their parents; to use ''motivation by fear''; pay bounties for enemy dead; execute opponents; subvert the press; and use torture, blackmail, and even injections of truth serum to obtain information.

These tactics come right out of an SS manual and have no place in a civilized society. They certainly have no place in any course taught with taxpayer dollars on U.S. soil by members of our own military.

These practices, which as we know too well have, in fact, been used by graduates of the School of the Americas, are part of a totalitarian playbook. They show complete disregard for the rule of human law and violate every tenet of basic human rights.

Yet nowhere in this report was there any apology for the horrific misdeeds tied to this training.

Nor was there any mention of the poor—any mention of all those who have suffered so much at the hands of those who were taught to torture and murder by elements within our own Government.

What about Archbishop Oscar Romero, gunned down in cold blood by SOA graduates because he stood up for the powerless against the powerful? What about the Jesuit priests and their housekeeper and her daughter, murdered in El Salvador because their hope for the poor clashed with the interests of dictators? What about the four Ursuline nuns, ravaged and mutilated and thrown into a ditch for the crime of teaching children to read? What about the children at El Mozote—machine gunned by School of Americas alumni for the sin of living in the wrong place at the wrong time?

These manuals are the smoking gun. They provide direct evidence that the school has not only failed to serve its mission, but has subverted its mission.

It's time to close down the School of the Americas.

Ms. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Torres amendment, which would help us close the U.S. Army School of the Americas once and for all.

The School of the Americas has taught some of the most ruthless dictators in Latin America to torture their opponents, censor the press, and intimidate their citizens. It must be shut down. But the issue of what to do with the School of the Americas goes well beyond the deplorable actions of the school, and right to the heart of U.S. foreign policy.

The question before us today is whether the United States has the moral responsibility to encourage other governments to respect human rights and democracy. Are human rights and democracy just catch phrases we use, or are they basic principles that we demand of every nation?

We must demand human rights and democracy—in name and in practice—from our own military and all of our neighbors. That is why the School of the Americas is an affront to everything that U.S. foreign policy should be about. That is why we must close this school.

Fifty years ago, the School of the Americas was opened with the goal of improving U.S. ties to Latin American militaries. The idea was to educate our neighbors to the South about democratic civilian control of the military. But over the last few decades, we started to hear reports of what was actually being taught there. Words like torture, beating, and execution were increasingly being associated with the school's courses.

Then some of the school's more distinguished graduates started to turn up in high positions in Latin American governments. People like Panama's drug-dealing dictator Manuel Noriega—now serving time in a United States prison on a drug conviction—and Roberto D'Aubuisson, who organized many of El Salvador's notorious death squads.

In response, many of us have been calling for the school to be shut down and for disclosure of the school's curriculum. Well, we got our second wish last year. In September 1996, the U.S. Army released portions of a training manual used at the school during the 1980's. The manual revealed what we have suspected all along: Latin American military officers were taught to intimidate, torture, and kill to achieve their political objectives.

According to the Pentagon itself, School of the Americas students were taught to imprison and execute their opponents. To use motivation by fear. To subvert the press. And to use torture, blackmail, and truth serum to obtain information.

This is unacceptable. U.S. foreign policy should not promote these tactics. And they have no place in a school funded by our tax dollars and taught by U.S. instructors on U.S. soil.

The United States stands for democracy and respect for individual rights. Its foreign policy must always be conducted with a commitment to these principles. The School of the Americas violated this fundamental tenet. It is time to close down the school for good.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING COSTS OF THE PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE PROGRAM AND NATO EXPANSION

SEC. 572. It is the sense of the Congress that all member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) should contribute their proportionate share to pay for the costs of the Partnership for Peace program and for any future costs attributable to the expansion of NATO.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that simply, frankly, expresses the sense of Congress that all member countries of NATO should be responsible for paying their fair share for the cost of the Partnership for Peace Program and to future NATO expansion.

Mr. Chairman, let me read my amendment specifically just for those Members who wish it to be clarified. It says that, ''It is the sense of Congress that all member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) should contribute their proportionate share to pay for the costs of the Partnership for Peace program and for any future costs attributable to the expansion of NATO.''

Mr. Chairman, many of us are concerned with recent statements by Mr. Chirac of France that his nation would be unwilling to contribute to the expansion of NATO. Now, as all my colleagues know, NATO agreed to invite Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into the organization last week in Spain. Mr. Chirac is apparently upset that the nations of Romania and Slovenia will not yet be admitted into NATO and is, therefore, threatening not to pay for this current expansion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is our responsibility to send Mr. Chirac and our NATO allies in Europe a strong message that they must pay their proportionate share of the defense of Europe. If they do not, the Congress must look at various options in response. One option would be refusing the reentry of France into NATO's unified military command structure, from which France unilaterally withdrew in 1966.

Or perhaps we should adhere to a cap in spending on NATO expansion, as other Members have suggested. Congress may even debate whether we should force nations that do not pay for the current expansion to incur all the costs for the next round of NATO expansion.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, whatever we choose to do in the future, I believe this is a good amendment for right now that will send a clear message to certain European allies in NATO that Congress will not allow the United States to continue paying a larger share of Europe's defense, while other nations opt out of contributing their fair share.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be a coauthor with the gentleman from Florida on this amendment. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the American taxpayers have been paying for the protection of the free world and there was a time when that was absolutely necessary. But we have rebuilt most of Europe; we brought Japan back to its feet. Every time there is a problem, there is a phone call, 9–1–1 and America sends our young people over to fight and our dollars and our American Express card.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Europe and NATO members in this expansion should not only pay their fair share, they should be paying the bulk of it. We are the major support for freedom and we, in fact, ensure that freedom through a tremendous military appropriation.

So I stand strong for this, but I just want to tell my colleagues that it is the sense of the Congress.

Now, at some point I am going to offer a very simple amendment that will either be stricken by a point of

order or it will have to be defeated. But the amendment that I plan to offer in conjunction with the efforts here of the gentleman from Florida will say that none of the funds in this act may be used to pay for NATO expansion not authorized by law.

Unless there would be some existing law that would authorize the use of the funds, there could not be an appropriation account that could be created to provide NATO expansion funds.

Mr. Chairman, that could be a little controversial and I do not want to do that. But my people have paid taxes all these years and we keep having all of these accounts, billions and billions of dollars. I think it is time that these countries who benefit from our taxpayers' commitments start to pay their fair share.

So, Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Florida, and I am proud to be associated with the gentleman.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the substance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS]. I would note, however, that this authorization language should not even be in our bill. But since the amendment was made in order under the rule, I will accept his amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

□ 1615

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 79 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds in this Act may be used to pay for NATO Expansion not authorized by law.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is the exact language that was placed in the defense appropriations bill. There is not a chairman of the House that I have any more respect for. And when I offered this amendment originally, the bill was to have been scheduled on a particular day and it had not been printed in the RECORD at that time. I printed it in the RECORD in a timely manner, and it was printed in the RECORD, and I guess we will have to now debate the germaneness and whether or not it is subject to a point of order.

It is straightforward, as it was in the defense appropriations bill. It should not be controversial. This appropriations bill has taken pains to try and remove authorization from, in fact, its line item.

The Traficant amendment basically says none of the funds in this bill may be used to pay for NATO expansion not authorized by law. This does not tie the hands of the appropriators. The appropriators could provide whatever money is necessary, but that money that is provided must have been authorized by law. If it was not authorized by law, that appropriation cannot appear.

I would like to talk some business about NATO here. We talk a good game about NATO. Members go home and campaign about all the money our taxpayers are putting into NATO and how we have got to stop that and let everybody else pay their own way. But when we come down to the real fine print of the law, we continue to leave open an opportunity for funds to go for NATO expansion.

This is, in my opinion, a strict appropriations bill. It is germane. It is the right thing to do. If it is authorized by law, we can give it all the money that you want.

I want to say one other thing: We collect taxes from hard-working people. We are paying for troops that are stationed all over the world, falling out of chairs without armrests, regarding borders in Bosnia and the Middle East.

We just had a debate on the war on drugs. We have got open borders in America. We have yet to in fact have a reasonable military program and a responsible drug program in this country. But when we are talking about NATO expansion, I will go along with what the rule of Congress is, but I would say this to the distinguished chairman of the authorizing committee: What Congress authorizes for NATO expansion should be what is appropriated for NATO expansion.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order, and I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] withdraws his reservation of a point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE IN INDIA

SEC. 572. Not more than $41,775,000 of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available for assistance in India.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 15 minutes, divided between an opponent and proponent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have several speakers on this side who would like to speak for 5 minutes each. We think we have three. So we think we need 15 minutes on this side.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I will amend my request to say 30 minutes divided 15 minutes for proponents, 15 minutes for opponents.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding there are two amendments or one?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, this unanimous consent is on this first amendment, 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. ACKERMAN. We have three speakers on this side. We have two Members on the gentleman's side who would like to speak on our time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, may I suggest to the gentleman, could not the Members take 4 minutes each instead of 5?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, does that apply to the gentleman from Indiana as well?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the time limitation applies to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] as well. If he wants to take all of it, he can take all of it.

Mr. PALLONE. My question, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is whether the speakers who are speaking against the gentleman from Indiana's amendment would be taking up the time on our

side as opposed to the time on the gentleman's side?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it would determine who yielded time to them.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, what we need on our side for our Members is 15 minutes on each amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, in light of that and in light of the congressional schedule with the House going in at 5 p.m., I think that it is only appropriate that we take up one of the Burton amendments today if we are going to have a time constraint at 15 minutes, half an hour or 15 minutes; or why do we not just go under the 5-minute rule until 5 p.m. and end at a time certain?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of it is in order that we could get through today with the debate on the Burton amendments, then leave tomorrow only the Smith and the Gilman amendments for debate.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's goal and I think that is a good try, but clearly there is more interest in the Burton amendments, and it appears that with the interest we are only going to be able to get through one amendment if we are going to abide by the House schedule of going back in at 5 p.m., so we will have one more amendment tomorrow if Mr. BURTON decides to offer it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, my unanimous consent is then 20 minutes on each side, and then if there is an objection, there is an objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, 20 minutes on each side on each amendment, 20 minutes on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York continue to reserve the right to object or does he withdraw his reservation?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman says ''on our side,'' I understand there are several Republican Members who want to speak against the amendment. If that 20 minutes is limited to everyone who wants to speak against the amendment, we probably do not have enough time, unless I am missing something.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, we have two on this side that I know of. How many does the gentleman have on that side?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have three that we know of.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, so we could do it in 25 minutes, 4 minutes each. We could do it in 20 minutes.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Would the gentleman from Indiana Mr. BURTON be limited by those same restraints as the rest of the Members of the House of Representatives?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think the Rules of the House on division of time, like this is, the proponents and the opponents have an equal amount of time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are trying to work it out equitably so that we can accommodate everybody who would like to speak.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has five Members against one. I think that is fair odds. But I do not want to give up time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there are others who would like to agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has withdrawn the request.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I read Cyrano de Bergerac as a boy. And when I read Cyrano de Bergerac, at one point in the play he is challenged by what he thought were 100 of the opponents. He was in the bakery shop and his friends came in. There were 100 of the enemy trying to kill his friends. And he said he thought the lovely Roxanne was in love with him. And he pulled out his sword and he ran to the door and said, only a 100. I do not mind if it is five or ten of my colleagues against me, as long as we have a fair distribution of the time. I feel kind of honored that I would be put in the same category as Cyrano de Bergerac.

Let me get to the point of the debate, talking about on this particular issue.

Mr. Chairman, we talk about tragedies and human rights violations all over the world. Right now, in the news today, they were talking about digging up possibly hundreds, maybe thousands of bodies in Bosnia. And that is a tragedy. That is something we should be very concerned about because human rights violations, wherever they occur, should be brought to the attention of the world and should be stopped.

We reprimand China for its draconian abortion policies and we threaten to stop international military and educational training, IMET, from Indonesia for abuses in East Timor. We talk about the struggles in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia that I just alluded to. We even criticize longstanding allies like Turkey for its treatment of its Kurdish citizens without addressing the brutal murders carried out by the PKK, a Kurdish Marxist terrorist organization.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, there is one human rights issue that continues to escape the attention of this administration and this country and some Members of the Congress and especially the media. And that issue involves India and its human rights abuses and the violations against the Sikhs and the Kashmiris and the Christians in Nagaland and the plight of the untouchables, the lowest caste in India's caste system.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian Government is one of the world's worst human rights abusers. You may ask, if that is true, why does not the world know? It is because Amnesty International and the International Red Cross is not allowed into the places where they are perpetrating these atrocities.

□ 1630

In Punjab, in Kashmir, in Nagaland. Let me just tell my colleagues, since 1947, over 200,000 Christians have been killed in Nagaland. I know it is horrible what is going on in Bosnia, and what has gone on in Bosnia. But 200,000 Christians have been killed since 1947 by the Indian Government and their troops in Nagaland since 1947. A quarter of a million, 250,000 Sikhs, have been killed in Punjab between 1984 and 1992, and more since then. Those are the latest numbers we have that we think are accurate. Fifty-three thousand Muslims have been killed in Kashmir since 1988.

For the past 15 years, I have been coming to this well to call attention to Punjab, where the Indian military receives cash bounties for the slaughter of innocent children and, to justify their action, these people are labeled terrorists, these kids. According to our own State Department, the United States State Department, India paid over 41,000 cash bounties to police for killing innocent people from 1991 to 1993 alone. Also in Punjab, Sikhs are picked up in the middle of the night only to be found floating dead in canals with their hands and feet bound together, and there is documentation to that fact, and many are never found.

Recently India's Central Bureau of Investigation, the CBI, told the Supreme Court that it had confirmed nearly 1,000 cases of unidentified bodies that were cremated by their military. They just happened to find 1,000 bodies and burned them up. Where did they come from? I submit they came from the same source that I was talking about just a moment ago, from the Indian troops in Kashmir and Punjab and Nagaland.

It does not get any better in Kashmir. Women, because of their Muslim beliefs, are taken out of their homes in the middle of the night and are gang-raped by Indian troops while their husbands are forced to stay in the House at gunpoint. This is a fact. This is not just me talking. It is a fact.

It was hoped that the new government in Delhi and Punjab would stop the repression which the Indian Supreme Court describes as worse than a genocide. The Indian Supreme Court

describes what is going on as worse than a genocide.

Mr. Chairman, opponents will say that the recent election in Punjab of a Sikh-dominated coalition and the fact that an untouchable is now the President of India is evidence of the new democratic process. But I can tell my colleagues that this new government in Punjab is closely aligned with the authoritarian Prime Minister Gudjaral of India and India's untouchable President is merely a figurehead.

Mr. Chairman, would democracies continue the rampant campaign of genocide? There are 550,000 troops, Indian troops in Punjab and 550,000 Indian troops in Kashmir.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, people are afraid to go outside at night and they worry about that knock on the door that we remember back during the horrible perils of Hitler in World War II when the Jews were taken out in the middle of the night, never to be seen again. That is going on today in Punjab and Kashmir and Nagaland in India. It is not the Indian people. We are not taking issue with the Indian people. It is the repressive policies of the Indian military and the Indian government.

On July 12, 1997, just about a month ago, a month and a half, in Bombay, 33 Dalits, those are called black untouchables that I would say to my friends in the Black Caucus, they ought to listen to this, black untouchables, were killed by the Indian police during demonstrations. Thirty-three of them were killed. On July 8, 1997, 36 people were killed in a train bombing in Punjab and 2 ministers of the Punjab government have blamed the Punjab police. The bombing occurred a day after 9 policemen were convicted of murder. Nine policemen were convicted of murder a day after this bombing occurred.

On March 15, 1997, a death squad picked up Kashmir Singh, an opposition party member. He was thrown in a van, tortured and murdered. Finally his bullet ridden body was dumped on the roadside. These military forces operate beyond the law and with complete impunity and the world does not know because they will not let human rights groups in there, they will not let the international Red Cross in there, they will not let TV in there because they do not want the world to see. We heard about Bosnia, we heard about Somalia, we heard about Ethiopia when Mengistu was there, but we do not hear about what is going on over there because they will not let us in.

The Indian lobby has a lot of friends in the Congress who are going to be their spokesmen today and they will be speaking up for them. I presume I will be the only one speaking for the people in Kashmir, Punjab and Nagaland, but I do not mind that. We should not support a government that condones widespread abuses with our tax dollars. All I am asking for is to send a signal. Cut 25 percent of the development aid we are sending to India. We probably should not be sending it there anyhow, any of it. But at least cut 25 percent to send a very strong signal that we do not support a government that allows those human rights abuses to take place.

Mr. Chairman, the Sikhs, the Muslims, the Christians, the untouchables, and the women of India are desperately looking to this Congress for help. The time has come for action. It is time for America to take a stand and to pass this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration has requested $56 million this year for development aid to India. India already receives $51 million. That means a $4.5 to $5 million increase from last year. My amendment would not allow more than $42 million to go. That is a 25-percent cut. That is a fair figure, and it sends a strong signal.

I would like to point out one more thing. We have here a picture, and this is the latest picture of what is going on in India. This is the tortured body of an unidentified Sikh. The Indian police have literally scalped this man. It is a young fellow, the police have seared his body with a hot iron rod and they cut off his fingers. That is what is going on today and that is what my colleagues are going to be saying does not occur. But I am telling Members it is here, it is happening. Women are being gang-raped in Kashmir because they are Muslim and they know if they are defiled, they will not be married, because of their religion and they take them out and gang-rape them and hold their husbands inside. It is a horrible thing that is going on over there and we keep giving aid to this country. This country has not been a friend of the United States in the past. During the cold war they supported the Soviet Union. They do not vote with us in the United Nations. Yet we continue to give them support. We ought to send a signal to them, at least on this one issue. Human rights violations, for God's sake, should not be tolerated anyplace in the world, and it is going on by the hundreds of thousands over there. We need to send them a signal.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, asked the question, who will speak for the people who are the victims of violence in Punjab and Kashmir and other places. Let me assure the gentleman that I do and we all do because we decry violence and we decry the abuses of human beings anywhere for any reason. But what the gentleman seeks to do is to punish an entire nation, the largest democracy in the world collectively, for random acts of a few that take place. He brings us one picture and cites hundreds of thousands. How do we condemn a whole nation because of that? That is nothing but India bashing, Mr. Chairman. Do we condemn our own Government because people put a bounty on people's heads in Arizona and people moved in and murdered them? Is that the fault of the whole American Government and the American people?

I would like to cite an article that appeared in the Hill newspaper. It is a quote by a gentleman of the House who shows an unbelievable amount of understanding when talking about the Government of Turkey and he says, ''When you have military conflicts,'' and the gentleman here is talking about insurgencies taking place against existing governments, he says, ''When you have military conflicts, you're bound to have unfortunate things happen,'' he said. Continuing the quote, ''People get killed, they're bombed and shot. These things happen,'' he said understandingly and justified, ''incidental and anecdotal things that happen during these times of conflict.'' Who was the gentleman who said that, so understanding of the Government of Turkey? It is the very same gentleman from Indiana who just took the well and offered this amendment. How can he justify it in the case of one country and oppose it when it comes to another country?

The gentleman offers up four amendments. Dr. Alukh mysteriously appears in the Halls of the House, in the gallery, it happens each and every time, and the India bashing begins. This, Mr. Chairman, is totally unacceptable. This is not the way two great democracies view each other or treat each other. The gentleman complains of human rights abuses, but he ignores the genuine progress that India has made on this question. According to the State Department report which he only quotes in part, it says ''India made further progress in resolving human rights problems.'' The same report notes that newspapers and magazines ''regularly publish investigative reports and allegations of government wrongdoing, and the press as a whole champions human rights and criticizes'' whenever there is a government lapse. Beyond this, the Indian Government has appointed a National Human Rights Commission with powers to investigate and to recommend policy changes and punishment and compensation in cases of incidental police abuse wherever it might happen to take place. Again in the State Department report that the gentleman quoted only in part, ''The NHRC continued to enlarge its useful role in addressing the patterns of abuse, as well as specific abuses.''

In particular, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is concerned about human rights in the states of Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir. Last year there was an election in Punjab where 65 percent of the eligible voters turned out in a Sikh-dominated government. This is the very minority that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]

claims the Indian Government oppresses. There were also elections in Kashmir which restored elected government there for the first time in 6 years.

I think, Mr. Chairman, what we have discovered, with the unwitting help of the gentleman from Indiana, is that India is a fully functioning, mature democracy with a free press, with civilian control of the military, with an independent judiciary, and very active political parties and civic associations. It seems to me that the oldest democracy in the world should not be sanctioning the largest. That is not the way democracies treat each other.

In addition to India's thriving democratic institutions, the current united front government led by Prime Minister Gudjaral has pledged, as has the finance minister with whom the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and myself met with only a week ago, has pledged to continue the economic reforms of the past 6 years. These reforms have provided enormous opportunities for United States business and, in fact, the United States is now India's largest overseas investor, its biggest trading partner and its preferred source of high-technology.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a deliberate and specific attempt to stigmatize India at a point where the relationship between the world's two great democracies has flowered. I urge all of my colleagues to stand and to defeat this amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the comments by the gentleman from Indiana. I do not know if he is going to be the only speaker in favor of the amendment. I certainly hope he is. But if he is the only one, it is because he is basically giving the House outdated, exaggerated, and inaccurate information about the situation in India. He said that India is not a friend of the United States. Just the opposite is true. India is the world's largest democracy. India, last year, had the largest democratic election, the largest number of people participating in a democratic process in the history of the world as far as we know. He talks about the signal that this might send. What signal is sent by this body if we were to pass an amendment that chastises the world's largest democracy, a country that seeks every day to be our friend more and more, and which at the same time over the last few years has established a National Human Rights Commission that has been seeking out any violations of human rights, that has brought people to trial, that probably now sets an example not only for South Asia and for Asia but for the rest of the world in terms of its going after and fettering out human rights violations. It would send a terrible signal to the rest of the world if this body, the greatest democracy in the world, if this House of Representatives, were to chastise India for the things that it has accomplished in the last few years.

I just want to say, in the past the gentleman from Indiana has criticized India on human rights. Let me give my colleagues some information. The independent National Human Rights Commission with unprecedented powers has been in operation now for 3 years. Some of the members have been here to talk to us as Members of our House of Representatives. The commission has been lauded by many international agencies, including our own State Department, for its aggressiveness and independence. The chairman of India's National Human Rights Commission has met with representatives of Asia Watch, Amnesty International and the International Red Cross. The steps taken by India to remedy human rights problems is far superior to any of the efforts of India's neighbors, in particular, Pakistan and China which I think the gentleman from Indiana mentioned.

□ 1645

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana is suggesting that his amendment would put pressure on the Government of India to improve its record on human rights. In fact, if this amendment were to become law, it would greatly reduce America's ability to positively influence the Indian Government in any way. Punitive measures like this amendment only serve to isolate the Indian Government, give aid and comfort to political forces in India who oppose closer ties with the United States, and ultimately set back the process of political and economic reform in India.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that this debate over human rights in India is focusing entirely on one side of the issue, and what is lost is the fact that terrorist organizations operating within India's borders pose a constant ongoing threat to peace, stability and, yes, to human rights.

Militant separatist groups often operate with no accountability. Calling themselves freedom fighters, these organizations reserve onto themselves the right to strike at civilian targets in India with impunity. Furthermore, many of the militant organizations receive support, both moral and financial, as well as arms and training, from other nations, specifically Pakistan which has frequently been linked to terrorist organizations in India in a direct attempt to destabilize its neighbor, and under these conditions imposing punishment by this House on the Government of India will have the unmistakable effect of encouraging and emboldening these groups which seek by violent means to pursue their separatist agenda. This is not the type of behavior that this House of Representatives should be condoning.

I visited India earlier this year, Mr. Chairman, and I had the opportunity to see firsthand why this amendment would be a disaster. First, my colleague from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN] talked about the situation in the Indian State of Punjab. Earlier this year the people of Punjab held elections in which the Sikh-dominated Akali Dal Party was swept into power. Voter turnout was 67 percent, better than we generally do here in the United States in most of our elections.

In the Punjabi capital of Chandigarh, I met with the newly elected Chief Minister of the State of Punjab, Mr. Prakash Singh Badal. He is a staunch defender of the Sikh people, but he is also deeply committed to working within India's democratic political system to advocate the political, economic, and social interests of his state and of the Sikh people.

He expressed his rejection of the separatist movement which has caused so much violence in recent years. His governing coalition includes a predominantly Hindu party, an indication that the Indian people want to work across ethnic and religious lines for the betterment of their entire society. This is the reality in today's Punjab. This is the reality in today's India. Everyone is working together to try to improve the situation. Human rights violations are being fettered out.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana's statements are not based on the accurate information of India today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the people of India have just celebrated their 50th anniversary of independence and democracy. It takes a special effort for Americans to imagine when our democracy was only 50 years old and the great hurdles we had to overcome to perfect our legal, political, economic, and social system.

India today is the world's largest democracy—950 million people. India is a multireligious, multiethnic society actively seeking to build a common national identity and overcome religious and ethnic conflict. In that half century India has struggled to overcome the legacy of feudalism followed by colonialism and all of the problems of underdevelopment and unequal development, including problems of population growth, capital formation, technology development, and infrastructure. They have shaped all of the basic institutions of a democratic system including, perhaps most significantly, many independent, nongovernmental institutions and organizations dedicated to involving and empowering people.

I rise here today in support of aid to India. Throughout my public career, I have worked with the Asian-Indian community.

My strong relationship with the Asian-Indian community in Chicago has afforded me the opportunity to meet with Indian officials who have visited Chicago and this interaction has helped me to understand how important democracy, economic development, and human rights are to India.

While the cold war no longer exists, our relations with South Asia must not be tainted by the cold war legacy.

There is a constant state of tension with neighbors like China and Pakistan—who have large and powerful militaries. Several states in India including Punjab and Kashmir have, in essence, been involved in a low-intensity war involving terrorism with foreign support as evidenced by the recent bombing of a train in Punjab resulting in 36 deaths. Despite the difficulties, India has proven that she will not tolerate violations of democracy and has acted to punish those guilty of violations of law and to reduce any such violations in the future.

The United States has become India's largest trading partner—now approaching $9.5 billion per year—and her largest investor. India has adjusted her tax policies to further encourage trade and has become a significant player in many fields including computer science.

Yet India is still a country in need of assistance and development especially in the most underdeveloped regions needing assistance with health and educational programs. These programs involve financial and technical support from the United States which is matched by volunteer equity on the part of the people of India. These program have proven themselves to be successful in addressing the problems of underdevelopment and also as powerful instrument of international understanding, communication, and trust.

It makes sense to continue our commitment to India. India is proving a success in its economic development and is a role model for other developing countries. We can take this opportunity now to improve our foreign policy relations with India. We can illustrate how the United States is a reliable friend and model.

A vote against India in this House, is not in the best interest of the United States and its reputation as a world leader. Therefore, I urge that we oppose any and all amendments that would single out India for a limitation on development assistance.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Burton amendment.

Since its independence 50 years ago, India has made tremendous progress in a number of key areas of United States foreign policy interest. First of all, it shares with the United States the values and institutions of free and democratic nations. Just last year, India held the largest democratic election in world history, an election that was universally regarded as free and fair, was contested by multiple political parties, and was scrutinized by an extensive free press.

Since the end of the cold war, India has embarked on an ambitious program of economic liberalization and market reforms. These reforms have helped bring the United States and India closer together in a cooperative spirit and have helped the United States to become India's largest trading partner.

In addition to progress at home, India also continues to improve its relations with its neighbors. Over the past year, Prime Minister Gujral, in an outreach effort begun during his tenure as Minister for External Affairs, has been at the forefront of initiatives to improve bilateral relations between India and its neighbors Bangladesh, Nepal, and Sri Lanka.

There also has been an important breakthrough this year in improving bilateral relations between India and Pakistan, a major goal of United States foreign policy in South Asia. In March, the Prime Minister of each country agreed to resume high-level talks which had been cut off since 1994. I was pleased that Prime Minister Gujral took the initiative to embark on such discussions so soon after assuming office. The two Prime Ministers met during the Asian summit in May of this year and agreement has already been reached on the establishment of working groups to explore solutions to the outstanding disputes between the two countries. Instead of undermining this important progress, U.S. foreign policy ought to be aimed at extending support for and encouraging the efforts being made by the prime minister of each nation to seek solutions to longstanding bilateral disputes.

Far from withdrawing from our growing cooperation and increasingly improving relations with India, as the Burton amendment would have us do, now is the time for the United States to deepen its commitment to strengthening relations between our two countries. As we commemorate the 50th anniversary of India's independence this year, United States relations with India should move forward, not backward. I urge all Members to vote against this amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Burton amendment, which would limit development assistance to India.

Mr. Speaker, it is 1 year later and we are still fighting the same fight. We defeated a similar amendment last year by an overwhelming margin—296 to 127.

I am proud to be a member of the Congressional India Caucus, and was pleased to travel to India recently.

On August 15, we celebrated India's 50th anniversary of democratic self rule. Passage of this amendment will have a devastating effect on the growing relationship between India and the United States.

The United States is now India's largest overseas investor and its biggest trading partner.

Since 1991, major Fortune 500 companies have invested in India. The Commerce Department has designated India as one of the most important ''Big Emerging Markets.''

Mr. Speaker, American businesses recognize the importance of a strong relationship with India.

The gentleman from Indiana appears to have a noble purpose—to focus the attention of the House on human rights abuses. But despite his intentions, the amendment will do great harm to the very people it purports to help.

Yes, India has had problems with human rights in the past. But this nation—this great democracy—has taken exceptionally strong steps forward.

In fact, India's Human Rights Commission, headed by a former Supreme Court Justice, has been hailed by the State Department for its ''significant progress in resolving human rights problems.''

Freezing developmental assistance would hurt the poorest of the poor in India. The amendment would directly undermine the stated objectives of India's democratically elected Prime Minister to improve the living conditions of the country's poorest citizens. And finally, this amendment would be an enormous blow to United States-Indian relations at the very moment when we should be strengthening ties between our two democracies.

Last year, India held a critical and historic election—300 million people went to the polls in what the New York Times' William Safire called ''the most breathtaking example of government by people in the history of the world.''

The world's most populous democracy proved that its most powerful weapon is the ballot, not the bullet.

We must not pass a punitive anti-India amendment on the heels of this election.

United States-India relations are strong. American businesses are flourishing in India.

Let's send the world's most populous democracy the right message.

Let's vote for progress in India.

Let's vote for democracy.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the Burton amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition today to the amendment offered by my colleague from Indiana. I must admit that I fail to understand why this esteemed Member, who has not even taken the time to travel to India to see her progress first hand, insists on demonizing an important ally.

I was fortunate, over the August recess, to join Chairman GILMAN on a House International Relations Committee Codel to Asia. We were in India on the 50th anniversary of her independence. I saw first hand India's thriving democracy, independent, nongovernmental institutions, a raucous free press, an independent judiciary, a welcoming, albeit suspicious economic sector, and a friendly, English-speaking people who are schooled in democratic values and who both value and demand their personal liberties. I saw a country of almost a billion people virtually begging for closer ties and friendship with the United States.

I realize that India is not perfect. I continued to be concerned with India's nuclear proliferation, human rights abuses, strife in Kashmir, and the occasional lack of hospitality toward foreign investment and infrastructure-building projects.

But as I have said many times in the past, we can have more influence using a carrot with the Indians than with a stick. Considering some of the other countries in the region with whom we are seeking better ties, India looks like a bargain to me. Oppose the Burton amendment.

Ms. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rose before this committee over a year ago and I now stand before you today, once again to strongly urge a vote against this amendment.

The Burton amendment, whether it freezes, cuts, or caps foreign assistance to India, is a step in the wrong direction. The new Government of India is moving at a rapid pace to strengthen its ties with the United States and the world.

The economic and diplomatic relationship between the United States, the world's oldest democracy, and India, the world's largest democracy, would receive a harmful blow with successful passage of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Government of India has been on a constant pace of change since

1991. The 1996 election featured the world's largest voter turnout, practically free of violence. The 1997 election featured the victory of Prime Minister I.K. Gujral, who is of Punjabi descent, the very region that Mr. BURTON claims human rights violations are taking place.

On the subject of the State of Punjab, the Sikh minority dominated the ruling party in open democratic elections. Voter turnout was 65 percent.

Prime Minister Gujral, in his first month of leadership, engaged in direct talks with newly elected Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan. A hotline phone system was established in a commitment to bring peace to the two nations.

So let us as Members of Congress not view the Government of India as being callous to these alleged human rights violations. India has made great strides in their battle to bring together the States of Kashmir, Jammu, Nagaland, and Punjab.

Recent reports by the U.S. State Department declare that India has ''made further progress in resolving human rights problems.''

It would be false and misdirected to say that India is not our friend. U.S. business in India has grown at an astonishing rate of nearly 50 percent a year since 1991, with the United States becoming India's largest trading partner and largest investor.

As India prepares to celebrate its 50th anniversary of democratic self rule, let us not break the ties that we have so diligently strived to assemble. Vote ''no'' on the Burton amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER LIMITATION OF AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2159, no further amendments shall be in order in the Committee of the Whole except the amendment Number 1 in House Report 105–184, and the amendment to that amendment, under the terms of the order of the House of July 24, 1997, and the pending amendment, Number 38, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and the amendment, Number 40, offered by Mr. BURTON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that under the two Burton amendments there is no limitation on the time? We will be under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to double check amendments 38 and 40. Now 38 is the one that we are on?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, that is the one we are on now, and 40 is the one the gentleman from Indiana indicated he wanted to introduce.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

VACATING REQUEST FOR RECORDED VOTE ON BEREUTER AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the request for a recorded vote on the Bereuter amendment, Number 53, on H.R. 2159.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] prevails by voice vote.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2209, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 2209, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SERANNO

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SERRANO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2209, be instructed to agree to the position in Senate amendment numbered 1 with respect to the account ''Joint Committee on Taxation'' providing not more than a 4.64 percent increase for the Joint Committee on Taxation compared to an 8 percent increase in the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] and the other gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my motion would simply direct the House conferees to do the fiscally responsible thing when we take up the funding level for the Joint Committee on Taxation and agree to the Senate position. The Senate bill would give the Joint Committee on Taxation a tidy 4.6-percent increase over last year. We think that it is more than fair.

The House bill, in my view, was overly generous in providing an 8-percent increase for this office. In comparison, in the name of fiscal discipline, both bills provide increases of only 3.6 percent for the operation of the House and less than 2 percent for such vital agencies as a Congressional Budget Office and the Government Printing Office [GPO]. The House bill actually cuts funding for the General Accounting Office by $8 million below last year.

In light of these funding levels, it is inappropriate and inconsistent to turn around and reward one office with an 8-percent increase. Moreover, the justification for this increase does not stand up to any reasonable level of scrutiny. I think the American people could question why we would increase the staff of this office the year after work is completed on a major tax bill, especially when at the same time we are cutting GAO whose main purpose is to look for wasteful Federal spending and save taxpayers money. If the existing staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation could operate effectively this year when they worked on what we are told over and over again was a major historic tax bill, one would think they could manage the work load during a more routine year without all this extra staff.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are simply calling on the House to be more consistent in imposing fiscal austerity within the legislative branch. We should treat all offices the same, not give special treatment to a favored few.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion.

The intent of the motion is to eliminate the five additional full-time

equivalent positions the bill provides for the Joint Committee on Taxation. The committee bill has already reduced the budget submitted by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] by seven positions, or $219,000. Chairman ARCHER, who also chairs the Committee on Ways and Means, testified that he needed 12 more staff positions to do the additional work mandated on the Joint Committee on Taxation's staff.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the Joint Committee on Taxation provides invaluable work for the House and the Senate through the support they give to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee. They do much of the technical work on all revenue bills. They also analyze tax treaties entered into between the U.S. Government and other countries, and they also review all large tax refunds issued by the Treasury Department.

During the past 5 years, the economists, lawyers, and accountants of the Joint Committee on Taxation have averaged over 2,000 revenue estimates requested by Members and committees in connection with the proposed tax legislation. In addition, the staff has reviewed several hundred large tax refunds. Last year, they reviewed 486 refund reports with a dollar value of over $4.6 billion. They found concerns in 103 of these cases, concerns of over and underfunding or errors that needed to be corrected.

So this committee does a great deal of technical work in support of the congressional revenue and tax treaty process, and they also oversee large tax refund work of the Internal Revenue Service.

In asking for a staffing increase this year, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] outlined additional responsibilities that have been given to the Joint Committee on Taxation. A new requirement imposed by House rule XIII to make dynamic estimates in major tax legislation; determining unfunded mandates contained in revenue legislation; and we saw the President exercise his line-item veto on this most recent tax measure. The Joint Committee on Taxation will be called upon to determine limited tax benefits that are eligible for consideration. He has asked for, the chairman has asked for, 12 more FTE's to do this work; the committee bill only allows 5. We removed 7 FTE's during the full committee consideration of the bill after the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and others indicated their concern for such a large increase. So we have gone more than half way in meeting their concern.

The bill provides funding for an FTE level of 66. It puts the full-time equivalent positions back at the level they were funded at in 1988. This increase would bring them, the Joint Committee on Taxation, up to the level of 1988. All we have done is put them back to where they were 10 years ago.

I heard this concern in the full committee, and I offered an amendment that reduces the subcommittee mark of 12 additional FTE's to 5. The Committee on Appropriations heard this concern, considered the prudence of restraint, and accepted a staff level of a decade ago and reported the bill with those limited resources.

Mr. Speaker, the House has voted on this; the House has taken a position supporting the House's position. This motion would have us agree with the Senate's position, and I strongly urge that the House vote to reject this motion.

The House of Representatives approved a fiscal year 1998 funding level for the Joint Committee on Taxation of $5,907,000, an increase of $437,000 over fiscal year 1997. This amount is less than the $6,126,000 requested by Ways and Means Committee Chairman BILL ARCHER and Senate Finance Committee Chairman BILL ROTH.

The $437,000 increase in appropriation approved by the House would be allocated as follows:

Cost-of-living adjustments (salaries and equipment): $161,000 and salaries for new hires: $276,000.

The increase attributable to cost-of-living adjustments matches the assumed Federal employee cost-of-living adjustment. The salaries for new hires would be used primarily to fill a portion of the increased FTE positions with additional professional staff—2–3 staff economists, 1 attorney, and 1–2 computer specialists or support staff.

The House approved an increase of 5 FTE's for the Joint Committee on Taxation for fiscal year 1998. The Joint Committee has 61 authorized staff positions for fiscal year 1997. Other than fiscal year 1996, in which the authorized staff positions were 63, the authorized staff levels have not, since 1980, been below 66 positions. Thus, the FTE's authorized by the House would provide the Joint Committee with the same number of FTE's as in fiscal year 1980. The attached summary sheet shows that the Joint Committee FTE's remained relatively stable over the fiscal year 1980–1997 period. Thus, when other staffs may have been growing during the 1980's, the Joint Committee did not see the same burgeoning of staff. By way of comparison, the Congressional Budget Office has an appropriation for fiscal year 1997 of $24,532,000 and 232 authorized FTE's, compared to $5,470,000 and 61 FTE's for the Joint Committee on Taxation.

The Joint Committee on Taxation needs additional funding to fulfill new responsibilities that have been assigned to it. In addition to the traditional role of the Joint Committee staff in the development, drafting, and estimating of proposed revenue legislation, the Joint Committee staff is now responsible for determining the possible unfunded mandates contained in revenue legislation and identifying the limited tax benefits subject to the Line Item Veto Act. In addition, a new House rule for the 105th Congress requires the staff of the Joint Committee to estimate the possible macroeconomic, or dynamic, scoring effects of major revenue legislation. The Joint Committee staff presently has neither the personnel nor the computer capabilities to satisfy the requirement of this rule.

Since calendar year 1992, the Joint Committee on Taxation has received, on average, over 2,000 requests for revenue estimates a year. The Joint Committee currently has the staff resources to respond to approximately 50% of these requests. Unless the number of Joint Committee personnel are increased, the response rate to Members of Congress will not improve. This is not a question of staff not working to capacity. The Joint Committee staff devote all of their resources to the legitimate needs of the Congress, but they are frankly swamped with requests for assistance from Members of Congress that they cannot possibly satisfy at current staffing levels.

The Congress will require increased services of the Joint Committee on Taxation during fiscal year 1998. During the first part of fiscal year 1998, the Joint Committee staff will be completing its work investigating whether the Internal Revenue Service has exhibited bias in the selection of tax-exempt organizations for audit. In addition, the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation will be involved with the following legislative proposals during fiscal year 1998: (1) Reauthorization of the highway trust fund, (2) Possible Superfund legislation, (3) Legislation relating to the tobacco settlement, (4) Legislation relating to expiring tax provisions, (5) Consideration of 7 tax treaties by the Senate, (6) Legislation to reform the operations of the Internal Revenue Service, (7) Possible tax reduction proposals for 1998, and (8) Fundamental restructuring of the Federal tax system.

Contrary to what some have asserted, fiscal year 1998 will see increased demands by the Congress for the services of the Joint Committee on Taxation.

I will include the following for the RECORD:

HISTORY OF APPROPRIATIONS—JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION SINCE FISCAL YEAR 1980

Fiscal year	Appropriations	Authorized positions
1980		66
1981		68
1982		70
1983	$3,377,000	68
1984	3,483,000	66
1985	3,605,000	66
1986	3,546,000	66
1987	4,159,000	66
1988	4,219,000	66
1989	4,346,000	70
1990	4,353,000	70
1991	5,203,000	77
1992	5,759,000	77
1993	5,759,000	77
1994	5,701,000	77
1995	6,019,000	73
1996	5,116,000	63
1997	5,470,000	61
1998	[1] 6,126,000	[1] 73
	[2] 5,907,000	[2] 66
	[3] 5,724,000	

[1] Requested.
[2] House.
[3] Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], our ranking member.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I would urge the House to adopt this motion. I think there is absolutely no reason why joint committees ought to be allowed a higher level of funding than was approved for any other committee in this House when the committee funding resolution was brought to

the floor, especially in light of the nature of the publicity which has been directed lately at the committee that would be the beneficiary of the largess contained in the House bill.

I would like to read from a newspaper article from USA Today. It says tobacco industry representatives wrote the provision of the balanced budget law that allows cigarette makers to reduce their future liability in smoking related lawsuits, Congress' chief writer told USA Today. The industry wrote it and submitted it; we just used their language, Kenneth Kies, staff director of the Joint Committee on Taxation said.

Kies declined to identify the lobbyist who presented the provision or the company the lobbyist represented, but his statement is the first public acknowledgment that the controversial provision which could save cigarette manufacturers an estimated $50 billion over 20 years originated with the industry itself.

□ 1700

Now, that statement was made by the director of the committee, which is being given a higher level of funding than any other committee has been given this year. It seems to me that if the staff director for that committee admits that they are not even doing their own job and they are turning part of it over to K Street and the lobbyists downtown, they have given up any excuse for needing additional funding to prepare tax legislation.

We have already finished most of the tax legislation that we are going to see for this session and next. We have had a huge change in the Tax Code. It seems to me that it would be highly out of order to provide this special treatment for the Joint Tax Committee, especially when they indicate that they are allowing a lobbyist from K Street to write $50 billion amendments that are included in the major legislative action taken by the Congress this year.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge the support for the gentleman's motion.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just again urge my colleagues to reject this motion. This committee's work, this joint committee's work, is of very timely importance. We did just pass a major tax cut. Thank God that we did. We did it with bipartisan support. Although some of the proponents of this motion did not support that tax cut, the majority of the Congress of both parties did, also the Senate, and the President signed the bill, with a major reduction in income taxes for people with children, for capital gains, estate and death tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, this is only the beginning. We feel very strongly that this is just the first cut, that next year there should be another and the following year there should be another.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] has suggested very strongly that the Committee on Ways and Means is going to take a serious look at reforming our overall progressive income tax program and reforming the Internal Revenue Service. This is going to require staff work.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking for only a funding level equal to what was there when the Democratic Party controlled the House back in 1988. This is the staffing level they had. We have reduced this dramatically, but now we are starting to cut taxes, and the economy of the country is picking up and responding positively.

We do not want this to be the last tax cut. We want it to be the first tax cut. We would like to make sure that the work that the House and the Senate and the President have done is properly accounted for, and that we keep on target and in the direction of further reducing the tax burden on the American public.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct before us.

It doesn't make sense to me why the Joint Tax Committee needs all of the funding it receives in this bill. Last month, when we all thought the committee was busy writing the provisions of the tax bill, it turns out they were checking their mailbox for suggested provisions from lobbyists.

One such suggestion was a $50 billion giveaway to the tobacco industry that went directly from the desks of the industry lobbyists into the tax bill.

This provision will allow the big tobacco companies to reduce the payment they are required to make under a settlement by the amount collected in excise taxes on cigarettes. This is unacceptable.

That is why I introduced legislation with Senator DICK DURBIN that will repeal this middle-of-the-night giveaway. We must not allow American taxpayers to foot the bill for big tobacco's settlement with the American people.

This provision should never have been written into the tax bill in the first place, and it must be repealed immediately.

But in addition to repealing the provision, we must determine how it was slipped into the tax bill in the first place.

Fortunately, Kenneth Kies, the staff director of the Joint Tax Committee, answered this question for us August 29. When asked about this giveaway to the big tobacco companies, Mr. Kies was quoted in USA Today as saying, "The industry wrote it and submitted it, and we just used their language."

Mr. Speaker, if that is the way the Joint Tax Committee determined which provisions to include in the tax bill, there are far better ways to use taxpayers' dollars.

We must repeal this tobacco giveaway, and we must send a strong message to Mr. Kies and the Joint Tax Committee that the manner in which this provision was slipped into the tax bill is unacceptable. I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 208, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

YEAS—202

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Carson
Chabot
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klink
Klug
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Largent
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento

Visclosky	Waxman	Woolsey
Waters	Wexler	Wynn
Watt (NC)	Weygand	Yates

NAYS—208

Aderholt	Gibbons	Pappas
Archer	Gilchrest	Parker
Armey	Gillmor	Paul
Bachus	Gilman	Paxon
Baker	Goodlatte	Pease
Ballenger	Goodling	Peterson (MN)
Barr	Goss	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Petri
Bartlett	Granger	Pickering
Barton	Greenwood	Pitts
Bass	Gutknecht	Pombo
Bateman	Hansen	Porter
Bereuter	Hastert	Portman
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Quinn
Bliley	Hefley	Radanovich
Blunt	Herger	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hill	Redmond
Boehner	Hilleary	Regula
Bonilla	Hobson	Riggs
Bono	Hoekstra	Riley
Brady	Horn	Rogan
Bryant	Hostettler	Rogers
Bunning	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Hunter	Royce
Burton	Hutchinson	Ryun
Buyer	Hyde	Salmon
Callahan	Inglis	Sanford
Calvert	Jenkins	Saxton
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Scarborough
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer, Dan
Canady	Jones	Schaffer, Bob
Cannon	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Kelly	Sessions
Chambliss	Kim	Shadegg
Christensen	King (NY)	Shaw
Coble	Kingston	Shays
Collins	Kleczka	Shimkus
Combest	Knollenberg	Shuster
Cook	Kolbe	Skeen
Cooksey	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Cox	Latham	Smith (OR)
Crane	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Lazio	Snowbarger
Cubin	Leach	Solomon
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Davis (VA)	Lewis (KY)	Spence
Deal	Linder	Stump
DeLay	Livingston	Sununu
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Talent
Dickey	Lucas	Tauzin
Doolittle	Manzullo	Thomas
Dreier	McCrery	Thornberry
Duncan	McDade	Thune
Dunn	McHugh	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McIntosh	Walsh
Ehrlich	McKeon	Wamp
Emerson	Metcalf	Watkins
English	Mica	Watts (OK)
Everett	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Ewing	Moran (KS)	Weldon (PA)
Fawell	Morella	Weller
Foley	Myrick	White
Forbes	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Fowler	Ney	Wicker
Fox	Northup	Wolf
Franks (NJ)	Norwood	Young (AK)
Frelinghuysen	Nussle	Young (FL)
Ganske	Oxley	
Gekas	Packard	

NOT VOTING—23

Berman	Hall (OH)	Roukema
Capps	Hinchey	Rush
Dixon	Istook	Schiff
Engel	Lantos	Smith, Linda
Ensign	McCollum	Tanner
Furse	McInnis	Towns
Gallegly	Payne	Wise
Gonzalez	Rohrabacher	

□ 1727

Mr. Livingston changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. CHENOWETH and Messrs. CLAY, STOKES, DINGELL, and UPTON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 352, severe thunderstorms caused my plane to arrive late. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WALSH, YOUNG of Florida, CUNNINGHAM, WAMP, LATHAM, LIVINGSTON, SERRANO, FAZIO of California, OBEY, and Ms. KAPTUR.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2209) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2160, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN]?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. KAPTUR moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2160, be instructed to recede to the Senate regarding funding levels provided under the Food and Drug Administration for the program to prevent the use of tobacco products by minors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the motion I offer today instructs the conferees on the fiscal year 1998 Agriculture Appropriations Act to agree to the higher funding levels provided by the Senate for the Food and Drug Administration's Youth Tobacco Initiative.

Just this morning, Mr. Speaker, the Senate agreed to provide $34 million, which was the full budget request, for the Food and Drug Administration Program to assist our States in enforcement and outreach efforts related to rules to prevent children, our children, from purchasing tobacco as minors.

The House bill included $24 million for this important program, and originally the Senate had only provided $4.9 million. But this morning, in an act of great wisdom, the Senate, on an amendment that was voiced after substantial approval was given and a motion to table defeated, voted in the Senate to raise the level to $34 million, which was the full budget request.

Mr. Speaker, our bill here in the House included $24 million for this important program. Our motion would simply instruct our House conferees to agree to the funding levels for the Food and Drug Administration provided by the Senate, therefore, fully funding this important initiative to protect our Nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to point out, I suppose, that nearly 90 percent of adult smokers in our country began doing so before the age of 18. In fact, at current rates, more than 5 million children under age 18 who are alive today will be killed by smoking-related diseases. So we are talking about the lives of millions of our children.

We know that every year more than $1 billion in tobacco products are illegally sold to minors. I underline ''illegally'' sold to minors in this country. And as much as $50 billion is spent every year in our country on smoking-related medical care.

Providing $34 million, $10 million more than in the House agreement but meeting the full budget request, will help our States set up enforcement programs and educate retailers and the public on the new Food and Drug Administration youth tobacco rules. It seems to me this is the least we can do to protect our country's future and our children.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], I concur that this is a very important issue for all of us. I share the gentlewoman's concern, but we have many differences in these two bills, and I strongly believe that the House should not, should not be instructing its conferees to accept a Senate position on any issue before the conference has even begun.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees to fully fund the FDA's program to crack down on illegal tobacco sales to minors. I appreciate the assistance of Chairman SKEEN and other members of the subcommittee in providing $24 million for this important initiative in the House bill. But I hope that in conference that we can join the Senate and provide the entire $34 million needed to stop our youngsters from taking up smoking and becoming addicted.

Facts of underage tobacco use are undisputed. Every single day 3,000 young people under the age of 18 who cannot even buy tobacco legally, become regular smokers. Selling tobacco to minors is illegal in all 50 States, but studies show that children can buy tobacco 67 percent of the time. What does this teach our children? It teaches them to smoke and it also teaches them that there are no penalties for breaking the law.

The FDA plan will help retailers understand and comply with the law. It enables strict enforcement by checking that stores require people who look younger than age 27 show an ID card before they buy cigarettes. It is a perfectly legitimate practice with regard to the sale of alcohol. It is an enforcement mechanism, it is an outreach mechanism, and it does not set up any, and I repeat, it does not set up any new government bureaucracy.

□ 1745

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal reported that 83 percent of the Members of the other body who took tobacco money last year voted against fully funding this provision. I would like to think that Members of this body today will be voting on this motion based on what is best for America's children and not on what is best for their campaign coffers.

Frankly, the tobacco industry has no reason to oppose this motion because this money all goes toward endorsing current law. This is no new law that is being talked about. But perhaps because 90 percent of all smokers start the habit by age 18, the tobacco companies are concerned that cracking down on youth smoking will hurt their businesses.

I would be ashamed if any Member of this body voted against this resolution as payback for a campaign contribution. This motion is about saving lives. Investing a small amount in prevention today is going to yield enormous savings down the road, not only in dollars for reduced medical costs but in the lives of our young people who can be saved.

I urge my colleagues to support the motion to instruct.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just wanted to mention that for Members who are listening on the floor or maybe listening to these remarks over their televisions in their offices, if you look at the budget issue involved here, and I wanted to place this on the record because it is important, voting for this motion to instruct is a very responsible vote.

Both the House and the Senate have decided within their respective appropriations committees for different marks, different funding levels for agriculture functions. In the Senate, the Agriculture Subcommittee allocations were much higher than in the House. In fact, they have $30 million more in budget authority and over $200 million more in outlays. As we go to conference, we have to conference on that as well.

So I want to assure my colleagues that the flexibility within the budget exists and we are not asking for anything unreasonable in this motion to instruct. We are again asking our House colleagues to agree with what the Senate has done and to instruct our conferees to agree to the $34 million youth tobacco prevention initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for her leadership and advocacy of this issue. I recognize the sensitivity of the chairman as well, but would respectfully disagree. I would respectfully disagree with the approach. It is vital and imperative that this motion to instruct conferees is passed by this body.

There is a whole lot of barking going around about what we intend to do about preventing children from engaging in the beginning of tobacco use, or smoking, but there is not a lot of bite. This is a simple instruction that simply provides the bite that is needed to ensure that we provide the enforcement and the education to our retailers around this Nation.

One of the failings that brought about this intense increase in cigarette smoking by our young people is that in the highways and byways and the rural communities and urban centers, there has been no incentive on the part of our retailers to stop that young person who comes in, approaches that cigarette, or to keep them from going to the cigarette machine; and what we have now is a $50 billion smoking-related medical care cost. This does not make sense.

All we are asking for our House Members to do is to be in sync with the Senate so that there is not a dilemma in conference, there is not confusion in conference, there is not disagreement in conference, that we would join in and support the $37 billion that the Senate has approved so we can put some action behind our words, put your money where your mouth is and that is not in your pocket. That is to ensure that there is enforcement and education.

Every time I go into my schools, whether we are talking about prevention of HIV, whether we are talking about understanding of one's ability to know how to interact and to be able to use one's sexual intensity properly, it is all about educating our young people. It is all about being forthright. It makes no sense whatsoever that we would not want to support this motion to instruct conferees to put some bite in our bark, to ensure that the 3,000 young people under the age of 18 who get cigarettes every day are educated properly and these laws are enforced.

We need to provide the bite for the Food and Drug Administration. This is a sensible, intelligent, forthright motion to instruct conferees.

I would be incensed, and I think the American people would not understand why the House would be backtracking from a so-called commitment to ensure that the Food and Drug Administration has all of the tools that it should have to make sure that we see this siege upon our young people in America prevented and we educate them toward good health and to stop the smoking that has infiltrated their young lives and caused devastating health impact in their late lives.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the motion to instruct conferees so that we can go to the conference with a strong position from both the House and the Senate and really do something for the young people of this country and help prevent additional addiction which will cost millions of lives in the future and billions of dollars. Let us do what is right for our children and give them a helping hand.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me summarize this issue for my colleagues, if I might. Currently the House has $24.3 million for new tobacco regulations. In an action today, the Senate provided $34 million for the same purpose. I am not, I repeat, I am not opposed to providing funds for regulating tobacco, but there has been no resolution of the differences in the allocations of the House and the Senate. The Senate allocation is $200 million more than the House. Until that is resolved, I do not believe that we should be issuing instructions to conferees to go to numbers higher than the House allocation can support.

I urge the defeat of the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct

offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 299, nays 125, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

YEAS—299

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)

NAYS—125

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Bateman
Bilbray
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Etheridge
Everett
Gallegly
Gekas
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hostettler
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kim
Kingston
Knollenberg
Largent
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Livingston
Lucas
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Myrick
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Packard
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Redmond
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ryun
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (OR)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Walsh
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Clay
Dixon
Gonzalez
Hall (OH)
Lantos
McCollum
Rush
Schiff
Towns

□ 1813

Mr. PAXON changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. PORTER, CALVERT, TIAHRT, BASS, BILIRAKIS, EWING, HUTCHINSON, METCALF, WAMP, TALENT, Mrs. EMERSON, and Messrs. SHIMKUS, BARRETT of Nebraska, LAHOOD and HULSHOF changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1815

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SKEEN, WALSH, DICKEY, KINGSTON, NETHERCUTT, BONILLA, LATHAM, LIVINGSTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2160, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2332

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 2332. His name was added in error.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2266, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2266) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 2266 be instructed to insist on the House position prohibiting the use of funds to approve or license the sale of the F–22 advanced tactical fighter to any foreign government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 30 minutes. Let me simply explain what is in the motion.

We are about evidently to proceed to spend $80 to $100 billion to build a new fighter aircraft, the F–22, to take the place of the F–15 and the F–16. We are being told that the reason we have to do that is because we have sold some 1,700 F–16's to other countries around the world plus a good many F–15's, and so therefore we must develop a new generation fighter aircraft.

We are told that we have to proceed to do this because we sold so many F–15's and F–16's to other countries around the world that we have to build a new generation aircraft in order to regain our technology edge.

All this amendment says is that if indeed we are going to proceed to build the F–22 and spend $80 to $100 billion on that project to regain that technology edge that we ought to keep that technology at home and we ought not then sell that advanced technology to other countries. We are already being told that the contractor for the new F–22 is already talking about fully marketing that technology abroad. That is how we got into this problem in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me if we want to stop chasing our tail, we will adopt this amendment and simply spell out that if we are going to spend $80 to $100 billion in order to regain a technology edge around the world, we are not then going to sell off that technology to other countries. That is all the amendment says, and I would simply suggest that if we do not do that, we will be back here in 10 years having to supply more money to replace the F–22 with an F–44, and 10 years after that replace it with an F–88 because we will have given away our technology edge time and time again. If we are going to spend taxpayers' money, we ought to keep the benefit of that technology here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would announce to our colleagues in the House that it is my intention to support all of the provisions in H.R. 2266 that the House agreed to when we go to conference. The matter that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has made a motion to instruct is part of that bill, and I would advise him that we intend to support that provision in the bill in conference, and we support his motion.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, MCDADE, LEWIS of California, SKEEN, HOBSON, BONILLA, NETHERCUTT, ISTOOK, CUNNINGHAM, LIVINGSTON, MURTHA, DICKS, HEFNER, SABO, DIXON, VISCLOSKY, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2266, Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1998.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 2266, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves, pursuant to rule XXVIII, clause 6(a) of the House rules, that the conference meetings between the House and the Senate on the bill H.R. 2266, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration: *Provided, however,* That any sitting Member of Congress shall have the right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida Mr. YOUNG.

Pursuant to clause 6(a) of rule XXVII this question must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 4, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter

Smith (MI)	Talent	Walsh
Smith (NJ)	Tanner	Wamp
Smith (OR)	Tauscher	Waters
Smith (TX)	Tauzin	Watkins
Smith, Adam	Taylor (MS)	Watts (OK)
Smith, Linda	Taylor (NC)	Waxman
Snowbarger	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Snyder	Thompson	Weller
Solomon	Thornberry	Wexler
Souder	Thune	Weygand
Spence	Thurman	White
Spratt	Tiahrt	Whitfield
Stabenow	Tierney	Wicker
Stearns	Torres	Wise
Stenholm	Traficant	Wolf
Stokes	Turner	Woolsey
Strickland	Upton	Wynn
Stump	Velazquez	Young (AK)
Stupak	Vento	Young (FL)
Sununu	Visclosky	

NAYS—4

Conyers	Stark
DeFazio	Watt (NC)

NOT VOTING—9

Clay	Hall (OH)	Towns
Dixon	McCollum	Weldon (FL)
Gonzalez	Schiff	Yates

□ 1844

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1031

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 1031, the American Community Renewal Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SNOWBARGER]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HOEKSTRA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECOMMENDING A CHANGE IN U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the subject of the United States' relations with Cuba. It was my privilege to visit Cuba last week with my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] as part of a delegation in connection with the Human Rights Foundation. Our focus was on the present economic and political circumstances in Cuba and the relationship between the United States and that country, with particular focus on the health conditions in Cuba, and the impact, if any, of the United States' economic restrictions on Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inspired to speak this evening by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN] and my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART], both of whom are friends and both of whom have spoken long and on this floor for human rights in Cuba.

I have two messages, and perhaps I should preface both of them by saying I do not consider myself an expert on Cuba. I was fortunate to spend 1 week there. I believe I was permitted to go where I wished to go. I was permitted to ask questions with no restriction. But I do not consider myself an expert. Still, I do wish to share my observations, largely at the urging of my two colleagues from Florida, who asked that I do so.

I wish to begin by emphasizing that there is a need for all Americans to continue to speak out on behalf of human rights in Cuba; that it is appropriate to call for full, free, and fair elections, including at the presidential level. I was informed during our trip there of the proximity of local elections, and also of the designation of multi-candidates for each available post in the assembly. Surely this is a positive development.

On the other hand, I was also informed that the Communist Party will still be the dominant basis for selecting the candidates for such offices, and that, obviously, should be opened up.

We were privileged to meet with the President of Cuba, Fidel Castro, we were privileged to meet with the Vice President of the Council of Ministers, and with the equivalent of the Speaker of the House, Senor Alarcon, and in each case we were able to raise any subjects that we wished.

When I met with Mr. Alarcon, I raised with him the issue of free and fair elections, access to prisons, and I emphasized the importance of allowing the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit the prisons of Cuba, and the presence of political prisoners.

His responses, as I took them down, were that there were still some prisoners in Cuban jails who, in his Government's belief, had received money from our Government to destabilize the Government of Cuba, and that that was the reason why they were in jail, although also other crimes.

He did not say that the International Committee of the Red Cross could visit those prisoners, and I urged him to do so. Tonight, if members of his Government are listening, it seems to me that the Cuban Government would only benefit from permitting free access by international groups of such repute as the International Committee of the Red Cross in order to ascertain conditions in prisons on a regular basis.

Mr. Alarcon did point out that America has not been as critical of other nations in Latin America as we are of Cuba, and that may well be right. But I do want my colleagues to know that I raised the issue of human rights, of free and fair elections, and of political prisoners, and that those are serious issues and remain so to this day.

I emphasize now in my remaining time the most important lesson, though, that I learned. This was one that reemphasized a judgment that I had made preliminarily before I went to Cuba. That is that it is wrong and shortsighted and harmful to America to continue the embargo between our country and Cuba. The United States ought to trade with Cuba. We ought to trade as we trade with China, as we trade with Russia, as we trade with the countries coming out of the socialist systems.

When we trade we begin to develop an economic group of people, a group of people who are devoted to free markets, to the extent that there is a control over people's lives through the economy that is loosened by free trade, and there is also a very important humanitarian component.

One of the very important issues of our trip was health care. The Cuban Government made a point that even though officially trade in pharmaceuticals and medicines are not prohibited under the Helms-Burton law, there is intimidation that has been practiced or at least felt by American companies who would wish to send medicines to Cuba but feel it is not worth the difficulty of obtaining an end-use license, or making a certification that they would monitor those people who would use it, or guarantee that the medicines will never get into the hands of the Government.

These are very difficult obstacles to overcome, and so many American companies do not send medicines, with the result that the Cuban Government is able, and not inappropriately on all occasions, to say that the United States policy and Helms-Burton in particular is depriving their people of the full medical care that they might otherwise have. To the extent that is true, that hurts our country. It is not the intention of those Members of this body, our colleagues who voted for Helms-Burton, and it would serve the interests of all to end it.

I will conclude, if I might, Mr. Speaker, with just this one observation. When our plane left Nassau and touched down in Havana, the passengers applauded, and I thought, they must be happy to be coming home. When our plane left Havana and touched down in Miami through Nassau again, the passengers applauded.

There are people of good will on both sides of the Florida strait. Let us foster friendship, foster free market, foster trust in individual freedom, and I think a first step to doing so is to repeal the Helms-Burton Act; and at least, if we cannot do that, to allow the free trade in medicines and food.

TRIBUTE TO ARTENSA RANDOLPH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a national leader in the public housing movement, the late Artensa Randolph. Ms. Randolph departed this life Tuesday, August 19, at the age of 81. She chaired the Chicago Housing Authority's Resident Central Advisory Committee, and served as a member of the Chicago Housing Authority's Executive Advisory Committee.

She was truly a staunch advocate for the rights of tenants of public housing. She possessed an enormous amount of courage, energy, and tenacity to advocate on behalf of the disenfranchised and the dispossessed. She was guided by the principles of justice and fairness for all people. She was indeed a remarkable person who gave her very best at whatever she did. Her work reached well beyond Chicago, for she influenced public housing policies and decisions on a national level.

Ms. Randolph moved to Chicago from Pine Bluff, AR, in 1937, and worked in the stockyards. During the 1960's she became involved in the tenants' rights movement, and was elected president of the Washington Park Homes Local Advisory Council in 1976. Her life paralleled the rise of public housing, and in many ways she was the catalyst for bringing about positive change in the way tenants are treated. She brought a tremendous amount of knowledge, perseverence, and dedication regarding public housing issues.

While Artensa Randolph has left this place, her spirit as a fighter for justice, fairness, and equality for all tenants of public housing shall endure forever. She has left a legacy that will speak to the unmet challenges still confronting public housing and its residents. We must never forget the cause which she championed, that of the poor. We must always stand ready to be a voice for the voiceless, and continue to make public housing the best that it can possibly be.

Anyone who continues to work at the age of 81 as chairman of a large organization, who helps to make policy for people all over the Nation, is indeed a champion. That was the life and that is indeed the legacy of Artensa Randolph.

REPORT ON CODEL TO NORTH KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to my colleagues in the House on a precedent-setting House CODEL visit to North Korea last month during our recess.

□ 1900

I was honored to lead a bipartisan delegation of seven members of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in traveling on oversight business to Asia. Our trip happened to include 3 days and 2 nights in North Korea, and I will include for the RECORD the formal written statement of our delegation released about that portion of our trip.

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact that the North Korean leadership welcomed a delegation of the size, seniority, and breadth of our seven-member group is very telling and somewhat remarkable, in my view. Crises is forcing the reclusive and anachronistic North Korean regime to reach out to the United States for assistance and pull back slightly on the veil of secrecy that has shrouded that nation for decades.

Even though our trip was obviously carefully managed by our hosts, we saw the signals of collapse during our visit. People really are starving; the infrastructure is crumbling; power shortages are routine; proregime propaganda is rampant; and the leadership, while refusing to concede failure, is tightening control and grasping for leverage.

After spending 48 hours in that isolated country, I felt as if I had been in a time warp, witnessing a life totally foreign to the American experience today, perhaps something back in the cold war days behind the Iron Curtain.

We repeatedly drove home the point that food aid distribution must be verifiable so that we can be sure it reaches the people who are most in need. And we were asked repeatedly about aid. We expressed hope that cooperation on the issue of MIA's would remain coming from the North Koreans and they have given us some cooperation. These are very positive signs.

But in response, the North Korean officials stated that the United States sanctions against them must be lifted and additional unconditional food assistance, and I stress the word ''unconditional,'' must be provided.

The North Koreans did not acknowledge the need for internal economic, agricultural, or political reform, focusing instead on external factors as the root of the causes of their current difficulties. While they were cordial in their hospitality, and they did give us fine hospitality, these senior officials were obviously mistrustful of the United States. They also forcefully underscored their position that they would not negotiate with South Korea as long as the South's President, Kim Young Sam, remains in office. He is scheduled to remain in office until the end of this year.

In the short term, we should be principally concerned with establishing a regular and more verifiable means of food aid distribution to ease the immediate crisis. I pointed out, and the others did, that Americans are a compassionate people willing to respond to human suffering in remote regions of the world. We have already provided about 60 million dollars' worth of aid, that adds up to about 100,000 metric tons of food, in relief of starving people in North Korea. Hopefully, it is going to people starving and not the military. But we were disappointed that during our visit we were not taken to see the food distribution centers, nor did we have access to the regions of the nation where food shortages are most severe.

However, we understand that our visit helped pave the way for a staff delegation from another committee to have greater access while in North Korea. In the longer term, an increasing presence of outsiders going about their business on behalf of nongovernmental relief organizations, the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, Congress, and other organizations that have legitimate business there, should help force open the door between North Korea and the outside world.

Mr. Speaker, the signals are abundantly clear: The North Korean regime is dying. We must do our part to prevent that process from undermining the security of the peninsula and threatening America's vital interests in the region. Americans do have several good reasons for being interested in the future relations with the North Korean regime. Not just the humanitarian concerns and seeking to prevent the starvation of literally millions of people, but, second, our interests are very much at stake when we consider something on the order of 200,000 Americans and Korean-Americans are living and going about their business in South Korea within close range of the world's fourth largest army, with its massed artillery on the DMZ. And, we have very serious concerns about North Korea's activities in proliferating weapons of mass destruction to rogue nations and, in fact, that has been happening.

To the extent that our visit marked a milestone in the United States-North Korea relationship, I hope that the elite band of leaders in the North will not allow current events to foreclose the opportunity now at hand. I believe that the veil is lifting there, and I am certain to believe that a negotiated settlement bringing North Korea into this century certainly is better than any of the other alternatives using the military.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD:

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE HOUSE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE—CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION VISIT TO THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA—AUGUST 12, 1997

From August 9 through August 11, a bipartisan, seven-member Congressional Delegation (CODEL) from the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) was

in Pyongyang, Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) to meet with North Korean officials and gather first-hand information about the current situation in that volatile region. This was a precedent-setting visit to North Korea by a Congressional delegation of this size, seniority, and breadth of experience.

The delegation was led by HPSCI Chairman Porter J. Goss (R–FL). The other Members of Congress comprising the CODEL were Nancy Pelosi (D–CA), Bill McCollum (R–FL), Jane Harman (D–CA), Sanford D. Bishop, Jr. (D–GA), Charles F. Bass (R–NH) and Jim Gibbons (R–NV). In addition to their assignment on the HPSCI, these members represent a wealth of experience on relevant issues based on their other committee assignments.

The delegation's interlocutors were headed by Mr. Kang Sokju, First Vice Minister of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), and Mr. Li Hyong-chol, Director of American Affairs of the MFA. All discussions took place in the Pyongyang region. Despite repeated requests by CODEL members, the delegation was unable to travel to famine-stricken areas where it had hoped to determine the extent of the problem and investigate the system used for distributing food aid.

In several formal and informal working sessions with the North Koreans, the CODEL made the following points:

The United States has a strong and abiding national security interest in helping defuse tension on the Korean peninsula. The four party talks should be responsibly pursued;

North Korea must cease its sale of advanced weaponry, missile systems, and supporting technologies to Iran and other ''rouge'' states;

The United States stands firmly behind its military and security commitments to the Republic of Korea;

North Korea must fully honor its commitments in the nuclear arena, as specified in the Agreed Framework, including allowing International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) challenge inspections and comply with its responsibilities to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO);

North Korea's cooperation in helping locate and return the remains of several United States military personnel killed in the Korean War is a positive step. Such steps must be continued and expanded;

Provocative acts such as those that occurred in the Demilitarized Zone on July 16, 1997 are counterproductive to cooperation and understanding;

To participate fully in the opportunities of the world community, North Korea must open up its society; and

North Korea must make its food distribution to the civilian population fully transparent and verifiable, in order to facilitate the United States' consideration of additional assistance. The food aid cannot be diverted to the military.

Though the visit was carefully managed by the North Korean hosts, the tenor of the discussions was cordial but candid. Frank discussion about mutual mistrust occurred on several items of a lengthy agenda. The delegation believes talks were constructive in demonstrating bipartisan support for United States policy to encourage North Korea to engage in honest and good faith negotiations to lessen tensions in the region.

The North Koreans were focused on seeing the United States sanctions lifted and the need for additional food assistance. In addition, the North Koreans stated their refusal to abandon their centralized political and economic systems. The delegation emphasized that Americans are a compassionate people, generous in their willingness to alleviate suffering, but who seek assurance that food relief is used to feed those North Korean people most in need. The delegation stressed that sanctions must be negotiated as part of a larger political package involving proliferation and other security matters.

The delegation will provide President Clinton, Speaker Gingrich, Minority Leader Gephardt, and the Department of State with a full report of the substance of its discussions and its impressions. The delegation concludes that opportunity for further constructive dialogue exists and will confer with other Congressional committees of jurisdiction.

The CODEL travelled to North Korea as part of a trip to Asia, which includes visits to Beijing, China; Tokyo, Japan; and Seoul, South Korea. The delegation returns to the United States on August 15.

THE HOUSTON COMETS WIN THE FIRST WNBA CHAMPIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, can my colleagues believe it? The Houston Comets will see them at breakfast. The WNBA champions. ''Can you believe it?''

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud woman and proud Houstonian. Move over Michael. Here we come, Magic, Bird, and Hakiem. Women's professional basketball got a league of their own and the Houston Comets are the new champions of the new world of women's basketball.

Houston is now the ''Clutch City'' as well as ''Coop City'' as the Comets, led by the regular season and championship game's most valuable player, Cynthia Cooper, beat the New York Liberty 65 to 51 before a sellout crowd and a national television audience at the Summit to claim the title of America's first Women's National Basketball Association Champion.

Mr. Speaker, it was a game my 17-year-old daughter Erica went crazy over. But, my 11-year-old son, Jason, did as well.

WNBA Coach of the Year Van Chancellor had brand new Mom, Sheryl Swoopes, work her heart out, and Wanda Guyton, after a heck of a season, may have been hurt, but Janeth Arcain, Tina Thompson, and Patty Jo Hedges, Tammy Jackson, and Kim Perrot, as well as ''Coop,'' were cooking on all cylinders and served up some home cooking for the Lady Libertys to give the Houston fans and basketball fans all over the Nation the memories that they will forever and forever remember.

Some of these women have spent years and years playing on the hardwoods of Europe, and now they can come home and strut their stuff before their own family and friends and fans.

It was so very special for Cynthia Cooper to be able to play on her home court so that her own dear mom could see her playing, a mom that has been a strong supporter of hers throughout the years.

This championship is an historic occasion, and not just for women's sports and not just as the fruition of our laws under title IX, and we have got to keep fighting to ensure that young people, young women, have the opportunity of equal access to sports and sportsmanship and playing the game well.

Saturday, August 30, was an historic occasion for the game of basketball. They have now come to their own. Women are playing the real game. Basketball is a game that has a long tradition of both women and men's play in our high schools and colleges. I have watched them for many years, and there is a deep respect for the game on our playgrounds and in our gyms. And, yes, it does teach character, it provides role models, and, yes, it teaches you how to play the game of life.

I dare say that it is probably the most popularly played game in our Nation, and it is fast becoming the most popular game in the world.

That championship game completes the cycle of respect and closes a hoop, if you will, on making the game of basketball a complete game. It is complete in the sense that now women, women who played for years and years, who have had to travel the globe just to practice their trade, who have the determination and devotion to play the game at the highest levels, have the respect of being able to make a living from their basketball skills in their own country where the game was invented and has evolved to the highest levels.

The Houston Comets, Mr. Speaker, they gave it all to Houston. They went to charities. They made themselves available to our schoolchildren. They were great. The Houston Comets are now a part of our history as a basketball nation and a basketball world. Those players will be forever mentioned and remembered as the first, the very first women of basketball.

Shine on Comets. We love you. Many of them who played their hearts out in the 1996 Olympics now have this great honor.

I am obviously bursting with pride as a Houstonian to salute our champion, the Houston Comets. The most fitting place for them now is to go to the House. That is the White House. So I have written and spoken to the White House regarding a visit with President Clinton here in Washington, D.C., at the White House to honor their historic achievement.

Mr. Speaker, to the Houston Comets let me say to them, and all Houstonians, wherever they may be, the Houston Comets, they really played the real game. Mr. Speaker, they are truly our real heroes. Mr. Speaker, see you at breakfast with the Houston Comets. Congratulations to them all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BISHOP addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CONGRATULATIONS TO ALDINE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], my colleague from Houston. That championship game last week was exciting not only for those of us who are from Houston, but all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to be here on the floor of the House and pleased to announce the high performance rating for a school district in Houston, Aldine Independent School District. It was recognized by the Texas Education Agency for the quality of their program.

As the parent of two graduates of Aldine schools, and my wife who teaches in the Aldine schools, and representing, along with the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], about half the district, it is a pleasure to see the school district receive the recognition that it deserves.

According to the latest data released by the Texas Education Agency, Aldine ranks among the Texas high performance school districts. This rating was based on 1996–1997 Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, our Statewide TAAS scores, attendance records, and low dropout rate.

Aldine is the largest recognized school in the State with a student enrollment of approximately 48,000 students. To earn a recognized rating, 75 percent of all students in each students group, district-wide, must pass each TAAS subject area. In addition, the dropout rate for all students cannot exceed 3.5 percent. They must also maintain an attendance rate of at least 94 percent.

Only a few schools have reached the high performing level of recognized or exemplary and Aldine is one of the four ''recognized'' school districts in Harris County, TX.

By achieving a recognized designation from the State, it is a great honor for everybody in the school district. But it is more than that. It recognizes each individual's hard work and commitment to education.

More specifically, a special thank you for the dedication of the curriculum program directors, principals, the teachers, the teaching assistants, and the students. It is a collaborative effort by these individuals which guarantee the continued success of the school district.

One of the reasons for the success of the Aldine Independent School District is their curriculum. The staff development focuses on teamwork and giving teachers of all subject areas the chance to support academic success. Each teacher in the district receives the same materials containing the same common strategies throughout the district. Program directors from different subject areas then work with the teachers on integrating those common strategies into their curriculum.

The curriculum is based on the continual assessment of student performance, analysis of student performance data, and the development of benchmarks, targets, and then implementation. It is a structured system to ensure that the skills are mastered and applied to each student's learning.

Not only has there been success for Aldine Independent School District, but there has also been success for the State of Texas. Students across the State of Texas have improved their performance on TAAS testing, TAAS is a statewide assessment of skills, from 55 percent in 1994 to 73 percent in 1997. In comparison, Aldine ISD students have improved their mastery from 49 percent in 1994, to 75 percent in 1997.

For the State of Texas as a whole, the figures show an increase in the number of highest performing districts and a decrease in the number of lowest performing districts statewide, despite tougher performance standards for the years 1996 and 1997. Again, each year the performance standards get tougher, as we know, the worldwide competition gets tougher.

Texas has the most high school seniors taking the SAT test than any State in the country, at 48 percent, and these scores have continued to improve. Texas has brought education to the forefront. It is a priority for everyone, and that is an important distinction.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be here this evening and recognize the contribution and the success of the Aldine Independent School District to the education of our children.

LISTENING TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, continuing the tradition that we have tried to begin as newly elected Republican Members focusing on positive success stories across the district, as you know just as our Nation's children are returning to schools all across this great land, we lawmakers are returning here to Washington and I think probably sharing some of the mixed emotions that our schoolchildren have as far as returning here to this establishment.

What we do here, of course, is very important with the bills and the debates and our struggles here. But I think what we do pales in comparison to the real life struggles that our constituents, the American people, are facing each and every day.

We talk about this 4-week period of time here in August, or just as August past, as a recess or a vacation. And I know many of the newly elected Members did not consider it as a vacation, as a recess. It was a very good time to get back home to really probe the minds and listen. And I think if anything that we have been able to accomplish that has been the most fruitful is that we stop shouting long enough in this body to listen to what the American people have to say.

And when we began to listen to those men and women that have been struggling to keep a roof overhead and keep food on the table, what we heard them tell us is that they were working longer and harder and yet had less to show for it at the end of the month and wondering where their tax monies had gone.

□ 1915

Basically what I was hearing, in a series of town hall meetings, was that the people back home in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District wanted us to change our ways here in Washington so that they would not have to change their ways back home.

I know certainly that there has been a wide difference of opinion on the budget agreement that we put together. Certainly future political candidates, I was flipping around the channels and watching C–SPAN and some of the speeches where future politicians or those seeking higher office have talked about what we did in a negative way. Yet I did not sense that at all. A series of town meetings in the Ninth Congressional District of Missouri were overwhelmingly positive.

The folks that came out recognized that we were on the path to a smaller, smarter government. They were appreciative of the fact that the centerpiece of our budget agreement, the tax relief package, was a child credit that will benefit the parents of 41 million children across this country, and the fact that nearly 2 million households will not have a Federal income tax liability just because of this $500 child credit.

They were appreciative of the child health initiative that we have commenced, that we put together in this budget plan to help the Nation's most vulnerable that are uninsured. And I tried to explain and made clear that this was not a new Federal entitlement that we had imposed but a way to reach out with local innovative solutions to this national problem of uninsured children.

They were certainly appreciative, as education is very much on the minds of the folks in the Ninth Congressional District, that we have education tuition credits that we are putting in place so that children that dream of college can actually get there, and those that have been laboring under the weight of a student loan might have a little bit of his or her burden eased by allowing the deduction of interest on that student loan.

Certainly we recognize that a strong economy is vital because as we help educate and invest in our children, the

future of this country, we have to make sure that there are jobs available. And clearly people recognize that we do not create jobs here in Washington; it is the American people, it is the business people, it is small business across this country that creates the jobs. And so clearly we want to make sure that every investor, every inventor, every small business person, every farmer has some relief from this very burdensome tax on savings and investment that we have come to call capital gains, and they were very appreciative that we have at least taken a step in the right direction regarding a reduction on that burdensome tax.

Many of the women that came to town hall meetings were astounded to learn that women in this country are starting businesses at twice the rate of men in this country. But oftentimes women have that very difficult choice, do I stay home with family or do I rejoin the work force? So we have reached out to them and all small business people that want to work from their homes by restoring the flexibility through the home office deduction; and the American people, at least those in the Ninth Congressional District, see that and applaud that as a step in the right direction.

Finally, as we have talked about many times in this Chamber, I personally believe it is immoral that the Federal Government can take up to 55 percent of a family farm or family business at death. Death should not be a taxable event. Certainly we will be having future discussions about death tax relief, but we have made some positive strides by raising the exemption so that family farms and family businesses and those that labor can pass the fruits of their labors on to future generations.

I know one of the polls that somebody showed me as we were leaving town 4 weeks ago indicated that Congress' approval rating was at a high level, at least the highest level since the early 1970's, and sadly our approval rating in this body was above our disapproval for the first time in several decades. And of course that is a sad event, but we need to continue to focus on our agenda that we will be bringing to the floor in the weeks and months ahead before we take our final recess for the end of the year.

We have got a lot of work yet to do. But I think we need to focus a little bit on some of the success stories and some of the things that we have listened to the people across this country in our respective districts.

I see I have various colleagues that are here to join me. I think first I would yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE]. It is interesting that each of us has our own respective districts and I know our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORAN], I think was one of the most ambitious and he embarked on a 60-plus county tour and made sure that he blanketed his district.

But certainly we do not have quite the expanse of territory to cover as the gentleman from Montana [Mr. HILL], who is not with us, or the gentleman from South Dakota who has the entire State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE].

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri and would say that over the course of the August break, I had the opportunity to travel over much of the 77,000 square miles that compose our State of South Dakota. As I traveled the highways and byways and places like Sturgis and Spearfish and Custer and Rapid City and Hill City and Mitchell and Yankton and Watertown and Pierre and Gettysburg and Clark and Aberdeen and Sioux Falls, my home town of Murdo, made it there, places like Wall and winding up at the State Fair in Huron, we had an opportunity, I think, to really get in touch with the real world and remember what we are all about here.

And it was great, because I had my wife and two little girls with me. They had an opportunity to return and enjoy the freedoms that you have on the windswept prairies of South Dakota.

In fact, my 7-year-old, who is sort of a tomboy, enjoys doing things outside, one afternoon when we were at the grandparents in Gettysburg, she said something to the effect, as her sister asked her if she could paint her toenails, she said, no, I have got frogs and snakes to catch outside. And she came back with a snake hanging on her hand, much to her grandmother's chagrin. I think she about had a conniption when that happened.

Those are the types of things that people in our part of the country are able to enjoy. It is a wonderful place to be from, and it was great to be able to travel.

One of the things that we did while we were out there is, we held a series of meetings on transportation issues. Those issues are critical in our State because we rely so heavily on our farm-to-market transportation system, because we are predominantly an agricultural State, but also we rely quite heavily upon tourism as an industry. So roads and bridges and transportation are critical in our States.

I had the opportunity to listen to people who were interested in transportation policy issues, people like mayors and county commissioners and State officials and economic development experts and Chamber people and those who are in the business of building roads and bridges in the construction business. One of the recurring themes was, when you rewrite this Federal highway bill out there in Washington, please do it in a way that maximizes our flexibility and that allows us and enables us to make the decisions about what the highest needs are at the local level; and try and get away from this micromanaging of Federal highway programs and policies and priorities from Washington, DC.

Through those discussions, I was really reminded, too, of why we do what we do because really this is about people and about giving them more control of their lives. And I was reminded, as well, of the difference between the way that the Washington glitterati views things and the way that people back in the real world view things. And there are a couple of distinctions I would like to draw to my colleagues' attention here this evening because I think it was a great reminder; any of us, when we go home, often have these things brought to our attention.

But one of the things that we have been talking about a lot is for the first time in over 30 years we will have balanced the budget in this country, and that was a priority for all of us here. All of us who are here in the Chamber this evening talked a lot about that throughout the course of our campaign, about lowering the tax burden on hard-working families, men and women in this country.

In my State those are ranchers, small business people; those are people who are trying to make an honest living and just really hoping that Government will sort of stay out of their way. And one of the things I saw was a tax foundation study which enumerated and broke down the tax savings and benefits that were in this particular package for the State of South Dakota. It was about $416 million in tax relief to our State, some 247 million coming from the family tax credit, but also estate tax relief for the 34,000 farmers and ranchers in South Dakota.

The 66 percent of the people in South Dakota who own their own homes will have the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of capital gains tax relief should they decide to sell that home. Income averaging can for farmers. There was an opportunity in there, as well, when it comes to the whole area of deferring income and allowing farmers and ranchers, people who have very volatile and erratic incomes to spread that over a period of years.

There were so many things that were positive in this. The one thing I will say though, and I heard this over and over, is that we made a step in the right direction; that we are lowering the tax burden in this country, but we did nothing to simplify what is already an inordinately complicated Tax Code.

I would hope that as we progress down the road in the next year or so, we can continue to draw attention to the complexity of the Tax Code in this country and how difficult it is for people to comply. We have added to what already are 471 different forms, and we spend some 5 billion man-hours a year complying with the Tax Code in America.

I was talking with an accountant in Pierre, and he was thanking his lucky stars for what we had done because it was job security for him. But at the same time, it has made it that much more complex and complicated and

really overwhelming, I think, to a lot of people in this country who try and fill out tax returns.

So I was reminded again of the need not only to simplify, to make things less complicated, but to take the power and control out of Washington, out of the hands of the Federal Government, out of bureaucrats, and to give it back to families and main streets and State and local governments and put that decision-making back in the living room. I think that is really what this whole thing is about. It is what this movement is about.

As we continue down the road, as we have started with the balanced budget and lower taxes, the next step along the way is to bring simplification, to lessen the regulatory burden, to continue to lower taxes and to bring some accountability to Government so that the people in this country know that they are getting a good bang for the taxpayer dollar. I think all that involves more flexibility.

We have a notion here in Washington I think that more is better, and frankly I think that the people of this country are much better off, my children are eminently better off in a form of government where we do not gauge success or measure success by how much we take tax dollars from hard-working families, run it through the Washington bureaucracy and then redistribute it in the form of grants.

We are a lot better off when we allow people to keep the money, the hard-earned dollars, and make the decisions about where best to use those. That is, I would hope, how we would measure success in the work that we are about here.

We have embarked on an important journey. It is the first step in what I hope will be a long process of restoring and taking control and power and decision-making and authority out of Washington and putting it back in the hands of families and individuals. That crosses so many different areas. You look at the world of education, allowing parents to have more decision-making authority, more choice on where they send their kids.

And so these are things that I heard as I traveled across the State, and as I said, it concluded what was an about a week at the State Fair, which is an opportunity to get a broad cross-section of people in South Dakota, to hear what is on their minds. And, frankly, I think that they are for the most part very upbeat, very optimistic about where we are headed, and I think that is a great tribute to what we have accomplished as a Republican Congress, because the things that we have accomplished and where we are today, in my view, are a testimony to and a tribute to the ability of the Republican Congress to move the agenda in that direction.

And I think probably that my colleagues here, the gentleman from Missouri, heard the same thing. I would hope that we would continue to be the shining city on the hill that attracts people from all over the world because they have hope and opportunity and freedom to explore the American dream here, to pursue happiness in their particular way and that is really what we are about. This was a great reminder as I traveled across my State of South Dakota about why we are here, what we do, why we do it; and again it was a great privilege and honor to get a feel for the people that we represent.

I would like to hear as well from some of my other friends who are on the floor here this evening.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I think the word that the gentleman used, ''optimism,'' I think that is probably what I heard most often from the folks that I had a chance to visit with. All the polls and surveys that these consultants and political pundits seem to find so important, I think truly when you get out of this place and you go back home and you listen to people in town hall meetings, you just open it up for discussion and you say, what is on your minds, I think some of the themes that you have mentioned are exactly what are the prevailing thoughts of most Americans, they do want less of Washington.

□ 1930

I certainly trust the folks on Ducelle Avenue in Columbia, MO, my hometown. I trust them to make the decisions with their tax money a lot better than I trust the 435 of us that assemble here to decide how that money should be spent. They clearly, the folks back home, are appreciative of the fact that we were letting them keep money, their own money. This is not some sort of a rebate, that we are giving them back their money. It is allowing them to keep the money they have earned. I heard some of the same themes that the gentleman mentioned.

I know the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PEASE] also was quite busy. In fact, his staff, as I understand it, had him crisscrossing the district. He saw himself coming and going, as I understand.

Mr. PEASE. I did, indeed. I was fortunate to spend about two-thirds of my time during the month of August doing the same thing that my colleagues from South Dakota, from Colorado, from New Jersey, from Missouri did; that is, spending time with the good folks in western Indiana, which comprises my district. And my experience was very similar to those that have been related here this evening. People from western Indiana I think are representative of all that is best in our country. They are folks that care about their kids, they care about their communities, they care about their country, and in most cases they really do not ask a lot of us, basically for us to leave them alone. They can make decisions for themselves, they will take care of their neighbors, they will reach out the helping hand to those who need it.

And in town meeting after town meeting, we heard the same thing, about an appreciation for the fact that their representatives in Congress, though they often differ, stood for the principles that they believed in, and, more than that, were willing to listen to those of differing viewpoints, to try and work together for the good of the country, to posture less and to build policy more, and generally gave positive marks, although they understand that what we did was really a down payment on the future, that there is still much work to be done, but that they supported the direction where we were going.

The thing that struck me more than anything in the time that I spent in my district and out of it, which I want to talk about in a minute, was the continuing generosity of the American people. Most of the folks in my district are working hard to support their families. Many of them have to have both spouses working in order to meet the needs of their children, or in some cases they are taking care of their parents, helping their neighbors, but in case after case, we saw people who still after all that gave of their time as volunteers, in their libraries, in their hospitals, in their schools, in community and youth organizations. Despite all the demands on them at work and at home, they still found time to be volunteers on behalf of others.

Which brings me to my second point, and that is, I spent the remaining third of the month of August as a volunteer myself in a couple of places: First, not far from here, near Fredericksburg, VA, where I was a volunteer, along with 5,000 other volunteers, at the national jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, an event that is held every 4 years. We had 30,000 young people from all across this country who were able to come and spend about a week together because we had 5,000 men and women who gave of their vacations, who left time away from their families, who paid their own way to come and work, and sometimes in 90 and 100 degree temperature, most of them living in tents, so that young people could have a good experience. The barracks where I stayed with other adult volunteers had a cross-section of America. We had Protestants and Catholics and Jews, Buddhists, people of all creeds and colors, who care about young people and who care about the principles that scouting tries to teach, which are character development and citizenship training and personal fitness, and they gave of their time, many of them, for 2 and 3 weeks, and came and labored. We had an admiral, we had factory workers, we had school teachers, a cross-section of America who gave up their time on behalf of young people, and they did it cheerfully, an example, I think, of all that is best in our country's traditions, of trying to instill moral values in our young people and not waiting and in fact in some cases resisting the Government doing it but

taking it as their own responsibility to care for young people in their neighborhoods, in their communities and across the country.

Part of the time I also spent at the Boy Scouts' facility in northeast New Mexico, near Cimmaron, where the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. REDMOND], who was elected in a special election earlier this year, met me at a town hall meeting in Colfax County, northeast New Mexico, and we talked to the folks there about the same sorts of thing we have been talking about here, and where I was also able to spend a little volunteer time at Philmont Scout Ranch, which is 138,000 acres in the mountains of northeast New Mexico where I saw another example of volunteerism, where young people, teenagers, teenage boys from all over the country paid their own way to come to the mountains of northeast New Mexico and volunteer to work, in most cases hard work, breaking rocks and building trails in the mountains of northeast New Mexico, where they could learn ways that we can protect the environment for the future, learn the good lessons of personal responsibility, both for each other and for the environment, and giving of their time and their energy as volunteers for other young people's futures who will benefit from that scouting facility in northeast New Mexico. Eighteen thousand young people over the course of a summer come to Philmont Scout Ranch. They come at their own expense and they come with volunteers, men and women from across the country who pay their own way, give up their vacations to spend time with young people.

I am reminded, too, that the Boy Scouts, along with many other organizations across the country were participants in the President's Summit for Volunteerism that was held at Philadelphia earlier this year. They are representative of that spirit in this country where people take responsibility for young people. They do not wait for the Government to take responsibility. In fact, in many cases their agenda is to make sure that young people have the positive example of role models that are concerned about their moral development, their spiritual development, their physical development, and they take that responsibility themselves. The Boy Scouts as a national organization have committed between 1997 and 2000, 200 million hours of community service in neighborhoods across this country where young people and their adult volunteers will work on behalf of their neighbors. All of that sort of experience and the folks that I saw in libraries and hospitals and schools across my district remind me again of that wonderful American tradition of personal responsibility, being accountable for yourself and helping your neighbors, and even though it was tiring to spend that time as a personal volunteer and to spend those hours, as we all did, traveling around our districts, it was refreshing and reinforcing and reminded me why it is important for us to be here and represent those values and do the best we can to support those folks back home.

Mr. HULSHOF. I appreciate the gentleman's report and certainly the good work that he has done, especially many of the themes that he has talked about as far as volunteerism and helping our young people. I had the opportunity to visit briefly with a group called Kids in Motion in Hannibal, MO, which is interesting because this was actually started, I think, 2 years ago, or last summer, that took at-risk youth in the Hannibal communities. This was not a government program. This was largely the efforts of two women, two businesswomen who chose to try to make a difference. And so they reached out to the business community to have jobs that would pay young people to try to help provide some positive role models, a little bit of institutional setting in the sense of teaching them how to get up on time and to get themselves ready for work. It was just an extraordinary experience when you realize that there is this sort of spirit in a small town where you recognize that there is a community problem, or a problem within your community, and rather than reach out to the government for some sort of assistance, here are two women that chose on their own accord to try to make a difference. I think this spirit pervades across the country. We need to help reinvigorate that spirit.

Mr. PEASE. I really believe in that. I believe it is our responsibility as a Congress to make it possible for folks to give more of themselves as volunteers, to reduce the tax burden on American families so that they have more time to spend with their families and as volunteers in their churches and in community organizations, to reinvigorate that tradition of American volunteerism that has persisted despite all of the time that we have taken away from families having to work to pay their taxes. I think it is our responsibility to give them back that time and that freedom. I know as the gentleman has seen, so many will step forward as volunteers to help in their communities and it is exciting to see that happen.

Mr. HULSHOF. I appreciate the gentleman. I see that our colleague from out West in Colorado is here and appears to have some visual aid along with him. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

It was a great month out in Colorado. Colorado, of course, being a western State with our sense of rugged individualism, we do not like Washington all that much, I have to admit, and I am afraid to say, and for good reason in many cases.

Since being elected to Congress, hardly a day has gone by when somebody does not run up to me at the grocery store or the post office and say, ''Congressman, I've been working harder, I've been working longer and it seems like I take less and less home,'' and that perception is in fact the reality over the years, and it is one that has really been the source of frustration for people throughout the country and it is the message that I think inspired many of us to run for office in the first place. Fortunately with the Republican majority, we are able to go to work on those very issues right here on this floor.

The package that we constructed a month ago, the tax cut package, is something that changed the message that I heard this last month being back home. Rather than the consistent complaints that we have always heard about high and excessive taxation here in Washington, I began to hear people at the grocery store and the post office coming up and thanking me for pushing and helping to support the Republican tax reform message again that we constructed a month ago. Let me suggest that it is a good first step and it is welcome news, but it is not the full measure of tax relief. We are going to come back and try to push for more at another point in time. But for the first time in 16 years, the American public has received a tax cut package. The first time in 16 years.

Let me just go through some of the numbers on this and tell about what I heard back home in response. Over 10 years, $260 billion in taxes, that is what we will pay, fewer taxes that we will pay as opposed to the plan that was constructed when the Democrats were in charge of the Congress. That includes a $500 per child tax credit, the capital gains tax cuts, the estate tax relief, education tax credit, expanded IRAs. Those individuals who understand that they have been paying more and more and more to the Federal Government and working harder and harder are exactly right. Let me direct my colleagues' attention to the chart here at my left.

Back in 1950, the Federal tax burden was 6 percent of the family budget. In 1994, the Federal tax burden jumped to 23 percent. That is a remarkable escalation in the tax bite that this Federal Government has taken away from American families. When we consider all taxes, State, local and Federal taxes, the total tax burden is almost 40 percent of a family budget. The farmers and ranchers and small business owners and the heads of families that I met with tell me that that 40 percent is far too excessive. I was in a Labor Day parade on Monday in the small town of Windsor in Colorado. Windsor is one of those towns that is just your typical American small town. Great patriotic families, people who love their work, love their community, will stand up for the flag and love their country, a town that has sent many, many war heroes to do battle to defend freedom and liberty. After that parade we held a little

barbecue and the numbers of individuals who came up and said thank you for cutting the capital gains taxes because that has real implications on running a capital intensive operation like a farm, thank you for cutting the estate taxes, the inheritance tax because now after working 30 years and putting all of my hard work and assets into a farm that produces and is successful, I finally know that I am going to be able to hand that farm over to my children. Think about that for a moment. Having the prospect of working so many years and putting so much into the ground and into the soil and into the family farm, that farm is more than just an economic enterprise. It is the definition of the character of many in the West and many in my State, most people in my State. The very notion that upon your death the Federal Government will get there first before your children do is something that just frightens the daylights out of many people. We are finally providing real hope, real opportunity. The suggestion that we have changed Washington as a Republican Party, that we have come here and have decided that the estate taxes must end, that we at our first step will reduce the effect of estate taxation, eventually getting to the point of abolishing them, I hope.

□ 1945

That is a message that was just embraced throughout the district, and it was a delight to go home and hear that.

I also attended a conference sponsored by the Independence Institute, and the Independence Institute is a free market organization, and the topic they were discussing was welfare reform, because last year the Republican Congress totally revised the welfare system in the United States and moved welfare authority out of Washington and pushed it back to the States in block grant fashion.

Let me tell you, it was truly exciting to go to these meetings with State legislators, with county commissioners, with local welfare workers, and hear them talk about the remarkable things that they are coming up with to reform the welfare system, to actually create systems on a county-by-county basis where people can make the transition from dependency on the Federal Government to total self-sufficiency.

And the numbers were remarkable as well. The numbers of people that are making that transition and finding the absolute joy of honest hard work and self-sufficiency is one of the most exciting things, I think, that I could have heard, and again thanking the Republican Congress for changing the way the government thinks about how we organize our society.

We are no longer looking to Washington and people here in the city of big government to organize and manage our lives. We have discovered, we have decided, and we have fought very hard for and passionately for a government that believes we can trust citizens, we can trust taxpayers, we can trust them to spend the dollars that the government used to take from them and allow them to put it toward the things that they believe to be important. They are small businesses, they are farms, they are child health care, the charity of their choice, their church, their synagogue, their community.

And we have also decided that within that framework we are going to create more opportunity in a way that frees people from the burden of an oppressive welfare state and instead rewards honest hard work, real opportunity, and makes Americans free again.

That is the real difference that we have made here in Washington, and I can tell you it is not just talk after 1 month being back in the district and talking with constituents and being in your district, too, by the way. Mr. THUNE from South Dakota spent a little time, a couple days, traveling through South Dakota. It is a consistent message: The work that we have accomplished here in Washington is hitting home, it is making a big difference, and the American public is responding very favorably.

Mr. THUNE. If the gentleman will yield on that point, I think you make an important point, because one thing has been lost, and sometimes in people's minds, is the important changes that were made in the area of welfare reform, and I think it points to the fact that the American public was leading the way on the issue because they arrived at the conclusion long before Washington did that the current welfare system was an abysmal failure, and you did not have to look very far to see that, and what is encouraging in listening to Mr. PEASE from Indiana who was here earlier talking about volunteerism and about the restoration of values in this country that have built it and made it great, things like the work ethic, like personal responsibility, self-discipline, those are the things that are really encouraging, and I think the American public led the way on that.

I think that Washington finally got the picture, and we have changed the mentality and the philosophy in this town, finally, to recognize as well that we needed a new model and something that again put a premium and a value and a priority on those types of values and that kind of an ethic. And that is the thing that has been really encouraging again about getting out there and hearing that from people, and I hope that we will continue to be the impetus that will move us in a direction on other issues that restores power back home, out of Washington, DC.

And welfare reform is a perfect example of that, is something for which the Members of this body and the last Congress should take great credit because they have redefined and changed the way that America thinks about that important issue.

I am delighted to hear that the gentleman from Colorado made his way to our State of South Dakota and helped our tourism economy out there. We hope that you will come back often.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I was asked this question, you get a lot of different questions when you are at these town meetings and hosting these listening posts, but this one question had me stumped for a second. I was asked by a constituent if I could only pass one bill in this Chamber, what would that one bill be. And I say, well, if I could write it and could make sure that it would actually be enacted into law, it would be this: that the parents of our children would teach their children individual responsibility and right from wrong.

But clearly that bill cannot be passed; that bill will never see the light of day. It is not government's place to take the place of a family. That is something that we have to encourage families to do, many of the themes that you just mentioned. But if we could pass any bill, that would be it, to help parents teach kids, their own children, responsibility and right from wrong.

But again I would be happy to yield.

Mr. THUNE. Well, I was just going to say I think what is encouraging to me as I travel in my State, and I think around this country, is we are seeing a resurgence of an emphasis upon those types of things. I think for years there has been an expectation that government could solve many of these problems, but I think Washington is realizing, as I said earlier, what families and churches and communities have known all along, and that is that it is the self-initiative, it is the ability to take these things into their own hands and to help resolve those issues, and to provide the kind of model and the kind of atmosphere in which these types of values can be nurtured and grown, and one of the things that was really stymieing that was the welfare system that has been in place for the past 30 years, and when that was changed, it broke the chain of dependency upon an old system that was outdated and did not work, and it created, I think it renewed, this whole attitude that we are seeing in this country that the things that you just mentioned, the importance of hard work, individual responsibility, self-discipline, the work ethic, the things that again have been the building blocks.

I mean, we cannot legislate that, but, frankly, we can do a lot, I think, to create an atmosphere in which those things will thrive, and that is really again what we are about here.

Mr. HULSHOF. In order to be geographically correct, I know we have heard from the Midwest and certainly from the West, but to make sure that we have all parts of this great land covered, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. I thank the gentleman, and once again I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this and to

view the visual aids of my friend from Colorado. I always look forward to what he is to present.

My month back in New Jersey was pretty diverse, as it normally is, even when I am just home for a weekend. The highlight of my month really, though, was the annual Somerset County 4–H Fair, which is my home county which I am very proud of.

We talk about our fair as the largest free fair east of the Mississippi, and we believe that it is. It is a 3-day event. This was our 49th annual fair, and typically during that 3 days we have anywhere between 75,000 and 80,000 people attend the event. It is one that I am proud to be a part of.

I have been an adult volunteer there for many years and mainly because of the wholesome environment and wholesome activities that the 4–H program provides.

We, again, in our county are proud of the fact that it is the largest 4–H program in the State of New Jersey and one that I know is prevalent in many communities throughout the United States and really throughout the world.

4–H, though, is not just for agricultural areas. While parts of my district, agriculture is very strong, yes, even in New Jersey agriculture is an important part of our economy, but the activities, the ways in which young people can grow and can be involved again in activities that help them as individuals and help them grow and expand their horizons and their experiences in life, are such that I think it is very important and why I support it as much as I do.

The activities that center around county fairs in my part of the country, in the State of New Jersey, I think adds to the attractiveness of the range of activities in our State. My district runs from the western part of the State, the shores of the Delaware River, and it runs to the east, almost to the Atlantic Ocean, and while I do not have any of the coast, as we call it the Jersey shore, as part of my district, the economy of my district and the people of my district, as I do, take advantage of the Jersey shore. And during the course of the month I had an opportunity to visit many of the shore communities.

Tourism is the second largest part of New Jersey's economy, and I believe that the activities along the Jersey shore and activities such as the Somerset County 4–H Fair add to that economic activity of our State.

Another couple of things that were a part of my month were meeting with many business people, business men and women. Early part of August, I was the participant of an all-day seminar that was hosted by the Princeton Chamber of Commerce, which is a very prominent community in my district. They have done this for several years and have had a Member of Congress there to meet with their membership one on one, which I did for about an hour and a half of the morning session, spoke to a group of CEOs in the morning, at breakfast, and then spoke to their general membership at lunch and participated in several Q and A sessions, and they were thrilled, to say the least, of the approved balanced budget plan that we enacted and the President signed and, of course, the tax relief measures.

But they reminded me, and was not anything that they needed to remind me, but it is important to hear it and important to know that people understand that the balanced budget plan is just that, it is a plan. It is a plan that is only good if we follow it, and it is a plan that will take several years to enact to see that very important goal of a balanced budget become a reality. I am certainly committed to that, and they understand that it is important for them, for their employees, for the future of their businesses, and, in turn, for the future of many of those who are employers.

I was encouraged to see how enthusiastic they were about that, but equally as important, the tax relief measure. I have said here, and I have said this in my district and in other parts of our State, that the tax relief measure is a first step to what I will hope to see several steps, second step beginning next year, and you, Mr. HULSHOF, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I know will be very active in seeing additional tax relief measures put forth and that we can debate and consider here in the Congress. That is something that I am committed to.

Just this afternoon, I spoke to a gentleman who is a small businessman in the central part of my district. He had e-mailed me and was frustrated over what he viewed as the abandonment of the Republican majority of our commitment to provide for tax and regulatory relief, and in speaking to him I corresponded with him, but I decided to telephone him as well to let him know, to assure him, that that is not the case, that what we in the House, Republican side, are attempting to do is to govern in a bipartisan fashion, recognizing that President Clinton, while he may not agree to the desire of tax relief that many of us would like to see, yet we need to meet each other halfway and that we have not abandoned our principles, we view this as a first step and that we are committed, just as he is, to trying to see things such as the elimination of the capital gains tax and the elimination of the death tax as goals just as important as the plan to see a budget that is in balance.

So I heard for that 4-week period what I hear on the telephone during the week when I am here through letters, through the time that I am home during weekends or long weekends, and I was just very happy to see that people are encouraged, people do have hope, but they also recognize that it is an ongoing process and one that they are willing to work with us on seeing those goals become realities.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I was in Wentzville, MO, on the eastern side of my district at the high school, and it was pointed out to me that in a normal day, if you just consider your actions of a normal day, when you wake up and grab a first cup of coffee you are paying a sales tax, when you drive to work you pay a gas tax, when you get to work you pay an income tax, when you flip on the light you pay an electricity tax, when you flush the toilet you pay a water tax, when you get home, if you are lucky enough to have a home, you pay a property tax, and, as we have talked about, if you are fortunate enough to work hard and save and want to pass on to the next generation, your kids, your descendents, then there is the Government wanting another bite with this Federal death tax.

The problem is not that people do not pay enough, the problem is that we here in Washington have been spending too much, and I think we have begun to try to get our arms wrapped around this problem of wasteful Washington spending, and, as you mentioned, it is simply a plan. We need to continue to make sure that the people in this body, certainly we want to provide for the essential services, but make sure that the people that come here from all parts of the country recognize that this is a critically important goal that we need to continue our path toward a balanced budget.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield, I am so glad that the gentleman from New Jersey is here, Mr. Pappas, because I remember when we first met as freshmen coming here, the first thing out of Mike Pappas' mouth was home office deduction.

□ 2000

We have got to get the home office deduction for small business people back in my home district. That is true in my area as well, as we talk about making the welfare transition from dependency to complete independence, to realizing the economic trends taking place in America toward smaller businesses and independent employment.

Our goal as Republicans has been in this Congress to try to find ways to triple the number of minority-owned businesses throughout the country as well. I have to tell you, when I went back home I heard so many people thanking us that MIKE PAPPAS' legislation made it into the final tax cut bill on the home office deduction.

Finally, we are going to be able to provide parity to small business owners, parity with respect to the expenses associated with running a business out of your home that large employers enjoy throughout the country as well.

Since you are here tonight, I want to thank you, and just let you and the constituents back in New Jersey know that this is an important item that you fought for that has had a tremendous

impact, not just in your home State of New Jersey, but had an impact in Missouri, South Dakota and Colorado.

You can drop me out of an airplane in a parachute anywhere in this country, and I guarantee people struggling to be entrepreneurs and finding a way to get their small business open and operating out of their homes appreciate the jobs created, thanks to the home office deduction. Would the gentleman talk a little more about that?

Mr. HULSHOF. If the gentleman would yield, I also wanted to ask you, you have had the opportunity I think to go into another district in Colorado, I think that of another freshman Member. Did you go into the inner city of Denver at one point? With regard to some of these themes, you talk about the minority business people. Did you talk about some of these conservative principles back in Denver?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for inquiring about that. My district, the 4th district of Colorado, is essentially the eastern half of the State, a very rural area, about the size of Indiana in square mileage. My district does not include Denver, but I did an exchange with a Member of the other party where I spent a day in her district and she in mine. We went to inner-city Denver and spoke with minority business leaders and owners of the business community in inner-city Denver.

The concern of the folks that we met with is very different than what you might expect in a setting of that nature. I did not hear requests for any kind of handout of any kind, any kind of preference program, anything along those lines that has come in Washington and in many places and seems to be what you would expect. It was just the opposite, asking for fewer government regulations, asking for the home office deduction, asking for 100 percent deductibility of health benefits for health care expenses for small employers, to get them to the same level where large employers are.

These are the key elements, removing the barriers of a large, oppressive Federal bureaucracy from the natural entrepreneurial instincts that occur to all Americans in all settings. It was just remarkable, because it is the same message I hear in the rural parts of my district. Going to inner-city Denver, I heard the same message.

This particular tax cut package that the Republicans crafted and constructed right here and passed and that we fought so hard for is really being embraced throughout the country. It is so exciting. And Mr. PAPPAS is exactly right, this is just the first step. It is a good start. But we are not finished, we are going to go back and get more and continue to fight to shrink the size of the government in Washington and expand the authority of real people, real, free people throughout America.

Mr. PAPPAS. If the gentleman would yield, one thing that I remind people is that again this is a first step. This plan to balance the budget is just that, a plan that needs to be followed. But also taking up the suggestion of Speaker GINGRICH, and that is people in my district believe that the tax on savings and investment and the death tax needs to be eliminated, that we need to band together and involve people in the community that may not have ever been involved in the legislative process before, to help educate people within our districts and the communities, to help make the people in the local media, who may not be involved in these issues as the national media is, aware that this is important for everyone's future, and not just the rich as is too often heard in this Chamber, but for small business people, their employees, people who could be employed by small- and medium-sized businesses in the future.

So those that may be watching this, whether you live in the central New Jersey area or the 12th district of Colorado or Missouri or South Dakota, if you are interested in being a part of this, contact any of us, contact Members of Congress who really are desirous of organizing public education activities to see this ball moved down the field, so to speak.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hard work of the gentleman from New Jersey, and the things that he has pointed out here are important to all of us.

I guess as our time is winding down, I want to pick up on one note that was made earlier, and that is that one of the things that we have to, I think, insist upon in Washington, is accountability.

As we move forward now, having balanced this budget, the gentleman talked about the fact that we have got the blueprint there, but we have to be conscientious and see that it is enforced.

One of the other things that I think we need to take very seriously is the so-called Results Act which has been passed by the Congress. It goes into effect this year. For the people in this country, we spend $1.6 trillion taxpayer dollars on the Federal Government, and the estimates are that as much as $350 billion is lost through fraud, waste and abuse, some $23 billion in the Medicare program alone, which represents 14 percent of their total budget allocated dollars.

So one of the things we do have to, I think, as we go through the process continue to try to root out, and that is all the spending in government that is over and above what is necessary to get the job done.

The people in this country expect Washington to be accountable. They deserve to have Washington be accountable. I think that that, too, is an important part. Think about the tax cut that we could do. $350 billion in waste, fraud and abuse. Figure out what that would translate to the average person in this country in terms of lower taxes, or investments in other types of things that might be important to the future of this country. But instead of having it lost through the waste, the fraud and the abuse that so oftentimes is endemic in big government and bureaucracy, that is the kind of thing that we are going to continue to focus upon, try and root that out, and see that those savings are passed on to the hard-working men and women in this country.

So I think that too is an important point and something that I think all of us are very concerned about and want to continue to pursue as part of our agenda for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Missouri. I think our time is winding up.

Mr. HULSHOF. I think the gentleman is correct. I again appreciate my colleagues for joining me and participating in this special order.

I think, Mr. Speaker, to those naysayers that have picked apart these past weeks' aspects of what we have done here, we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Clearly we are not here to rest on past accomplishments. We have a tremendous amount of work yet to do, and we have just touched the surface.

Mr. THUNE talked about trying to crack down on fraud and abuse in many of these programs. I know one of the things on the agenda we will be focusing on, Mr. PAPPAS mentioned the Committee on Ways and Means. We are going to be focusing on how to restructure possibly the Internal Revenue Service.

Everybody talks about trying to simplify the Tax Code. We need to continue to have those discussions, beyond just having Presidential candidates come forward and say this is what we ought to do. I think this is a dialog we have to get the American people on board with us, whether they favor just the Tax Code that we have and simplifying that, or whether they favor a flat income tax or a national consumption tax, a sales tax or the like.

But our efforts to restructure the IRS, whether it is the highway bill, the infrastructure, investing in roads and bridges that are so needed across the country, or as another freshman Member, we are talking about education. This is the time everybody is heading back to school or colleges and universities. The fact is we have to get more money than is presently appropriated back into the classrooms, so teachers are not having to dig in their own pockets and purchase school supplies to educate the kids that are entrusted to them.

There are so many things we have yet to do. But I think in our quest for progress, we have to continue to stay on the path. I think we are committed to doing that, certainly as this freshman class is on this side and many on the other side, of trying to work with politics of cooperation, rather than politics of confrontation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on my special order in recognition of the life of Betty Shabazz to be given today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF BETTY SHABAZZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come forward this evening to lead a special order in recognition of the life of Betty Shabazz.

Betty Saunders was the adopted and only daughter of loving parents, who grew up in Detroit, MI. She died on June 24, 3 weeks after being burned over 80 percent of her body. Her grandson, Malcolm, has been convicted of the arson and has since been judged to have been mentally disturbed.

I come forward this evening to speak of a woman who in a very real sense was two women. Betty Shabazz was her own woman, and inescapably and memorably, Betty Shabazz was the widow of a great man, Malcolm X. The two identities are inevitably related. Each side, gracious and strong, fed the other side of this remarkable woman.

I want to begin by saying some words about Betty, and later on I want to say some words about Malcolm X, because many have no clear vision of who Malcolm became, and in honoring Betty, we inevitably honor this man who transformed himself.

I knew Betty well. On one level she was simply a friend, one of the girls. On the level where she is remembered best, she of course was the widow of Malcolm X. But at the level that I find most remarkable, Betty Shabazz was all Betty, not Malcolm, because Betty, like Malcolm, redefined herself from the wife of a great man who was tragically assassinated, to herself, a self-made woman.

There is, of course, Betty the mother. There is a kind of primacy that was attached to being Betty the mother. When you raise six girls, when your husband is struck down and assassinated before your very eyes, when you and four children are in the ballroom where that act occurs, you are inescapably, first and foremost, a mother. When you are pregnant with twins who are then later born, there is a very special primacy to being a mother.

Yes, she went on to get her doctorate and to become an associate professor at Medgar Evers College in Brooklyn, NY, and ultimately to become an administrator in that college. This is the kind of transformation aspect of her life that, in many ways, is shades of Malcolm.

□ 2015

Betty met Malcolm in New York, having come there to study nursing. She described the courtship as an old-fashioned courtship. I wish we had more of those today. Malcolm loved children, and he particularly loved his children. I must say that during their what turned out to be a short marriage, Betty was pregnant most of the time.

Malcolm was assassinated on February 21st, 1965, with four of those six girls by her side. She threw herself onto the children when she heard the bullets, and then she ran to Malcolm, by which time he was already dead.

How do you go forward after something like that? Unlike the two other civil rights widows, with whom she became friends, Betty was left without any protection. Myrlie Evers, the extraordinary wife of Medgar Evers, who has since become chair of the board of the NAACP, was left with the protection of our largest and oldest and best-known civil rights organization, the NAACP. Coretta Scott King, when Dr. Martin Luther King was assassinated, was left with the protection of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and, as it turned out, of much of the Nation, for whom King was recognized as a very special martyr and a very great man. But as for Betty, it was members of the Nation of Islam who were ultimately convicted of the assassination of her husband. She was left with no organizational protection.

What did she do? She did what such women often do, only she did it in her way. She raised these girls, got more education, and went on and got a career. The country and the world did not hear much of Betty Shabazz during this period. I cannot imagine who could have heard much of Betty Shabazz, doing what she was doing during this period. She lived a very private life. She was particularly keen to protect these children, and, of course, she had to live and move forward.

I had a forum at the Black Caucus Weekend last year where I invited Betty Shabazz, my old friend, to be one of the speakers, because it spoke to issues about which she had been identified. And this very gracious and remarkable woman was anything but self-assured about coming to this forum and speaking at this forum with women whom she regarded as more practiced at such pursuits.

I remember that Betty said when she finally got herself so that she could see the movie Malcolm X that the young actress who portrayed her was far more self-assured than Betty felt she was during this period. There was a kind of inner assurance and inner conviction, an inner self-esteem that came out during the forum, and that was part of the very essence of Betty Shabazz.

Ultimately, in addition to her professional stature, Betty was to become a human rights advocate of very special stature.

I want to say something further about her husband, the man who transformed himself from a petty criminal to a major league thug to a black Muslim and finally to an orthodox Sunni Muslim who embraced universal brotherhood, because I think we ought to be clear who Malcolm became. There is lack of clarity on that in this country, because only then can we understand Betty Shabazz.

But before I go on, I see that I have been joined by my good colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JOHN LEWIS]. It is very fitting that JOHN should come forward first, for he and I worked together in the very same civil rights movement for which the civil rights martyrs became so well-known and admired in this country, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, and Medgar Evers.

I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JOHN LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], for calling this special order tonight. I know some time ago the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia had planned to hold a special order, but because of the schedule of the House, we are doing it tonight.

So Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague in paying tribute to a noble spirit, Dr. Betty Shabazz. I felt a profound sense of loss when I learned of her death. Betty Shabazz stood tall as a wife, a mother, and a friend.

As a matter of fact, I knew Malcolm and got to know her husband fairly well. I first met him on the night of August 27th, 1963, 34 years ago, here in the city of Washington on the eve of the march on Washington. The last time I saw her husband alive was in Nairobi, Kenya, in October 1964, at the New Stanley Hotel.

Malcolm and Betty together represented something deep and good about the very best of America. Betty Shabazz stood tall as a wife, as a mother. She stood tall as a woman of courage, pride, and with a great sense of dignity.

As I said before, at the age of 28, Betty Shabazz suddenly lost her husband, Malcolm, to an assassin's bullet. With few resources, she began to raise her six daughters. With determination she pursued and achieved a doctorate degree in education. With a deep sense of compassion and an abiding faith, Betty Shabazz continued Malcolm's work.

On February 21, 1965, I say to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, my friend and colleague of long standing, I remember very well, we were driving back from Macon, GA in south Georgia on the way to the city of Atlanta, and then on our way to Selma, when we

heard on the radio that Malcolm had been assassinated by an assassin's bullet.

As the gentlewoman stated so well, Betty was pregnant with twins as she witnessed the murder of her husband. Just a week earlier the family home had been firebombed, and as the wife of a controversial public figure, worry and concern for the well-being of her family had become part of Betty's life.

So on this day, we are here to honor the life of a remarkable woman, an extraordinary person. Ghandi, the great teacher of the philosophy and the discipline of nonviolence, once said that there was a soul force in the universe which, if permitted, would flow through us and produce miraculous results.

In the life of Betty Shabazz we can find that soul force, a power to transform tragedies into great victory. By her quiet and courageous example, Betty Shabazz fought tragedy with love and compassion. She did not become bitter or hostile after the murder of her husband. Instead, Betty picked herself up and raised six lovely daughters. As their mother, she got involved in their lives. She passed on to them the great legacy of their father.

Betty not only had the ability but also the capacity to grow and to learn. Perhaps that is why she became an educator. That is why she had the capacity and the ability to reach out to others. She had the ability and the capacity to inspire. That is why I think we are here today. In her professional life as an administrator of Medgar Evers College in New York City, Betty Shabazz encouraged young people to study and to strive for their very best.

I would say to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], Betty Shabazz touched so many with her strength and kindness. I know on so many occasions she made me laugh. Being with Betty was always joyful, sharing funny stories or something we saw in the audience, or something we read about or something we saw during the Congressional Caucus weekend. I will never, ever forget her sweet and wonderful smile; just being in her company, being in her presence.

I have a photograph of Betty with Mrs. King and Dr. King's sister, Christine King Farris, and they are all smiling, sharing some story. Sometimes we never know how powerful, how influential a person is until we miss them or do not see them. Maybe we will never know.

Betty, through her courage, was able to supply all of us with faith and hope. She had the ability to be able to see good or goodness in all humankind. With one more river to cross, I wanted Betty to survive, to beat the odds. Even as she struggled to overcome and to recover from the extensive burns on her body, she held onto life longer than many had expected.

Yes, this is the life of a remarkable American woman, of a beautiful woman with iron will and strong determination. Betty Shabazz has left us. I would like to think that she is now in a better place, and at long last she has been reunited with her beloved Malcolm. Tonight our hearts and our sympathies go out to her family and her friends. We will all miss her, but the great example of her life leaves us sweetly blessed with a profound sense of hope.

So tonight I say to you, Betty, thank you. Despite great challenges, defeats, and difficulties, you, Dr. Betty Shabazz, walked through life with soul force. You had the ability, you had the capacity, to produce great results. You will be missed. As a Nation and as a people, we will not forget your gifts to all of us and to all humankind.

Again, I want to thank my friend and my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for bringing us together tonight to participate in this special order.

□ 2030

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] for his eloquent words concerning Betty Shabazz.

I see that I have been joined by other Members, and I am pleased to recognize at this time the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], who will now speak to us, and I am pleased to receive her words at this time.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], my sister and my esteemed colleague, for giving us the opportunity tonight to speak about a great woman, and to help America understand the place that this great woman will have in the history of this country.

Dr. Betty Shabazz, Mr. Speaker, was a woman of honor, a woman of integrity, and a woman who will set an example for all of America's children.

On February 21, 1965, Dr. Shabazz and her four young daughters witnessed the brutal assassination of her husband and their father, Malcolm X. This violent, terrifying incident thrust her into the national spotlight. We all remember Brother Malcolm. We all remember his wife, Betty Shabazz. And that is why we are here tonight, to pay special honor to Mrs. Shabazz.

She spent the next 32 years of her life preserving the legacy of Malcolm X. Through these efforts we came to know and admire Dr. Betty Shabazz, for in the process she established her own legacy. While we mourn the passing of our beloved friend and sister, we also celebrate her life and reunion with her husband in a strange twist of fate.

Malcolm X unknowingly prepared Dr. Shabazz for her life's work. Throughout their short but wonderful marriage, Malcolm urged her not to hold grudges. Brother Malcolm's advice Mrs. Shabazz took to heart. At the same time Dr. Shabazz found the strength she needed to help her children through the crisis of the loss of their father and to nurture and fortify them for life's uncertainties.

By example, Dr. Shabazz rejected bitterness as she embraced the principles of ethnic unity, universal peace, and nonviolence. She touched thousands of lives through her work as an educator and administrator. She was a quiet but effective healer of the breach between perceived conflict in ideologies. That is why it is so important that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], our sister, called us here tonight, so that America will never forget Dr. Shabazz.

It was not her way to challenge other's memory of her husband. She chose instead to live the beliefs she and her husband shared. Although tragedy haunted their family, Dr. Shabazz remained strong in her convictions. Her life was a living testament to her strong belief in self and family values.

We talk about family values; Dr. Betty Shabazz lived them. Goes by an old dictum which I love to follow: I would rather see a sermon than to hear one any day. She did not preach family values; she lived them.

She believed in education as the linchpin of self-determination. Her early training as a nurse complemented her care and her spirit as a care-giver. Her passion for learning inspired her as she achieved academic excellence. She earned a bachelor's degree in public health. Her master's course work was in early childhood education.

In 1975, Dr. Shabazz received a doctorate in education, and after that she joined the faculty of Medgar Evers College where she served until her death. Betty Shabazz passes on her love of learning to her six daughters. They are also women of achievement in their own right. She believed in family, she loved her daughters, and she lived life. Indeed, her love for life and children fused at the moment of this tragic episode.

We cannot pay homage to Dr. Shabazz without mentioning the troubled life of her grandson, for even as she lay dying, her love and care reached out to him. I would say to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, and my colleagues, that I am certain that Dr. Shabazz would want us to remember her life by remembering the life and needs of her grandson.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her memorable words. I want to say how pleased I am to be joined at this time by the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], for holding this Special Order and providing us an opportunity to enter brief remarks about this distinguished woman who is a woman of our history.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened but inspired tonight. I am saddened because I stand here to say farewell to a sister friend who lived a life worth emulating. The late Betty Shabazz was a

woman of character, a woman of strength and presence. She rose above tragedy when her husband was murdered. She stood up to challenges, rose to the occasion after the death of her husband, and raised her children with dignity and pride.

Those words have been often stated tonight and will be said again. I am saddened at the loss of this special woman, this special woman of history. I am happy, however, to have known of this woman and to be alive to have this woman demonstrate what strength and character really is.

Not better words can be said than those spoken by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEKS]. It is certainly better to see the sermon than to hear ideology spoken.

Dr. Shabazz died this summer the victim of an unfortunate circumstance, but until the end she showed courage, grace, and class to the victim and her family. She was an extraordinary woman. After her husband's death, she lived quietly, raising her six daughters, giving them the value of family and the emphasis of education by showing that she, too, would go on to school earning a doctor's degree. She served as a college administrator, and as her children grew up, became more active in the community and the world as a participator in democracy.

We have lost a great human being, a mentor, a mother, a grandmother, and a friend. But we also have missed her spirit, a spirit of self-confidence and worth and value. We will always remember her strength, but we also will remember her courage and her love for her children, yes, and her grandson. Commitment to love all who had been given to her caring, nurturing arms to raise and to be a mother and a grandmother, and a committed sister friend. We say fare you well.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, those were very special words, and I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], my wonderful colleague, for coming forward to make them here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to be joined by another wonderful friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California, [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD].

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for bringing this Special Order tonight so that we would have an opportunity to really speak about a dear friend, an outstanding woman, a woman of character, a woman of dignity.

Yes, on June 23d, we lost one of the greatest leaders in the fight for social justice, Dr. Betty Shabazz, and I join tonight with my colleagues in sending my deepest sympathies, as I did during those dark days and dark moments after her demise, to the entire Shabazz family.

Despite the third-degree burns which covered over 80 percent of her body, and numerous painful skin grafts, she endured. Dr. Shabazz held on with strength and determination, those qualities that have continued to sustain us during these difficult days ahead.

So I am so proud tonight to be able to participate in this evening's function to offer the rightful homage to one of our greatest political and social activists to have graced this earth.

I rise tonight not to focus, though, on the tragic loss of Dr. Shabazz, but rather on the tremendous gains that we as a society have made due to the unyielding dedication and determined leadership of Dr. Betty Shabazz.

Throughout her 61 years of life, Dr. Shabazz embodied an extraordinary balance of intellect and compassion, coupled with grace and composure. Dr. Shabazz grew up in Detroit and studied at Tuskegee Institute, New York's Brooklyn State Hospital School of Nursing and the Jersey City State College in New Jersey, while helping her children to accept the absence of their father.

In 1975, she received a doctorate in education from the University of Massachusetts, and later became the Director of Institutional Advancement and Public Relations at Medgar Evers College in Brooklyn, NY. Throughout her academic career, and long afterwards, Dr. Shabazz served as a spokesperson and tireless advocate for the homeless, the poor, and for civil rights.

She educated children and adults on dealing with racism and civil rights, and built very strong relationships with the Hasidic rabbis and other Jewish leaders to address the violence and tensions dividing communities throughout this country.

On top of all of her work to advance social justice, Dr. Shabazz raised those six daughters of hers all on her own and she never asked for pity, she just exemplified her pride.

She was a leader with a powerful and contagious compassion for making a difference. She was also a team player and knew how vitally important it is that we all work together to resolve racial tension and inequality in this Nation.

The pain and sorrow that fills all of our hearts when we think of the tragic death of Dr. Betty Shabazz is overwhelming, but I ask my colleagues, and all within the sound of my voice, to join me in recognizing and honoring the wonderful ways in which Dr. Shabazz has enriched all of our lives as an inspiring role model and as a friend. Let us continue to impart her fine work to generations and for the generations yet to be born.

Yes, Dr. Betty Shabazz dedicated her life to social justice and had a tremendous impact on the young since the death of her husband, Malcolm X, some 30 years ago. While we mourn her passing, let us not forget, more importantly, how blessed we were to have had someone of this esteemed caliber touch all of our lives in such an unforgettable way.

The legacy of Dr. Betty Shabazz will live on in all of our lives.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for those very warm and wonderful words of tribute to Betty Shabazz.

There may, indeed, be other Members coming to the floor, and while I await them, I think I would like to deepen my own remarks, because we speak of Betty Shabazz, a woman who carved out her own identity in a most memorable way. And yet we also say and remember that this was the widow of Malcolm X. Because of confusion concerning who Malcolm X was and, therefore, in a great and important sense who Betty Shabazz was, I feel an obligation to say a word about the legacy of Malcolm X that Betty Shabazz carried with such grace.

It is according to what generation we live in and what we saw as to who we may understand Malcolm X to have been. It was his very capacity to transform himself that leaves me wondering when I hear people say Malcolm X, which Malcolm are they talking about?

□ 2045

Are they talking about the Malcolm who transformed his life and who in so doing should be an inspiration to us all that we can all become something else, something better, something different? It takes enormous will to be able to say at the end of 5 years, I am something different from who I was 5 years ago, because I have made myself something different.

If we think about the extraordinary transformation of Malcolm X, then I think there will be a greater capacity for us to imagine the transformation of our country and the transformation of many in our country who seem stuck where they are.

Let me say to you that Betty transformed herself, and in a real sense, when you see a great man like Malcolm, you ought to understand that a great man does not choose a little woman. He chose a woman who also was capable of transforming herself.

I have to say, if I was left in this world with four babies and two more I was about to bear, I am not sure I could have transformed myself. It would have been doing good just to hold on.

This is a woman who said, hey, I, too, can make myself what I need to be. And what a model she had for self-transformation.

Make no mistake about who Malcolm X was before we met him, Malcolm Little, the petty criminal who became the serious felon and who, while in prison, became converted by the Black Muslims and finally left them. Each and every time Malcolm X had to say to himself something that is very hard to say, who am I? Is this who I want to be? Can I be something else?

I ask you to consider, how many people do you know who have become something truly different from who they once were? How many people do

you know who have improved themselves? How many people do you know who live by principle so that they are willing to risk their very lives for principle? When Malcolm X converted, he became an orthodox Sunni Muslim and so did Betty Shabazz. He broke with the Nation on matters of principle at the risk of his life. He came to accept universal principles of human rights, brotherhood and sisterhood.

I do not always know who we are remembering when we remember Malcolm X. The Malcolm X on the T-shirt, which Malcolm X is that brother? Yes, it will be the Malcolm X of black nationalism. I think he would have continued to stand for that, but that sense of nationalism would have been for him the motivating force to continue to bring justice to his people, for he had also embraced orthodox Sunni Muslim religion and spoke openly and often of universal principles of brotherhood. This is a man who learned, was willing to say when he thought he had been wrong, and to move on.

I have to tell you, I ask you, even among great men or women to find me examples like that. Here is a great man, Martin Luther King. But he was born into the tradition that he came to represent and he represented the best of that tradition. He was born into a family of Baptist ministers which led him to get a wonderful education which led him to study philosophy. All of this was growing into something. That is very different from becoming somebody different, from leaving behind somebody who you were, recognizing and taking responsibility to say that was the wrong person, that is not who I want to be, and becoming somebody else.

Very few of us can become somebody else while growing, as a matter of principle. That is what Malcolm El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz did, and when you wear those T-shirts, do understand that you are not wearing T-shirts of the man who spoke of white devils because Malcolm, who became a Sunni Muslim, said that is not who I am anymore. I am Malcolm El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz who embraces the notion that we must become one people.

That is who he was, and I have had many a conversation with Betty Shabazz about that Malcolm. This was the last and the final Malcolm, and that is the Malcolm who deserves our greatest respect. That is the Malcolm whom history will remember now, not only as a revered leader of my own black community but as a far more universal figure, standing for universal principles and standing for the strength of character to change who he was.

Oh, do I wish I could put aside some of my habits and tomorrow wake up and say, Eleanor, that part of Eleanor is not anymore, I can say with assurance that there is a new Eleanor here. That kind of strength of character I find simply awesome.

I have to tell you that at the memorial service that I attended for Betty Shabazz, I found that legacy living and I found that legacy of principle living in Attalah, the eldest daughter, the eloquent Attalah. This girl has Malcolm in her. And let me indicate how and why. There came a point in the service, to show you how universal a figure Malcolm has become, Governor Pataki was there, Mayor Giuliani was there, all of the prominent politicians of New York were there. Mayor Koch was there. He talked about a street, a grand avenue named for Malcolm.

There came a point in the service when they recognized the politicians in the audience and they would stand up and say something or at least be recognized. When they recognized Mayor Giuliani, there was some boos in the church. At that point, others in the church began to clap so as to drown out the boos, and it was all over.

When it came time for the daughters to come forward, all six of them, it was only one who spoke for them, the eldest. I know about that obligation; I am the eldest of three daughters. Attalah stepped forward, extemporaneously to speak for the remaining family. And she obviously had thought about what she was going to say. And the question of the boos, I can tell you, had been dealt with. But this girl had Malcolm's principle in her. She felt the necessity to say that that had been wrong. I was never so impressed in my life.

She did not have to get in that. She did not have to take the chance that there were some in the audience who thought maybe you should boo Giuliani and so you might turn them off. She did not have to get in it. She got in it. As an aside, she said, and by the way, it is wrong in this service to boo the mayor or anyone else. She had to say it. It was a matter of principle for her. Teach girl, I thought. That is what Malcolm would have done. Malcolm would have said, hey, silence is not a moral act. The moral act is to say, that was wrong and I am going to take the consequences. I am going to stand up and say it.

That is Malcolm. That was Attalah. That legacy is in her. It was in her with great eloquence. This is family I revere for the way in which their values have been spread across their family. These values feed on one another. I don't know where they come from. I cannot say Attalah got this from Malcolm. She was such a little girl. I do not know that Betty got her sense of universal brotherhood from the final Malcolm. I do not know that. All I know is that in families those things just come together and that is what being a family is all about. I hope we all regard ourselves as part of that family as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], another very good Member of this body.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia. The words will be few but heartfelt, only because as I have listened to your passion and compassion and those of my other sisters, as I hope the Speaker will tolerate briefly and indulge us just for a moment, because this is such a special occasion. As the moments tick by, I hope he will allow those who have come to the floor to complete this tribute.

But in listening to you, sometimes it is appropriate to offer the benediction but for the fact that others continue to come to pay tribute. I will simply say a few points because I knew the honorable and cherished Dr. Betty Shabazz as an admiring watcher, if you will, of her eloquence and love of life.

Interestingly enough, from a distance, unlike the knowledge and personal friendship that you possessed, I watched her stateliness, her regalness, and her capturing the audience wherever she went in her most humble and honest way.

She taught at a college in New York. A good friend of mine had the pleasure of being on campus as a faculty member with her, Sheryl Williams, I called her Shey Williams. And on the occasions that we had to speak together, there was always an endearing comment made about Dr. Betty Shabazz.

My fellow sisters are right that Dr. Betty Shabazz was part of a family, Malcolm, the children, the sisters, the daughters, so Dr. Betty Shabazz was a wife, a mother, noble, queenly, an educator, a nurturer. She certainly was a grandmother, proudly so, something she did not rebuke; and I believe that it is true in life and, yes, in death.

She showed up places and she was a bright star and clearly she provided a light for us. I hope that as she now watches us, and as Dr. Betty Shabazz sleeps on peacefully, that we will take to heart the partnership that she had with Malcolm X, one who did believe in humankind; and that those who wish to emulate and imitate this dynamic offering to this Nation and this world, Dr. Shabazz and Malcolm X, that they will imitate the realness of who they are, people who reached out in obstacles and adversity and fought against the tide.

And so my tribute tonight is to recognize that I have many miles to travel to be able to capture the bright and shining star still remaining here given to us by Dr. Betty Shabazz, and likewise I have many miles to travel in order to capture the spirit and the dynamic strength of Malcolm X. But my commitment to you, to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia who has expressed such deep and abiding friendship; as I see the chairwoman of the Black Caucus, who likewise shares that relationship, that we will not stand and allow the clock to be turned back, the light to be darkened, the daughters of Malcolm and Dr. Betty Shabazz to be forgotten or ignored, the grandchildren that represent so many who may have lost their way to be abandoned by us.

□ 2100

As we continue our service in the U.S. Congress, our commitment will be to lift up the bloodstained banner, but lift it up with the understanding that Dr. Betty Shabazz lived, Malcolm lived, the family lived, and they will live on through us. I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her leadership on this special order.

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for those remarkable words about Betty Shabazz. If I had to bet money, I would have been willing to do so that the next speaker would have to come to the floor this evening. It is my very special pleasure to recognize at this time the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], who is at the same time the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON]. I thank her for taking the time to organize this tribute to Betty Shabazz. She is one of the busiest persons in this House. Not only does she have the regular legislative duties, but given all that is going on in the District, I know the hours that she is spending working with the very serious problems that are confronting this District and this Nation. I want to tell her, for her to have time to get us to stop and focus and do this tribute is more than admirable. I admire her stamina, and her courage, but I also deeply respect the fact that she decided no matter how busy she is, that our dear friend and sister Betty Shabazz deserves the attention of this House, of this body. I thank very much the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that she and I both attended the memorial services for Dr. Betty Shabazz in New York. We were there and we watched as people came from all over this Nation to pay tribute to Betty Shabazz. We watched our friends mount the podium there and talk about their relationship with her. We watched people she has worked with both in the political arena, in academia, step forward to tell us about their very special relationship with this remarkable woman. When I was there, I talked a little bit about Betty Shabazz, my friend that I have worked with, that I have known, that I have spent time with, that I have exchanged all kinds of information with, about our families, et cetera. But I could not help but think about how long it took me to meet Betty Shabazz, even though I had met Malcolm many years ago.

Of course, I and the Nation met Malcolm X as he came forth with his brilliant oratory and presence to help make this Nation think about who we are and what we are doing, to help draw attention to the injustices of our own society, to help us to articulate our pain, to force legislative bodies to pay attention. He did all of that, this magnificent man with this brilliance and this kind of presence that many of us have never witnessed before.

And so I met Malcolm X and I can recall being in Los Angeles, going to wherever I would hear he was going to be, to listen one more time. I was finding my own self in those years, coming to grips with not only my philosophy about life but about what I really felt about what I had learned, my experience growing up in St. Louis. And so I met Malcolm X, I listened to him. I was profoundly influenced by him, carried away with his brilliance, with his ability to articulate what I was feeling so often. But I never asked, and what about his family? What about his children? What about his wife? It was only after Malcolm's death did I meet and get to know Betty Shabazz.

Too often we see leaders, we see people in high visibility roles, and somehow we think about them without thinking about them in relationship to their families, their children, their home environment. After I met Betty Shabazz, I understood why Malcolm could comfortably do what he did. In order to be the leader that Malcolm X was, he had to have tremendous support and understanding. This was a woman who was with one of the most controversial leaders of our time. This was a woman who knew that her life and the life of her children were in danger. Their house was set afire. This was a woman who knew that even though her husband had evolved to a point where as some describe him as more international, more wanting to bring people together, there were people who did not feel the same way as I felt and many, many others felt about Malcolm X. But this was a woman who loved her husband. This was a woman who raised the babies. This was a woman who knew that at any point in time, her husband could be killed, her house could be burned, she could be killed, but she believed in Malcolm X and they believed in each other. He loved Betty Shabazz and Betty Shabazz loved Malcolm X.

And so, even though I had not met her, I did not know her, it became very, very clear to me after meeting her why Malcolm X was able to do and be in the manner that he was. And so this Betty Shabazz that I met was not a woman with her head hanging down, it was not a woman who had been scarred by the assassination of her husband, it was not a woman whose very life, existence and ability to thrive, this was a woman, a very wise woman, who, of course, felt the deep pain of having lost this brilliant man that she loved, but this was a woman who had counseled with her husband, had talked through the possibility of his death. This was a woman who witnessed her husband's assassination with her babies but was not destroyed by it. This was a woman whose wisdom goes far beyond that which most of us hope to be able to achieve.

She suffered the pain of the loss of her husband, she mourned his death, and she went on to do and be what Malcolm would want her to do. Not only did she find a way to raise the children, she went back to school. This is a woman who got a Ph.D. This is a woman who not only became the professor, the teacher, the leader; she spread out in the overall community, in this country, and went on to become a speaker, a leader, someone who joined with her sisters to try and make life better for others. This was a woman who said to me once, ''Maxine, I came out to Los Angeles, and I had an opportunity to speak with these young men, some of whom were in gangs, some of whom had left the gangs, but they sat with me, and I had an opportunity to talk with them and tell them about Malcolm, and what Malcolm would have them do.'' And she said, ''I'm coming back again. I'm going to come back to talk with them. Because I think it is important for me to share what I know.'' So this woman, raising children, teaching, being available to the many groups and organizations who demanded of her time, not only did I see her all over this country at the many Malcolm X celebrations that go on, we sat and talked about these celebrations and her role and her responsibility. She never tired of responding to the request.

I would often see her at the Congressional Black Caucus dinners. We hold these Congressional Black Caucus weekends, and she would always come, and we would joke, ''Well, she won't be with us at this Congressional Black Caucus weekend.'' But she will certainly be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and the other members of the Congressional Black Caucus for helping me to select Betty Shabazz as one of the awardees. I as the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus will be presenting awards to Betty Shabazz, posthumously, and to Coretta Scott King and to Myrlie Evers, 3 women who have lost their husbands, 3 women whose husbands were the civil rights leaders recorded in history never to be forgotten, 3 women who stood by their husbands, who raised the children while their husbands were shot down in America, but who did not go away, who did not vanish, who did not become so devastated that they did not continue to play a role in American life. They are all speakers, they are all heads of organizations, they are all teachers, they are all keepers of the flame of the faith. And so we are going to award them the chairwoman's award at the Congressional Black Caucus weekend. We are going to say to them, thank you for being who you are. We are going to say thank you for persisting in the quest for freedom, justice and equality despite what was done to your husbands. We are going to say to Coretta Scott King and to Myrlie Evers, we love you, we love you and we want you to know that. We want to use the most important platform that we

have in the Congressional Black Caucus, and to Betty, who we will not be able to say it to because she is gone now, to her children who will be there and Attalah, her daughter, who will accept the award, we want them to know that we loved their mother, and that we hold her in the highest of esteem, and we hope that this small token that we are able to present that evening from all of us will speak to our love for them. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for allowing us the opportunity to focus some attention from this House on Betty Shabazz.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman for those remarkable remarks. This special order would not have been the same without her.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I simply want to thank not only the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus but the other Members and friends who came forward at a time when many of us are thinking through ways to transform ourselves into better people, to transform our country into a better place, and when I, I must say, Mr. Speaker, am trying to think of a way to transform my own city into a united city that will regain its own human rights and that will reform its own agencies at such a time I find great inspiration in the life and work of Malcolm X and in the life and work of Betty Shabazz.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great woman and humanitarian, Dr. Betty Shabazz. Her family lost a mother, grandmother, or sister but the world lost a friend and a symbol of inspiration to all of us. In her death, Dr. Shabazz leaves a legacy of dedication to family, a quality that is much praised but little practiced. Her impact will be felt for a period much longer than we realize right now.

Her much recognized qualities of perseverance and determination were first publicly recognized after her husband's death on February 21, 1965. Betty Shabazz, left with no source of income to provide for her four young daughters and the twins she was pregnant with, was determined to raise her children and did so alone. Along with taking care of six children, she completed her nursing school education and went on to earn bachelor's, master's and doctorate degrees. Dr. Shabazz lived the dictums of self-reliance, discipline and education as espoused by her husband, Malcolm X.

Our prayers are with the family in this hour of grief. I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the many contributions Dr. Shabazz has made to our country and to the world.

□ 2115

TRIBUTE TO BETTY SHABAZZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me also add my accolades to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Delegate NORTON, for calling this very important Special Order. It has been already said about the outstanding work that she does here in the District fighting for the people of the District, as she fought for people here in the entire United States of America when she had a tremendous, important administrative position years ago, and she continues to do that work.

And to the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, Ms. WATERS from California, she continues to lead the caucus in unprecedented times. We are so proud of the outstanding work that the caucus has done, and I would just like to, as I was in my office working, and I turned to this channel and saw that this Special Order was being done, I was unaware of it but felt it was extremely important to me to come over and to say a few words.

I knew Betty Shabazz very well, because living in Newark, NJ, she was not far away, and about a month before the tragedy I had the opportunity to be in her company three or four times. First, we had a meeting in Mount Vernon, the Constituency for Africa. Mayor David Dinkins was there, Congressman RANGEL, Mel Foote called in from the Constituency of Africa in Mrs. Shabazz's hometown, and of course the first person to speak after the invocation was given at the church was Doctor Betty Shabazz, because she not only worked for people in this area and in this country, but worldwide, and she was loved by everyone.

I know Dr. Edison Jackson, who was the president of Medgar Evers College, he was the former president of Essex County College in Newark, NJ, where I live, and the wisdom of President Jackson to see the worth of a Betty Shabazz, to have her lead the light for that great institution named after, as has been mentioned, Medgar Evers, another person who was taken away from us, and his wife Myrlie Evers carried the torch, and so it is unique; as a matter of fact, the college that Dr. Edison Jackson at Essex County taught at before going to Medgar Evers after leaving California on Martin Luther King Boulevard. Doctor Shabazz, it is altogether.

I would just like to say that then she came over to Newark about 2 weeks before the tragedy and spoke out at community meetings. She was always there, grass-roots people. She would come to the caucus and go to all of the sessions and rush around because everyone wanted to see her.

And so we have lost a tremendous person. It is unfortunate that tragedies take people. This week we are hearing the tragedy of the great Princess of Wales taken away unnecessarily, and once again Dr. Betty Shabazz.

So I think that we have to remember and we have to always be aware of the fact that we all have to do more in our own way. She was a great person.

I, too, attended the memorial service and David Dinkins and Basil Patterson and Percy Sutton did such outstanding jobs as they brought this community together.

I once again would like to simply thank the gentlewoman from the District here, and I appreciate having the opportunity to address the House.

GOOD NEWS FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about good news for America.

I just had a wonderful opportunity during the past month to see lots of folks all across Wisconsin, and it was very educational for me and, I hope, for some of the folks we saw that they picked up on some of the good things that have happened here in the last month or thereabouts out here in Washington.

The one thing that struck me, though, as I talked to more and more of our families across Wisconsin and our senior citizens across Wisconsin and some of our young people, college age students across Wisconsin, they did not really realize that the tax cut bill has been signed into law, so I would like to begin this evening by pointing out that the tax cut bill, along with the first balanced budget since 1969 and restoring Medicare, has all been signed.

It is done. The ink is dry. The President signed it. It has passed the House. It has passed the Senate. First balanced budget since 1969, taxes coming down for the first time in 16 years, and Medicare restored for at least a decade. That is what was accomplished before we left for recess in August.

The other thing I learned is that not very many people really understood what was in the tax cut bill, and I would start talking to people and I would say, ''Well, the budget is balanced, that's the most important thing we could do, and that was our responsibility, and that's done, and at the same time we've reduced your taxes.''

And they go, ''yeah, sure, but that affects somebody else.''

And then we would start through it, and the first question would be: Do you have children? And this is so important. If you have children age 17 or younger for virtually all families out there, 550,000 Wisconsin families alone, you are eligible to keep $400 more for each one of your children in your own home next year instead of sending it to Washington.

We should make this very clear. This is not somehow a gift from Washington to the people. This is money that the people get up in the morning, they go to their jobs, they work hard, and they earn the money, but instead of sending it to Washington, they keep it in their own homes to spend on their own families and the way they see fit. That is the first part of the tax code.

And I am going to put this a little different so folks have a handle on how important and significant this is.

In January of next year, a family with a child, with one child, should go into their place of employment, they should talk to the person that handles the W–4 forms, they should increase their exemptions so as to increase their take-home pay by $33 per month. It is $33 per month in increased take-home pay for each one of the children in the house.

And my fear is people are not going to do this. My fear is what is going to happen is they are just going to go through the year and Washington is going to see all this extra money coming out here that those families should be keeping in their own home, and, of course, when Washington sees money, sometimes they spend it out here, and I will admit, as hard as we try to stop that and as hard as I personally worked to stop them from spending on new programs, it would be much, much better if our families out there did the right thing.

And, again, let me make this very clear. Starting in January of next year, a family with children should go into their place of employment, they should talk to the personnel director, whoever it is that handles the W–4 forms, they should change the number of exemptions so as to allow their take-home pay to increase for $33 per month per child.

Let me put this another way. If you have three children in your family, for most families you should start taking home $100 a month more in your take-home paycheck than what you were in December. So the difference between your take-home pay in December and January should be $100 a month for a family with three children.

That is significant; it is real. The bill is signed. You should do it in January of next year, increase your take-home pay. Keep the money in your own home; do not send it out here to Washington.

But that is not all in the tax cut bill. The other thing that people seemed when I talked with them out in Wisconsin to be generally familiar with was the capital gains reduction. The capital gains tax in the past was 28 percent, and that has been reduced to 20 percent. So the good news is that capital gains, the amount of money that you send to Washington, is lower when you sell a stock or a bond or whatever it is that you might have held and made a profit on.

Good news is that drops even further in the year 2000, to 18 percent, and it depends on your income bracket there. If you are in a $41,000-a-year or higher income bracket, the capital gains are 20 percent, and if you are lower than that, they dropped all the way down to 10 percent.

Those two people seem to be vaguely familiar with, at least out there, but there is a whole bunch of others that they were not familiar with at all. Let me start with the first one.

If people own a home, homeowners for the most part when they sell their home will no longer owe any Federal taxes. In the vast majority of the cases, very few exceptions, and only on the very higher-priced homes, will people owe any money in Federal taxes. If you have lived in your residence, it is your personal residence, you have lived there for 2 years or more, you will not owe any Federal taxes when you go to sell your home. This affects a whole bunch of people.

There were a lot of folks out there, empty nesters, people whose children are grown and gone who are waiting for that one-time exclusion at age 55 to sell their home and downsize. That is no longer necessary. The age 55 one-time exclusion is gone. It is no longer there. If you lived in your home for 2 years, you sell the home, you make a profit, there is no tax on it.

It was interesting. I was in Green Bay, WI. I was doing a radio talk show about the tax cuts, and I had a young lady call in, and she said, ''Well, I bought my home for $22,000, and I'm now about to sell it for $60,000.'' So a period of years have gone by, and she said, ''How much taxes am I going to owe?''

And I said, ''Well, you're not going to owe any Federal taxes on the sale of your home.''

So she said, ''Does that mean I owe income taxes?''

And I said, ''No, no, you do not owe any Federal taxes when you go to sell that house.''

And she said, ''Even though it went from $22,000, I'm going to get $60,000 back, how much taxes do I owe?'' She asked me three times the same question because folks are having a hard time believing that Washington actually did something right, they actually lowered taxes instead of raising them like they were doing previously.

So the third part here that I would like to talk about then in the tax cut, if you owned your home, you have lived there for 2 years or more, and you sell your home, in the vast majority of the cases, the only exceptions are the very high priced homes, you will not owe any Federal taxes on the sale of that home.

This affects a lot of senior citizens, also. In Wisconsin, 74 percent of our senior citizens still own their home, and it may be people that took the one-time 55 exclusion that had bought a different home at age 56, maybe a smaller home or whatever, but if they have lived in the house for 2 years and they are now 60, let us say, for example, they can now sell that home, move to a different home, if they like, own it for 2 years, sell it again, so there is no one-time exclusion, you can do this as many times as you want as long as you live in the home for at least 2 years.

So this part was very unfamiliar with most of the people out there.

Then I went on to the part and I started talking about saving up for their children's education, because we had a lot of families that we were talking with, and we started talking about the fact that it is now possible to put $500 per year per child into what is called an education savings account. The money then accumulates tax free, and the student can then take it out when they reach age 18 and are ready to go off to college.

I talked to a lot of grandparents about this account because it seems that there are a lot of grandparents that are interested in giving their grandchildren some sort of a gift, whether it be a Christmas or their birthday or whatever, and it makes an ideal gift from a grandparent to a grandchild, and I know everybody cannot afford it, but there are some grandparents out there who would like to give this sort of a gift to their grandchildren, and it is certainly an ideal way to provide their grandchildren with a college education.

Again, the education savings account, you can put $500 a year into this savings account, the money accumulates tax free, and when the kids take it out at age 18 they pay on the lower tax rate that they would be at. So it is money for them for college.

Speaking of college, very, very important. I took my daughter to her first year of college. My son had left for—he is a junior in college, and of course we talked to a lot of college students and the parents of a lot of college students, and there is a general lack of understanding of how this college tuition credit is going to work. Well, it works like this:

If you have got a freshman or a sophomore in college and the cost of their college education is $2,000 a year or more, and in Wisconsin at least that is the vast majority of the cases, if it is 2,000 a year or more in costs, the parents get to keep $1,500 more of their own hard-earned money in their own home rather than sending it out here to Washington.

And, again, I would point out this is not a gift from Washington. This is money that the people have gotten up in the morning, gone to work and earned. The only thing is instead of being taxed on it, instead of that tax coming out here to Washington and Washington spending it, you keep that money in your own home.

So if you have a freshman in college, and the costs of their college tuition is $2,000, room, board and tuition is $2,000 or more, you should start keeping $125 a month more in your take-home pay starting in January of next year.

And, again, that is simply 1,500 divided by 12 is $125 a month more.

For juniors and seniors, if the cost is over $5,000, which in many cases it is for room, board, and tuition, you should start keeping a thousand dollars more of your own money in your own paycheck, and again that should start in January.

This is very, very straightforward, and if the people do not start keeping their own money, if they send it out here to Washington, we are not sure Washington is not going to spend the

money. We here in Washington, many of us, want the people to start keeping their own money next January. Why should you send it out here to Washington when it is your money?

College tuition, then, freshman and sophomores, in most cases are going to get a $1,500 credit; juniors and seniors in most cases, in many, many cases, are going to get a $1,000 credit.

□ 2130

I said are you interested in saving more money for retirement. He said yes, but I am in a pension funds already, so none of those IRA's affect me.

I said well, no, that is not entirely true. In fact, this new IRA, called the Roth IRA, you can put $2,000 per year into the Roth IRA per person. So in this case a husband and wife could put $4,000 away for their retirement.

You put after tax dollars into the Roth IRA, but when you take the tax dollars out at retirement, it is tax free. This might be one of the best provisions for middle age people in the entire country. This might be one of the best savings accounts in terms of taking care of yourself in retirement.

So even if you are in a different pension fund, and even if you are already doing some other things to take care of yourself in retirement, you may want to take a look at the Roth IRA, where you can literally put $2,000 per person into this savings account, and at retirement, you take the money out tax free.

It is very significant, because $2,000 put in at age, say, 40 typically will at least triple by the time you reach retirement. That means it goes from $2,000 thousand to $6,000 in value when you take it out, and there is no tax on that $4,000 on increased value. A very, very significant change in the tax laws that people should be taking advantage of.

Again, the idea here is to encourage savings and encourage people to take care of themselves in retirement.

Then we went on to talk to some others. Farms, roughly 90 percent of the farms transferred from one generation to another in this Nation today will no longer have any taxes due because of the Tax Code change. So for small farmers and businessowners, you will be able to pass that small business or farm on to the next generation without the tax burden that was there before.

It is very clear to farmers as you pass this on from one generation to another, the benefit. But there a hidden benefit in here that not many people have picked up on. When a business is held by a family and the family has been running that business for a period of time, if the owner of that business cannot pass it on to the next generation, many times the business gets sold and somebody else takes over and the jobs are moved out of that community to a different community. So by allowing that business to stay in the family and be passed from one generation to another, many times that means jobs stay in a community that otherwise might not have stayed there.

There are so many different provisions in this Tax Code that provide benefits to the American people that I found by the time I was done, we virtually could not find anyone who was not in some way, shape or form going to benefit by this Tax Code.

I have left out one other group, and that is young couples or young working folks, singles, couples. Those folks have the benefit of being able to save for education and their first home in this Roth IRA that I was just describing, where they can then literally take the money out tax free and use it for the down payment on their first home or for college education.

So, again, there is a benefit for the young workers, the people in their thirties, forties, and fifties preparing to retire for themselves, there is a benefit for seniors who own a home and who want to sell it, there is a benefit literally all across the generations here, and certainly there are many, many benefits for our families contained in the tax cut bill.

Again, I would be remiss to talk about these tax cuts without also saying that the budget is balanced first. I would like to bring the American people and my colleagues some other good news. Numbers have come out now that reestimate the revenues coming into the Federal Government, and, in fact, as we have been saying in our office for quite some time, the economy is stronger than people were giving it credit for and revenues are coming in faster.

What does that mean in English? The budget is balanced for the first time since 1969 next year. Four years ahead of schedule, we are on track to balancing the budget, the job is done, and your taxes are coming down at a great time.

What a great time this is in this country. I never, 3 years ago when I was first elected, thought we would be in a position to stand here and talk seriously about a balanced budget in 1998, taxes coming down, Medicare restored, welfare reform. Able-bodied welfare recipients have now to go to work, and not heartlessly. They are guaranteed a job in Wisconsin. We are seeing our welfare rolls fall dramatically. Good news all across the specter in terms of what has happened in the last couple years here in Washington.

With that, I would like to turn my attention now to another topic that I find is very confusing as I talk with groups of people. A lot of folks are saying if the budget is balanced, what about that $5 trillion debt out there? It has to be smoke and mirrors, because we know there is a $5 trillion debt out there.

Let me explain the difference between two terms. The first term is deficit and the second term is debt. Deficit is like the family with their checkbook. Deficit is like overdrawing your check book.

Since 1969, each and every year Washington has written out more in checks than what it collected in taxes, so they have literally overdrawn their checkbook each and every year since 1969. That is called the deficit.

When they overdrew their checkbook, what they did was borrowed the money, put it in their checkbook, and then, of course, the checks were cashed and on we went.

So for each and every year since 1969 they have overdrawn their checkbook, and then they went and borrowed the money, put in the checkbook and made good on the checks. As you might imagine, since they have been borrowing more and more money each and every year since 1969, the debt has been growing each and every year, and that is the $5.3 trillion we have staring us in the face.

I am talking now about the debt and how fast it has been growing, and I think it is very important that the American people realize that we still have a very significant problem staring us in the face.

On this chart I show the growing debt facing America. From 1960 to 1980, the growth was relatively slow and relatively small. That is, The deficits were not big because they did not borrow lots of money in each one of those years.

But from 1980 forward, the debt has been growing in large amounts. This is what brought many Members of the class of 1995 out here, the Republican class of 1995. We watched this debt grow and realized we were about here on this debt chart right now, and that if we don't do something about this as a Nation, we are not going to have a future in this country.

That is what brought many of us here in the first place, and that is why it is such good news we are going to stop borrowing the money and the red line will quit going up when we reach a balanced budget.

When I point to 1980, all my colleagues on that side of the aisle say sure, that is the year Ronald Reagan was elected, and all my colleagues on this year say yeah, I know, but that is the year the Democrat Congress started spending out of control.

The fact of the matter is it doesn't matter which side it was responsible. The fact is we as a nation have this debt staring us in the face, and it is not a Republican problem or a Democrat problem, it is an American problem, because this Government does represent the people. It is time that we as a nation solve the problem, rather than pass the blame back and forth in the House of Representatives and the Senate and the presidency.

For those that have never seen this number, this is the amount of money, it is $5.3 trillion, that is the amount of money that the Federal Government has borrowed on behalf of the American people. This is the accumulation of the overdrawn checkbook, the amount of money that was necessary

to make the checkbook balance since 1969.

Let me translate that into English. I used to be a math teacher, so you will see some of the math still in here. If we divided this debt up by the number of people in the United States of America, if each and every American were to pay just their share of the Federal debt, they would need to pay $20,000. The Federal Government has borrowed $20,000 on behalf of the every man, woman, and child in the United States of America basically within the last 15 to 20 years.

The real problem, you look at a family of five like mine, my kids are here, my wife is here, we have got five of us in our House, the Federal Government literally borrowed and spent $100,000 on behalf of my family.

The real problem, the kicker, is the bottom line number. You see every family of five in the country today or the average family of five is paying $580 a month to do nothing but pay the interest on this debt.

This money is owed to people. It is a real debt. Interest is being paid on it. The cost of interest alone to a family of five in the United States of America today, or any group of five people, is $580 a month. A lot of people say, I do not really pay $580 a month in income tax. I don't have to worry about it.

But it is not only income tax. If you do something as simple as walk in the store and buy a loaf of bread, the store owner makes a profit on that loaf of bread and, of course, part of that profit gets sent out here to Washington, and, you guessed it, it goes to help pay the interest on the Federal debt.

As a matter of fact, one dollar out of every six collected in taxes goes to paying the interest on the Federal debt. So the real problem with this picture is that there are real people out there, real families out there, that are paying $580 a month to do nothing but pay the interest on the debt.

It would be logical to ask the question, how in the world did we get into this mess and didn't anybody try to correct it in the past?

I wanted to talk specifically about the past, the past. Let me define the past to be pre-1995. Again, this is very specific, what we are talking about here. The American people were promised a balanced budget repeatedly. This is not news that all of a sudden we have a $5 trillion debt staring us in the face. As a matter of fact, the Gramm–Rudman-Hollings bill, first passed in 1985, promised the American people a balanced budget in 1991. Well, we look at the deficit line in this chart, and what actually happened, and it is clear that the promise made from Washington was broken.

The promise was not kept. But they knew what to do. When they couldn't keep the first promise, Washington made a series of new promises. Again, I emphasize this is the past. This is what led many of us into leaving the private sector and coming to Washington.

This blue line shows the fixed Gramm–Rudman-Hollings bill, and it was promising a balanced budget in 1993. I think that 1992 and 1993, those are real important dates to look at out there because, you see, when the budget was supposed to be balanced, instead we had huge and growing deficits. So rather than balance the budget as was promised then under this bill, when we got to the early 1990's, instead we had huge, growing deficits.

So what did Washington do? In 1993, passed the biggest tax increase in American history. Washington looked at this picture and concluded that the right answer was to reach into the pockets of the American people and take more money out of their pockets and bring it out here to Washington.

Why would they do that? Well, because if they take more money out of the pockets of the American people and bring it out here to Washington, they can keep their Washington spending programs going and still bring the deficit down. You see, that is what the tax increase of 1993 was all about.

To pass the tax increase of 1993, what it really allowed them to do is keep spending going out here in Washington. Again I emphasize, this is the past, because in 1994, the American people decided to change what was going on in Washington, D.C. In 1994, the people for the first time in many, many, many years elected a Republican House of Representatives and a Republican Senate. This history of broken promises, this history of tax increases, that changed in 1995.

We had this theory when we came here in 1995 that went like this: Rather than raising taxes on the people and taking more money out here to Washington, why don't we slow the growth of spending here in Washington, have fewer Washington spending programs and get to a balanced budget, because Washington is spending less, not because they are taking more money out of the pockets of the American people. That was our theory.

Our theory went like this: If we can just get Washington to spend less money, that means they would borrow less money out of the private sector. If they borrowed less money out of the private sector, of course, that means more money available in the private sector; more money available in the private sector, the law of supply and demand is straightforward, the interest rates stay down.

So if we could just get Washington to spend less money, they would borrow less money. That would leave more money available in the private sector, and with more money available, the interest rates would stay down. If the interest rates stayed down, our theory was, people would buy more houses, buy more cars; and of course when people bought more houses and cars, that meant other people had to go to work building the houses and cars, and that meant job opportunities and less welfare and less cost to the Government and more people paying taxes in. This was the 1995 theory.

I think it is more than fair that the American people should at this point start asking how did they do? How are the Republicans doing? They came here in 1995, laid down a plan to balance the budget in 7 years, how are they doing?

I think that is a legitimate question. I brought the next chart along to show exactly how the new Congress, since 1995, is doing. The red columns in this chart show the promises that were made in 1995. These are the deficit amounts that the Republican Congress said we would keep the deficit to in order to reach a balanced budget by the year 2002.

I am happy to say that in the first year, and this is in, this is not a promise, an empty promise, we not only hit our target, but we were about $50 billion ahead of schedule.

So the good news is, in year one, the Republican plan not only hit our target, we were well ahead of schedule. Year two came. Year two, the change was significant. Washington borrowed over $100 billion less than was projected out here until year two and it worked exactly the way the theory we had hoped would work.

That is when Washington borrowed less money, because their deficit was lower, that left $100 billion more money available in the private sector; $100 billion more in the private sector kept the interest rates down, and sure enough, it worked. People bought more houses and cars and stoves and refrigerators and all the other things that go with it, and that provided job opportunities so the unemployment rate dropped to the lowest level in years. That meant job opportunities for people. They went to work and started paying taxes in, and of course, that made the program go better.

The rest of this chart was kind of theory a few days ago. We found out recently that the theory was way too lacking the optimism that should be there because of the strong economy we are in. We are now finding we are going to reach a balanced budget, this blue column, the actual deficit is going to go to zero sometime between the year 1998 and the year 1999, 3 or 4 years ahead of the promise that was made by the Republicans back in 1995. Is this a change or what?

Before 1995, we had the broken promises of Gramm–Rudman-Hollings and the higher taxes. Post-1995, well, we are 3 years into the plan and are now looking at balancing the budget 3 years ahead of schedule for the first time since 1969, and lowering taxes and restoring Medicare at the same time because the idea of constraining the growth of Washington spending works.

□ 2145

A lot of folks say, well, you are just plain lucky out there in Washington. You are just plain lucky. The economy is booming, and since the economy is booming there is more revenue coming

in, and you guys can get your job done and you all look great out there doing it, and everybody is bragging about it.

I brought with me a chart to show the actual facts on that particular argument as well, because I hear that quite a few different places that I go to. We have had booming economies in the past. In the past every time Washington went into a booming economy Washington subsequently went into booming spending cycles. In fact, all the extra revenue that came in, they spent it, so we never did get the deficit down. We never did get to a balanced budget.

In fact, this Congress since 1995 is very different. We are in a booming economy. Yes, the revenues are coming in stronger than expected. But rather than go and spend the extra money, this Congress has seen fit to slow the growth of Washington spending by over 40 percent at the same time the economy remains strong.

This is how fast Washington spending was growing before 1995. This is how fast it is growing since 1995 on through the year 2002. So let us make this very clear. In the face of a strong economy and more revenues coming in, instead of Washington doing what it has always done in the past, going and spending the extra money, what Washington did is at the same time the economy was strong they slowed the growth of Washington spending.

So in the face of a slowed growth of Washington spending and a strong economy, we hit our deficit targets, we are on track, we are ahead of schedule, and we are about to balance the budget for the first time since 1969, while at the same time lowering taxes and restoring Medicare.

For those that are interested in inflation-adjusted dollars, it is even more dramatic. The Washington spending was increasing by 1.8 percent. It has now been slowed to .6 percent. We are down to a point where Washington spending in real dollars has virtually stopped in terms of increasing spending. That is good news, and that is why we are also able to both balance the budget and reduce taxes at the same time for the good of the American people.

I brought one more chart with me that I think says it all, because a lot of people are saying, well, how can all of this stuff happen at the same time? You know, in fact, would this all have happened anyhow?

This chart shows what would have happened if when we got here back in 1995 we had played golf, tennis and basketball instead of doing our jobs. The deficit line that is shown here in the red, this is what we inherited when we got here, back in 1995. In fact, Members can see that the deficits were projected to go all the way up to $350 billion at that point in time.

A lot of people remember 1995. They remember the 100 days. They remember the government shutdowns. They remember the hassles and what seemed like a constant battle out here in Washington. I want to say something. I was here. It was a constant battle. It was worse here living through it than what the American people saw out there in public.

But at the end of 1995, we had made progress. This yellow line in the chart shows what the deficit projections were after one year of very difficult battles. The green line shows what we had hoped to do. We laid this out in 1995, and again, we hoped to get to that balanced budget by the year 2002.

The good news is here. The good news is what we have actually accomplished is below either one of those projections, and in fact we are now going to reach zero right here in the year 1998 or 1999. So not only are we not losing what was given to us in 1995 when we got here, but we are going to reach a balanced budget in 1998 or 1999 for the first time in more than a generation.

Again, I cannot emphasize this enough. The last time the budget was balanced I was a sophomore in high school. My son is now a junior in college, my daughter is a freshman in college, and my youngest is a freshman in high school. This is more than a full generation ago, the last time we balanced the Federal budget. It is great news for the future of this country.

I have been real upbeat and I have been real optimistic about this, as well we should be. We should be celebrating this first balanced budget in a generation; welfare reform, taxes coming down, Medicare restored, we should be celebrating this. But we would be remiss if we did not recognize that even after we got a balanced budget, we still have this $5.3 trillion debt hanging over our head.

Remember, when we say the budget is balanced, that is just a checkbook. All we mean is that we are taking in as many dollars as we are spending in this given year. That does not pay this debt off. I have good news on that front, though, too. We are working on it. We have a plan on the table right now, it is called the National Debt Repayment Act.

What the plan does is this. It says after we reach a balanced budget, we recognize we still have this huge problem. We have a responsibility to future generations to do something about this problem. So after we reach a balanced budget, we are going to cap the growth of Washington spending at a rate of at least 1 percent under the rate of revenue growth. So spending is now going up slower than revenue growth.

With spending going up slower than the rate of revenue growth, if you start a balance, that creates a surplus. With the surplus, we take one-third of that surplus and provide additional tax cuts to the American people, so the American people should expect a tax cut every year from here on out. Two-thirds of it goes to repaying the Federal debt.

I have great news. If we were to enact this plan, by the year 2026 the entire Federal debt would be repaid, and we would pass this Nation on to our children debt-free. But there is another hidden advantage to doing that. As we are paying down the Federal debt, the money that has been taken out of the Social Security Trust Fund would also be returned.

Social Security is collecting more dollars than it is paying back out to our senior citizens in benefits each year. As a matter of fact, this year alone the Social Security system will collect about $70 billion more in tax revenue than what it is paying back out to our senior citizens in benefits.

The idea is that money is supposed to be set aside in a savings account so when the baby boom generation gets to retirement, you can go to the savings account, get the money, put it in the checkbook, and make good on the Social Security payments to our senior citizens.

That money, though, it is not in that savings account. That money is all part of this $5.3 trillion debt. What Social Security is doing is instead of putting the money in the savings account, they are collecting the Social Security tax dollars, more than what they are paying out to seniors in benefits, they are putting all the money in the general fund, in the big government checkbook, if you like. They are writing out checks out of that checkbook, and of course there is no money left at the end. That is the deficit. Then they are simply putting an IOU down in the Social Security Trust Fund.

Under the National Debt Repayment Act, as we go about paying off the Federal debt, we would also be putting the money back into the Social Security Trust Fund. So under the National Debt Repayment Act, we create a surplus by slowing the growth of Washington spending, which we have already been successful doing.

We just continue what we have done for the last 2 years, continue it on forward. We create that surplus, we take one-third of the surplus and work to reduce taxes further each year for the American people. We take two-thirds and apply it to the Federal debt, and when we are repaying the debt, it is completely repaid by the year 2026, we are also restoring the Social Security Trust Fund.

Just think about this. It is not only the fact that we are doing the right thing, we are paying the bills we have run up over the last generation; it is not only that. It is not only that we are going to give this Nation to our children debt free.

It goes a step further. When the debt goes away $1 out of every $6 that the Federal Government is now spending no longer needs to be spent. That opens the door for huge tax cuts for the American people.

When we start talking about these tax cuts, let us talk about some of the possibilities here, because under the National Debt Repayment Act, as the debt gets paid down, lower interest

payments, the government needs less money, we can now talk about revamping the entire tax system.

I do not know how all of my colleagues feel and all the listeners this evening feel, but many of us do not like the fact that the IRS is so complicated it is almost impossible to understand. In all fairness, the new Tax Code did not make it any easier. It did lower taxes. We should not complain about the fact that taxes are coming down. But the fact is the IRS is far too cumbersome and far too difficult to understand.

As we look at these tax cuts down the road, therefore, it gives us the opportunity to throw out the IRS as we know it and bring in a new tax system that would be a lot simpler than the one we have today. Until we get this in hand, we cannot do that.

So the good news under the National Debt Repayment Act, and again I would encourage all of my colleagues that are not already on board as cosponsors to join us in the National Debt Repayment Act, what it does is it pays off the debt by the year 2026 so our children get this Nation debt-free, restores the Social Security trust fund for our senior citizens, and for those people in the work force today, for those people in the work force today, they should expect additional tax cuts each and every year as far as the eye can see. It is great news to the American people.

When we start thinking about the future tax cuts, I opened the hour here by talking about the fact that I had listened to a lot of people out there in Wisconsin. What the people told me when I listened to them is two tax cuts they were most interested in. The first one is the marriage tax penalty. This is just totally unfair in our society today. I could not find anybody who did not think we should not get rid of the marriage tax penalty.

That works like this. If you have 4 people all working in the same place at the same time earning exactly the same salary, but two of those people are married to each other and two of those people are not married to each other, the two people not married to each other pay less tax than the two people that are married to each other. That is called the marriage tax penalty, and that is just plain wrong. That is one thing I heard.

The other thing I heard repeatedly is, Mark, just simplify the entire Tax Code. Just make it a lot simpler. If you are going to do more tax cuts, for goodness sakes, just cut it across board. I can tell the Members, we are going to look forward to eliminating the marriage tax penalty and work towards an across-the-board tax cut for virtually all Americans out there. So whatever bracket you are in, it would be very easy to compute if your taxes went down by 5 percent or 10 percent or whatever the number is.

I would like to wrap up my part this evening by again going back and just comparing the past, the present, and the future.

The past: broken promises of the Gramm–Rudman-Hollings bill, the higher taxes of 1990, 1993; especially 1993, the biggest tax increase in American history, taxes went up with a gasoline tax increase. For those who were not paying real close attention, the discussion went like, well, that tax increase is only on the rich. But you were rich if you bought gasoline at a gas pump, because it went up 4.3 cents a gallon.

So the tax increases of 1993, the broken promises of a balanced budget of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, all of these deficits that ran up this huge 5.3 trillion dollar debt, that is all in the past. In 1994, the American people, and the credit should go to the American people, the American people changed what was going on. They sent a new group out here to run Washington.

Under that new group, where are we at? I think it is a fair question to ask, where are we at? We are in the third year of a 7-year plan to balance the Federal budget. We are not only on track, we are ahead of schedule. We will have our first balanced budget since 1969 next year, three or four years ahead of what was promised back in 1995. So for the first time since 1969 the budget will be balanced. It has changed here in Washington. Instead of the broken promises of the past, we will have a balanced budget for the first time.

How about the higher taxes of 1993? That is not happening under this Congress, either. As a matter of fact, taxes are coming down. Just to run through that list of tax cuts and what is all in this bill, again, just briefly, $500 per child, starting—it is $400 next year and goes up to $500 the year after; capital gains going from 28 to 20, or even to 10, depending on your income bracket. If you sell your home, it is your principal residence, you have lived there for 2 years, in general there will be no taxes on the sale of your home. However old you are, the one-time exclusion age 55 is no longer there.

Grandparents, parents, to save up for your children's education you can put up to $500 per year per child into a savings account. The interest accumulates tax-free. College tuition for most freshmen and sophomores out there, the parents are going to keep $125 a month more. That is $125 a month more if you have a freshman or sophomore in college, in most cases you keep that money in your house. You earned it. It is not a gift. You earned it. It is your money. You keep it instead of sending it out here to Washington. $1,500 is the total for freshmen or sophomores, $1,500, and in most cases for a junior or senior it is $1,000 that you keep in your own home.

If you are in a pension fund today, wherever you are, if you are saving for retirement, if you would like to increase the amount that you are saving for your retirement, there is a new IRA called the Roth IRA that most everybody watching tonight, my colleagues, are eligible for. You can put up to $2,000 per year per person into the Roth IRA for a husband and wife, $4,000 a year you put in after-tax dollars, which means you have already paid taxes on that money. But the good news is the interest accumulates tax-free, and when you take it out, it is tax-free completely. So you put the money in, it accumulates, and at retirement when you take the money out it is tax-free.

For young folks, if you want to save up to buy a house or college education, put money into an IRA type account and you are allowed to take it out without the penalty. For small businesses, and I may not have mentioned this one earlier, the health care deduction for self-employed people is going all the way up to 100 percent over a period of years.

Death taxes are reformed. Ninety percent of farms are passed from one generation to another with no taxes paid. Businesses, family owned businesses will pass on to the next generation in many cases without taxes so the jobs can stay there in the community.

The point of this is we are in a very, very changed Washington, DC. The tax hike of 1993 versus the tax cut of 1997, that is dramatically different. There has been a dramatic change that has been brought on by the American people, sending a new group out here to control the House and Senate, and the American people have a right to understand just how far we have come.

The present: a balanced budget for the first time since 1969. The present, tax cuts, the first time in 16 years. The present: Medicare restored for our senior citizens. The present: welfare recipients, able-bodied welfare recipients having the opportunity to work so they have a chance at a job promotion and a better life for themselves and their families. That is the present. It is very, very different than it was just a couple of short years ago out here. I do not believe the American people fully understand the magnitude of the change yet. That is the present.

Where are we going? Well, even after we get the budget balanced, even after we started with the first tax reduction in 16 years, Medicare restored for a decade, we still have a $5.3 trillion debt hanging over our heads.

□ 2200

We have introduced the National Debt Repayment Act, which would repay the debt in its entirety by the year 2026, giving this Nation to our children debt-free. It would restore the Social Security Trust Fund for our senior citizens and, as it creates surpluses by controlling the growth of Washington spending, one-third of those surpluses would be used to provide additional tax cuts.

Think what a changed environment this is: The budget is balanced, taxes coming down, and a plan on the table

that actually talks about paying off the Federal debt, instead of how we are going to stop borrowing this money. What a changed country this is.

We as the American people should start having optimistic visions of the future again for our children. Growth, opportunities, our kids are going to have opportunities in America just like we did to start from scratch and build a company from the ground up, or do what they want to do in this society. Those opportunities will once again be there because instead of passing them an ever growing debt, instead of giving them a legacy of virtual bankruptcy, we are now in a position to talk seriously about repaying the debt, passing the Nation on to our children debt-free, restoring Social Security for our senior citizens, and additional tax cuts for people in the work force today.

That is what this is all about, and I sincerely hope that is what my service to this country is all about, because it is a worthwhile endeavor if we reach those goals.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SCHIFF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMPBELL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, on September 4.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, on September 4.

Mr. HOEKSTRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CAMPBELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today and on September 4 and 5.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on September 9.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, on September 4.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. ROEMER.
Ms. DELAURO.
Mr. MOAKLEY.
Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
Ms. MALONEY of New York.
Ms. WOOLSEY.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. NADLER.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. OLVER.
Mr. DICKS.
Mr. PASCRELL.
Mr. BONIOR.
Mr. TOWNS.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Mr. BENTSEN.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. NEAL.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
Ms. SANCHEZ.
Mr. CLEMENT.
Mr. BERMAN.
Mr. MANTON.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
Mr. CLAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMPBELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FORBES.
Mr. HUTCHINSON.
Mr. HAYWORTH.
Mr. NEY.
Mr. SHIMKUS.
Mr. LEWIS of California.
Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. GREENWOOD.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.
Mr. CALVERT.
Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado.
Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NEUMANN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. ETHERIDGE.
Mr. GOODLATTE.
Mr. KIND.
Mr. ENGEL.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1120. An act to provide for a consultant for the President pro tempore; to the Committee on House Oversight.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 408. An act to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes.

H.R. 584. An act for the relief of John Wesley Davis.

H.R. 1198. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the City of Grants Pass, Oregon.

H.R. 1585. An act to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1944. An act to provide for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon Ski Area and other land in the State of Oregon

H.R. 2014. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(2) and (d) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

H.R. 2015. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On August 1, 1997:

H.R. 2014. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(2) and (d) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

H.R. 2015. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

H.R. 1198. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Grants Pass, Oregon.

H.R. 584. An act for the relief of John Wesley Davis.

H.R. 1944. An act to provide for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon Ski Area and other land in the State of Oregon.

H.R. 1585. An act to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps, and for other purposes.

On August 4, 1997:

H.R. 408. An act to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 4, 1997, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by various committees, House of Representatives, during the 1st and 2d quarters of 1997 in connection with official foreign travel, a consolidated report of Speaker authorized travel in the 2d quarter of 1997, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, as well as foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by various miscellaneous groups, House of Representatives, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1977

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Sanford Bishop	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Helen Chenoweth	3/26	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Michael Crapo	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Earl Hilliard	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Collin Peterson	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Robert F. Smith	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Charles Stenholm	3/23	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Andrew Baker	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Sharla Moffett	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Michael Nervda	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Bryce Quick	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Jason Vaillancourt	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Paul Unger	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Committee total									2,203.30		2,203.30

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BOB SMITH, Chairman, July 23, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to Israel, Jordan, Egypt and Morocco:											
Hon. Terry Everett	1/11	1/13	Israel		417.00						417.00
	1/13	1/14	Jordan		251.00						251.00
	1/14	1/17	Egypt		701.00						701.00
Commercial airfare							2,743.68				2,743.68
Committee total					1,369.00		2,743.68		0.00		4,112.68

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD SPENCE, Chairman, July 31, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Terry Everett	5/8	5/10	Nicaraqua		468.50		([3])				468.50
Hon. Robert F. Smith	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
	5/28	6/1	Philippines		1,188.00						1,188.00
Hon. Richard Pombo	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
	5/28	6/1	Philippines		1,188.00						1,188.00
Hon. Bill Barrett	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
	5/28	6/1	Philippines		1,188.00						1,188.00
Paul Unger	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
	5/28	6/1	Philippines		1,188.00						1,188.00
Bryce Quick	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
	5/28	6/1	Philippines		1,188.00						1,188.00
Kevin Kramp	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
Committee totals					11,016.50		23,837.70				34,854.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

BOB SMITH, July 23, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Sean Peterson	4/4	4/8	Johannesburg, South Africa		1,035.00						1,035.00
	4/9	4/11	Harare, Zimbabwe		585.00						585.00
	4/12	4/15	London, England		1,284.00		7,229.25				8,513.25
Armando Falcon	5/9	5/14	Fukouka, Japan		1,295.00		4,646.95				5,941.95
Hon. Mark Foley	6/12	6/16	Port-au-Prince, Haiti		892.00		542.45				1,434.45
Committee totals					$5,091.00		$12,418.65				$17,509.65

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JIM LEACH, Chairman, July 31, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Robert Taub	6/10	6/15	Denmark		661.96		2,118.29		16.45		2,796.70
John T. Griffin	5/18	5/22	United Kingdom		403.63		736.65		42.02		1,182.30
Joseph F. Jakub III	5/18	5/21	United Kingdom		563.47		779.28		9.35		1,352.10
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		[3] 13.33		[3] 36.11		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		[3] 111.11		[3] 116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Hon. Mark E. Souder	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		[3] 13.33		[3] 36.11		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		[3] 111.11		[3] 116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Marshall Sanford	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		[3] 13.33		[3] 36.11		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		[3] 111.11		[3] 116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Hon. Bob Barr	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		[3] 13.33		[3] 36.11		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		[3] 111.11		[3] 116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Rod R. Blagojevich	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		[3] 13.33		[3] 36.11		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		[3] 111.11		[3] 116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Robert Charles	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		[3] 13.33		[3] 36.11		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		[3] 111.11		[3] 116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Sean Littlefield	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		[3] 13.33		[3] 36.11		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		[3] 111.11		[3] 116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Kevin Long	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		[3] 13.33		[3] 36.11		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		[3] 111.11		[3] 116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Committee total					16,693.06		5,878.22		2,872.62		$25,443.90

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Estimates only; information not available from State Department.

DAN BURTON, Chairman, July 31, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to Panama, Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina and Chile:											
Hon. Floyd D. Spence	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	4/01	Argentina		822.00						822.00
	4/01	4/04	Chile		898.00						898.00
Hon.Herbert H. Bateman	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	4/01	Argentina		822.00						822.00
	4/01	4/04	Chile		898.00						898.00
Hon. Howard ''Buck'' McKeon	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	4/01	Argentina		822.00						822.00
	4/01	4/04	Chile		898.00						898.00
Hon. John M.McHugh	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	4/01	Argentina		822.00						822.00
	4/01	4/04	Chile		898.00						898.00
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	3/30	Argentina		416.00						416.00
Commerical airfare							2,987.85				2,987.85
Dr. Andrew K. Ellis	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	3/30	Argentina		416.00						416.00
Commerical airfare							2,987.85				2,987.85
Andrea K. Aquino	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	4/01	Argentina		822.00						822.00
	4/01	4/04	Chile		898.00						898.00
Delegation expenses	3/21	3/23	Panama						106.30		106.30
	3/25	3/29	Brazil				370.18		2,621.70		2,991.88
	3/29	4/01	Argentina				815.00		3,941.61		4,756.61
Visit to China:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	3/24	3/28	China		954.00						954.00
Commerical airfare							3,986.95				3,986.95
Visit to Panama:											
Gene Taylor	4/01	4/04	Panama		254.00						254.00
Commerical airfare			Panama				2,026.95				2,026.95
George O. Withers	4/01	4/04	Panama		254.00						254.00
Commerical airfare							1,400.95				1,400.95
Visit to Italy, Bosnia, Albania, and Germany:											
Hon. Sonny Bono	4/19	4/21	Italy		275.00						254.00
	4/20	4/20	Bosnia		0.00						0.00
	4/21	4/21	Albania		0.00						0.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	3/21	4/22	Germany		75.00						75.00
Commerical airfare							6,765.35				6,765.35
Committee totals					20,386.98		21,341.08		6,669.61		48,397.67

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD SPENCE, Chairman, July 31, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Kristi E. Walseth	5/29	6/1	Germany		$650						650.00
Commercial airfare							3,434.65				3,434.65
Committee total											4,084.65

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JERRY B.H. SOLOMON, Chairman, July 10, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner	4/1	4/5	China		973.50		4,773.95				5,747.45
	4/5	4/7	Japan		636.00						636.00
Philip Kiko	4/1	4/5	China		973.50		4,773.95				5,747.45
	4/5	4/7	Japan		636.00						636.00
Hon. George Brown	3/29	4/5	Mexico		1,736.50		947.92				2,684.42
Michael Quear	3/29	4/5	Mexico		1,736.50		775.92				2,512.42
Committee total					6,692.00		11,271.74				17,963.74

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Chairman, July 17, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bill Archer	5/29	6/2	Russia		1,103.00		2,384.95		396.63		3,884.58
Hon. Mac Collins	5/29	6/2	Russia		1,450.00		2,384.95				3.834.95
Hon. Barbara B. Kennelly	5/29	6/2	Russia		1,450.00		2,384.95				3,834.95
Hon. Wally Herger	5/29	6/2	Russia		1,450.00		2,384.95				3,834.95
Committee Total					5,453.00		9,539.80		396.63		15,389.43

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL ARCHER, Chairman, July 30, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Michael Sheehy	4/18	4/19	Europe		317.00						317.00
Commercial airfare							3,414.35				3,414.35
Thomas Newcomb	4/18	4/25	Europe		1,970.00						1,970.00
Commercial airfare							3,035.15				3,035.00
Patrick Murphy	4/18	4/25	Europe		1,970.00						1,970.00
Commercial airfare							3,035.15				3,035.15
Wendy Selig	4/23	4/25	Europe		468.00						468.00
Commercial airfare							2,634.45				2,634.45
Hon. Julian Dixon	5/8	5/10	Central America		468.50						468.50
Calvin Humphrey	5/8	5/10	Central America		468.50						468.50
SWendy Selig	5/8	5/10	Central America		468.50						468.50
CODEL Expenses									250.00		250.00
Hon. Norm Dicks	5/23	5/30	Europe		2,073.000						2,073.00
Commercial airfare							3,368.25				3,368.25
Michael Sheehy	5/23	5/25	Europe		642.00						642.00
Commercial airfare							3,849.25				3,849.25
Committee total					8,845.50		19,336.60		250.00		28,432.10

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

PORTER J. GOSS, Chairman, July 18, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ASIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 24 AND APR. 2, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Newt Gingrich	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. John Dingell	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Bob Livingston	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Chris Cox	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Jeff Jefferson	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Al Hastings	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Jay Kim	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Ed Royce	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Mark Foley	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Bill Livingood	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Arne Christenson	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Gardner Peckham	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Rachel Robinson	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Ben Cohen	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Barry Jackson	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Christina Martin	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Bob Hathaway	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Adm./Dr. John Eisold	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Dwight Comedy	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Newt Gingrich	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. John Dingell	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Bob Livingston	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Chris Cox	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Jeff Jefferson	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Al Hastings	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Jay Kim	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Ed Royce	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Mark Foley	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Bill Livingood	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Arne Christenson	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Gardner Peckham	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Rachel Robinson	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Ben Cohen	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Barry Jackson	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Christina Martin	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Bob Hathaway	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Adm./Dr. John Eisold	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Dwight Comedy	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Newt Gingrich	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. John Dingell	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Bob Livingston	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Chris Cox	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Jeff Jefferson	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Al Hastings	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Jay Kim	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Ed Royce	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Mark Foley	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Bill Livingood	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Arne Christenson	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Gardner Peckham	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Rachel Robinson	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Ben Cohen	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Barry Jackson	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Christina Martin	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Bob Hathaway	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Adm./Dr. John Eisold	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Dwight Comedy	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Newt Gingrich	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. John Dingell	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Bob Livingston	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Chris Cox	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Jeff Jefferson	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Al Hastings	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Jay Kim	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Ed Royce	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Mark Foley	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Bill Livingood	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Arne Christenson	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Gardner Peckham	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Rachel Robinson	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Ben Cohen	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Barry Jackson	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Christina Martin	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Bob Hathaway	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Adm./Dr. John Eisold	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Dwight Comedy	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Committee Total					6,688.00						20,064.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

NEWT GINGRICH, May 2, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO RUSSIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 27 AND MAY 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Curt Weldon	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Hon. Lindsey Graham	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO RUSSIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 27 AND MAY 31, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Roger Wicker	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Hon. Jay Dickey	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Hon. Charles Taylor	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00		2,560.15				3,940.15
Hon. Steny Hoyer	5/27	5/30	Russia		1,000.00		3,460.95				4,460.95
Hon. Corrine Brown	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Hon. Owen Pickett	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Douglas Ritter	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Cory Alexander	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Marlene Kaufmann	5/27	5/30	Russia		1,000.00		3,460.95				4,460.95
David Trachtenberg	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Committee total					15,800.00		9,482.05				25,282.05

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CURT WELDON, June 22, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO JAPAN AND NORTH KOREA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 3, AND APR. 8, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Rick Carne	4/3	4/8	Japan, N. Korea		1,350.00		4,627.95				5,977.95
Committee total					1,350.00		4,627.95				5,977.95

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RICK CARNE, May 1, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO ESTONIA, LATVIA, POLAND AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 25 AND APR. 4, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
William R. Teator	3/25	3/27	Estonia		612.00						612.00
	3/27	3/28	Latvia		245.00						245.00
	3/31	4/1	Poland	1,599.04	526.00					1,599.04	526.00
	4/2	4/4	Czech Republic		564.00						564.00
Committee total					1,947.00						1,947.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WILLIAM R. TEATOR, April 21, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO BARBADOS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 9 AND MAY 11, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Carlos Romero-Barceló	5/9	5/11	Barbados		1,261.23		599.05				1,861.18
Committee total					1,261.23		599.95				1,861.18

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELÓ, June 9, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO ESTONIA, LATVIA, POLAND AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 13 AND MAY 16, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Gretchen E. DeMar	5/13	5/16	Canada	1,044	[3] 755.97		351.90	107.15	150.00	1,251.15	[3] 905.97
Committee total					755.97		351.90		150.00		1,257.87

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] U.S. dollars equivalent based on rate of exchange applied by U.S. Consulate per Mr. H.J. Steemers for per diem and registration fee.

GRETCHEN E. DEMAR, June 5, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 26 AND JULY 1, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Amory Houghton, Jr.	6/27	7/1	Germany								
Hon. Donald Payne	6/27	6/29	Germany				4,693.65				4,693.65

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 26 AND JULY 1, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Carrie Meek	6/28	7/1	Germany				2,530.05				2,530.05
Hon. Charles Taylor	6/28	7/3	Germany				2,996.05				2,996.05
Robert W. Van Wicklin	6/27	7/1	Germany				3,356.05				3,356.05
Committee total							12,140.08				12,140.08

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

AMO HOUGHTON, July 30, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 24 AND JUNE 1, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Doug Bereuter	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Hon. Floyd Spence	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Hon. Ralph Regula	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				972.00
Hon. Gerald Solomon	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Hon. Tom Bliley	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Hon. Marge Roukema	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Hon. Herbert Bateman	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Hon. Joel Hefley	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Hon. Vernon Ehlers	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Hon. Scott McInnis	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Hon. Pat Danner	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
John Herzberg	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Jo Weber	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Rick Stafford	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Linda Pedigo	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				1,952.00
Martin Sletzinger	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				972.00
Commercial airfare							1,564.00				1,564.00
Jim Doran	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				972.00
Commercial airfare							2,295.00				2,295.00
Ronald Lasch	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				972.00
Commercial airfare							2,295.00				2,295.00
David Goldston	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(3)				972.00
Commercial airfare							2,295.00				2,295.00
Committee total					34,140.00		8,449.00				42,589.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DOUG BEREUTER, July 11, 1997.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4550. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Removal of U.S. Grade Standards and Other Selected Regulations [Docket Number FV–95–303] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4551. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Winter Pears Grown in Oregon, Washington, and California; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97–927–1IFR] received August 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4552. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97–993–1 IFR] received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4553. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Milk in the Texas Marketing Area; Suspension of Certain Provisions of the Order [DA–97–06] received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4554. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Reduced Assessment Rates for Specified Marketing Orders [Docket No. FV97–922–2 IFR] received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4555. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Irish Potatoes

Grown in Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, California, and in All Counties in Oregon, Except Malheur County; Define Fiscal Period and Decrease Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97–947–1 FIR] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4556. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Amendments to the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act [Docket Number FV96–351A] (RIN: 0581–AB48) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4557. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of Administrative Rules and Regulations Governing Issuance of Additional Allotment Base to New and Existing Producers [Docket No. FV97–985–1 FR] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4558. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Almonds Grown in California; Amended Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97–981–4 FR] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4559. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fresh Peaches Grown in Georgia; Termination of Marketing Order No. 918 [Docket No. FV–97–918–1 FR] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4560. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Revision of Administrative Rules Pertaining to Delinquent Assessments [Docket No. FV97–920–1 FR] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4561. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97–920–3 IFR] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4562. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fresh Bartlett Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Reduced Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97–931–2 IFR] received August 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4563. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Limes Grown in Florida and Imported Limes; Change in Regulatory Period [Docket No. FV97–911–1A FIR] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4564. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—National Arboretum [7 CFR Part 500] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4565. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Humane Treatment of Dogs; Tethering [Docket No. 95–078–2] (RIN: 0579–AA74) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4566. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Additions to the Quarantined Areas [Docket No.97–056–4] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4567. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Change in Disease Status of the Dominican Republic Because of Hog Cholera [Docket No. 97–084–1] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4568. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly; Designation of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 97–073–1] received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4569. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Change in Disease Status of Italy, Except the Island of Sardinia, Because of African Swine Fever [Docket No. 97–002–2] received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4570. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Herbicide Safener HOE–107892; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300517; FRL–5731–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4571. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bacillus Cereus Strain BP01; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP–300526; FRL–5735–6] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4572. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Copper Octanoate; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–300524; FRL–5734–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4573. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300520; FRL–5732–5] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4574. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Coat Protein of Potato Virus Y and the Genetic Material Necessary for its production; Exemption from the requirement of a tolerance [OPP–300531; FRL–5738–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4575. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Replicase Protein of Potato Leaf Roll Virus and the Genetic Material Necessary for its production; Exemption from the requirement of a tolerance [OPP–300530; FRL–5738–3] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4576. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Myclobutanil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300522 FRL–5732–9] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4577. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation; Receivers and Conservators (RIN: 3052–AB72) received August 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4578. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—1997 Marketing Quotas and Price Support Levels for Fire-Cured (type 21), Fire-Cured (types 22–23), Dark Air-Cured (types 35–36), Virginia Sun-Cured (type 37), and Cigar-Filler and Binder (types 42–44 and 53–55) Tobaccos (Commodity Credit Corporation) [Workplan Number 96–056] (RIN: 0560–AF03) received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4579. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Disaster Reserve Assistance Program (RIN: 0560–AF11) received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4580. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Macadamia Tree Crop Insurance Regulations; and Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Macadamia Tree Crop Insurance Provisions [7 CFR Part 456 and 457] received August 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4581. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—General Crop Insurance Regulations, and Common Crop Insurance Regulations; and Peach Crop Insurance Provisions [7 CFR Parts 403 and 457] received August 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4582. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Macadamia Nut Crop Insurance Regulations; and Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Macadamia Nut Crop Insurance Provisions [7 CFR Parts 455 and 457] received August 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4583. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Accounting Requirements for RUSElectric Borrowers (RIN: 0572–AB36) received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4584. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Securities Representing Investment of Customer Funds Held in Segregated Accounts by Futures Commission Merchants [17 CFR Part 1] received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4585. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to FY 1998 appropriations requests that would provide resources for the implementation of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107; (H. Doc. No. 105–118); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4586. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting FY 1998 budget amendments for the Legislative Branch, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107; (H. Doc. No. 105–120); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4587. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the FY 1998 appropriations requests for the Department of Commerce, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107; (H. Doc. No. 105–121); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4588. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request to make available appropriations of $7,642,000 for the Department of the Treasury from the Treasury Counter-Terrorism Fund, pursuant to Public Law 104–208; (H. Doc. No. 105–123); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4589. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification of intent to study a commercial or industrial type function performed by 45 or more civilian employees for possible outsourcing, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 nt.; to the Committee on National Security.

4590. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Secretary's Selected Acquisition Reports (SARS) for the quarter ending June 30, 1997, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on National Security.

4591. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on improvement of pricing policies for use of major range and test facility installations of the military departments, pursuant to Public Law 103–160, section 846(a) (107 Stat. 1723); to the Committee on National Security.

4592. A letter from the Director, Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Departmentof Defense Newspapers, Magazines and Civilian Enterprise Publications (RIN: 0790–AG37) received August 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4593. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Single Process Initiative [DFARS Case 97–D014] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4594. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Cost Principles [DFARS Case 95–D714] received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4595. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Application of Berry Amendment [DFARS Case 96–D333] received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4596. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's ''Major'' final rule—Bank Holding Companies and Change in Bank Control (Regulation Y); Amendments to Restrictions in the Board's Section 20 Orders [Regulation Y; Docket No.R–0958] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4597. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Oman, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4598. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 2002 resulting from passage of H.R. 1226, pursuant to Public Law 101–508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388–582); to the Committee on the Budget.

4599. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 2002 resulting from passage of H.R. 1901, pursuant to Public Law 101–508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388–582); to the Committee on the Budget.

4600. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for OSHA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Longshoring and Marine Terminals (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) [Docket No. S–025] (RIN: 1218–AA56) received July 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4601. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits [29 CFR Part 4044] received August 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4602. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Occupant Crash Protection; Occupant Protection in Interior Impact (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) [Docket No. 74–14; Notice 121] (RIN: 2127–AG94) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4603. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Toxic Substances Control Act Test Guidelines [OPPTS–42193; FRL–5719–5] (RIN: 2070–AB76) received August 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4604. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Revisions to Tennessee SIP Chapter 1200–3–5 Visible Emissions [TN–142–9727(a); FRL–5872–9] received August 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4605. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO–028–1028; FRL–5875–7] received August 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4606. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee: Approval of Revisions to the Chattanooga/Hamilton County Portion of the Tennessee SIP Regarding Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD), Nitrogen Oxides, Lead Emissions, Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), and PM10 Revisions [TN–178–02–9724a; TN–179–01–9723a; FRL–5871–9] received August 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4607. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revision to the Illinois State Implementation Plan for Ozone [IL137–1a; FRL–5868–5] received August 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4608. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments: Flexibility and Streamlining [FRL–5871–4] (RIN: 2060–AG16) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4609. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Control of Air Pollution; Amendments to Emission Requirements Applicable to New Nonroad Spark Ignition Engines At or Below 19 Kilowatts and New Marine Spark Ignition Engines: Provisions for Replacement Engines and the Use of Two Stroke Engines on Certain Nonhandheld Equipment [FRL–5871–1] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4610. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee: Approval of Revisions to the SIP Regarding Emission Standards and Monitoring Requirements for Additional Control Areas [TN–171–01–9764a; FRL–5863–9] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4611. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee: Approval of Revisions to Maintenance Plan for Knox County, Tennessee [TN–150–01–9711a; FRL–5866–1] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4612. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; States of Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska [FRL–5868–3] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4613. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Bay Area Air Quality Management District [CA–179–0045a; FRL–5863–4] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4614. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; (Hancock and Waldo Counties Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision—Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets) [ME47–01–7002a; A–1–FRL–5867–8] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4615. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District and Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District [CA–

173–0044a; FRL–5867–3] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4616. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Revisions to North Carolina SIP Involving Open Burning and Other Miscellaneous Rules [NC–82–9728(a); FRL–5863–6] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4617. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—New York: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Program Revisions [FRL–5870–8] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4618. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Maryland; Enhanced Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [MD037–3015; FRL–5864–8] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4619. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Modification of Significant New Use Rules for Certain Substances [OPPTS–50626A; FRL–5735–4] (RIN: 2070–AB27) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4620. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arizona—Maricopa County PM–10 Nonattainment Area [AZ–69–0012; FRL–5867–9] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4621. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Alaska [Alaska 001; FRL–5847–7] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4622. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Georgia; Enhanced Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [GA–34–2–9716; FRL–5865–9] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4623. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia, New Source Review Program [DC032–2006; FRL–5864–4] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4624. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Washington [WA61–7136, WA64–7139a; FRL–5869–8] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4625. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Reasonably Available Control Technology for Volatile Organic Compounds for the State of New Jersey [Region II Docket No. NJ17–2–169, FRL–5868–4] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4626. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Degreasing Operations and Vehicle Refinishing, and Definition of Motor Vehicle [MD040–4014a and MD047–4014a; FRL–5867–5] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4627. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Chromium Emissions From Hard and Decorative Chromium Electroplating and Chromium Anodizing Tanks [AD–FRL–5872–7] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4628. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans (SIP); Texas; Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Increments for particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM–10); Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes [TX60–1–7269; FRL–5870–1] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4629. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA–128–0043; FRL–5875–9] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4630. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, Louisiana; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [LA–39–1–7332a; FRL–5876–3] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4631. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Approval of VOC and NO_X RACT Determinations for Individual Sources [SIPTRAX No. PA–4051a; FRL–5865–8] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4632. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO–029–1029; FRL–5875–4] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4633. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan, South Carolina: Addition of Supplement C to the Air Quality Modeling Guidelines [SC–30–1–9645a: FRL–5877–1] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4634. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA 157–0046a; FRL–5881–1] received August 20, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4635. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Bay Area Air Quality Management District [CA 034–0049a FRL–5880–4] received August 20, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4636. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Hobbs, Tatum and Jal, New Mexico) [MM Docket No. 96–77, RM–8780, RM–8918] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4637. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Idalou, Texas) [MM Docket No. 97–69, RM–9007] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4638. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Clayton and Jena, Louisiana) [MM Docket No. 97–59, RM–8976] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4639. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—The Commission's Forfeiture Policy Statement and Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Rules to Incorporate the Forfeiture Guidelines [CI Docket No. 95–6] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4640. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Parts 2, 15, and 97 of the Commission's Rules To Permit Use of Radio Frequencies Above 40 GHz for New Radio Applications; International Harmonization of Frequency Bands Above 40 GHz; Petition of Sky Station International, Inc., for Amendment of the Commission's Rules To Establish Requirements for a Global Stratospheric Telecommunications Service in the 47.2–47.5 GHz and 47.9–48.2 GHz Frequency Bands [ET Docket No. 94–124, RM–8308; RM–8784] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4641. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules To Provide for the Use of the 220–222 MHz

Band by the Private Land Mobile Radio Service [PR Docket No. 89–552] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4642. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Shawsville, Virginia) [MM Docket No. 97–103, RM–9030] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4643. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Mansura, Louisiana) [MM Docket No. 97–110, RM–9045] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4644. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Cloudcroft, New Mexico) [MM Docket No. 96–257, RM–8966] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4645. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Mount Horeb, Mazomanie and Dodgeville, Wisconsin) [MM Docket No. 97–10, RM–8984, RM–9033] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4646. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (St. Marks and Woodville, Florida) [MM Docket No. 96–142, RM–8829, RM–8873] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4647. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of Section 254(k) of the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended [FCC 97–163] received August 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4648. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Correction to Ranges of Comparability for Clothes Washers (RIN: 3084–AA26) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4649. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers [Docket No. 95F–0170] August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4650. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Current Good Manufacturing Practice in Manufacturing, Processing, Packing, or Holding of Drugs; Revision of Certain Labeling Controls; Partial Extension of Compliance Date [Docket No. 88N–0320] received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committeeon Commerce.

4651. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Food and Cosmetic Labeling; Revocation of Certain Regulations [Docket No. 96N–0174] (RIN: 0910–AA69) received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4652. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting two final rules: ''Statement of Priciples and Policy for the Agreement State Program,'' and ''Policy Statement On Adequacy and Compatibility of Agreement State Programs'' received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4653. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Human Tissue Intended for Transplantation (Food and Drug Administration) [Docket No. 93N–0453] (RIN: 0910–AA40) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4654. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the listing of all outstanding Letters of Offer to sell any major defense equipment for $1 million or more; the listing of all Letters of Offer that were accepted, as of June 30, 1997, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4655. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on chemical and biological weapons proliferation control efforts for the period of February 1, 1996 to January 31, 1997, pursuant to Public Law 102—182, section 308(a) (105 Stat. 1257); to the Committee on International Relations.

4656. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on proliferation of missiles and essential components of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2751 nt.; to the Committee on International Relations.

4657. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determination and certification regarding government actions to terminate chemical weapons proliferation activities of foreign persons, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2410c(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

4658. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on additional measures to confirm that the embargo on Iran prohibits all trade and investment activities by United States persons, wherever located, and to consolidate in one order the various prohibitions previously imposed to deal with the national emergency declared on March 15, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); (H. Doc. No. 105—117); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4659. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the emergency regarding export control regulations is to continue in effect beyond August 19, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 105—119); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4660. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4661. A letter from the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting the Agency's classified Executive Summary and Annexes to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's (ACDA) 1996 Annual Report, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2590; to the Committee on International Relations.

4662. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the 1996 Annual Report of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2590; to the Committee on International Relations.

4663. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an alternative plan for Federal civilian employee pay adjustments, to take effect in January 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5305(c)(1); (H. Doc. No. 105—122); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and ordered to be printed.

4664. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Census, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Census Designated Place (CDP) Program for Census 2000 [Docket No. 970728183–7183–01] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4665. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List [97–015] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4666. A letter from the Director of Benefits, Farm Credit Bank of Texas, transmitting the annual report for the Farm Credit Banks of Texas Thrift Plus Plan for the Year ended December 31, 1996, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4667. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; Acquisition of Commercial Items [APD 2800.12A, CHGE 76] (RIN: 3090–AF86) received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4668. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Office of Personnel Management (RIN: 3206–AG 87,3209–AA15) received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4669. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1996, through March 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4670. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4671. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Delegation of Royalty Management Functions to States (Minerals Management Service) (RIN: 1010–AC25) received July 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4672. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Temporary Conditional Approval of Tungsten-Iron Shot as Nontoxic for the 1997–98 Season (RIN: 1018–AE09) received August 11,1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4673. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlifeand Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Framework for Early-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations (RIN: 1018–AE14) received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4674. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adult Education Program (Bureau of Indian Affairs) (RIN: 1076–AA15) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4675. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Logical Mining Units in General; LMU Application Procedures; LMU Approval Criteria; LMU Diligence; and Administration of LMU Operations [WO–320–1320–02–24–1A] (RIN: 1004–AD12) received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4676. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—St. Croix National Scenic Riverway, Boating Operations (RIN: 1024–AC46) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4677. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 1997–98 Early Season (RIN: 1018–AE14) received August 27, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4678. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Early Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands (RIN: 1018–AE14) received August 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee onResources.

4679. A letter from the Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for Three Plants from the Channel Islands of Southern California (RIN: 1018–AD37) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4680. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Area 2A Commercial Fishery [Docket No. 961217359–7050–02; I.D. 080597A] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4681. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Framework 9 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan [Docket No. 970508108–7108–01; I.D. 022597B] (RIN: 0648–AJ62) received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4682. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Adjustment from the Queets River to Leadbetter Point, WA [Docket No. 970429101–7101–01; I.D. 070297B] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4683. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Amendment 9 [Docket No. 970311053–7139–02; I.D. 020397B] (RIN: 0648–AJ23) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4684. A letter from the Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations [Docket No. 970129015–7170–04; I.D. 031997B] (RIN: 0648–AI84) received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4685. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Western Pacific Crustacean Fisheries; Amendment 9; OMB Control Numbers [Docket No. 960401094–6183–02; I.D. 022296D] (RIN: 0648–AI32) received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4686. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 961204340–7087–02; I.D. 073097D] received August 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4687. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Scallop Fishery; Shelikof District of Registration Area K [Docket No. 970613138–7138–01; I.D. 080797B] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4688. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Shallow-water Species Fishery by Vessels using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 961126334–7025–02; I.D. 080897B] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4689. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Scallop Fishery; Closure in Registration Area Q [Docket No. 970613138–7138–01; I.D. 081397A] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4690. A letter from the Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Species: Listing of Several Evolutionary Significant Units (ESUs) of West Coast Steelhead [Docket No. 960730210–7193–02; I.D. 050294D] (RIN: 0648–XX65) received August 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4691. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Northern Anchovy Fishery; Quotas for the 1997–98 Fishing Year [Docket No. 970813196–7196–01; I.D. 073197A] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4692. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; End of the Primary Seasonand Resumption of Trip Limits for the Shore-based Whiting Sector [Docket No. 961227373–6373–01; I.D. 082097C] received August 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4693. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—Indiana Regulatory Program [SPATS No. IN–136–FOR; State Program Amendment No. 95–4] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4694. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—Indiana Regulatory Program [SPATS No. IN–138–FOR; State Program Amendment No. 95–3 II] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4695. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—North Dakota Regulatory Program [ND–036–FOR, Amendment No. XXIV] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4696. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—Coal Moisture (RIN:1029–AB78) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4697. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—Kentucky Regulatory Program [KY–211–FOR] received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4698. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Pension and Welfare Benefits, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Rule Relating to Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties (RIN: 1210–0056) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committeeon the Judiciary.

4699. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on the Clifton, Arizona Local Flood Protection Project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4700. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on the Federal navigation project at Santa Barbara Harbor, California; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4701. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting volume II of the annual report on civil works activities for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4702. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Small Railroads; Policy Statement on Enforcement Program (Federal Railroad Administration)

[FRA Docket No. SBR97–1, Notice 1] (RIN: 2130–AB15) received August 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4703. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Passenger Origin-Destination Survey Reports [Docket No. OST–95–744] (RIN: 2139–AA04) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4704. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F28 Mark 0100 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–149–AD; Amdt. 39–10100; AD 97–16–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4705. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Commercial Passenger-Carrying Operations in Single-Engine Aircraft under Instrument Flight Rules (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28743; Amdt. No. 135–70] (RIN: 2120–AG22) received August 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4706. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW2000 Series Turbofan Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–ANE–25–AD; Amdt. 39–10094, AD 97–11–51 R1] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4707. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–137–AD; Amdt. 39–10090; AD 97–16–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4708. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–NM–221–AD; Amdt. 39–10089; AD 97–15–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4709. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Industrie Aeronautiche e Meccaniche Rinaldo Piaggio S.p.A. Model P–180 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–CE–56–AD; Amdt. 39–10088; AD 97–15–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4710. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Avco Lycoming and Textron Lycoming Reciprocating Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–ANE–26–AD; Amdt. 39–10085; AD 97–15–11] (RIN:2120–AA64) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4711. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28982; Amdt. No. 1811] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4712. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28981; Amdt. No. 1810] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4713. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28983; Amdt. No. 1812] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4714. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Alteration of Jet Route (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 94–ASW–8] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committeeon Transportation and Infrastructure.

4715. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Assateague Channel, Chincoteague, Virginia (Coast Guard) [CGD05–97–012] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4716. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Port Canaveral, FL (Coast Guard) [COTP JACKSONVILLE 97–035] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 4,1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4717. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–100 and -200 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–NM–152–AD; Amdt. 39–10102; AD 97–17–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4718. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of the Legal Description of the Dallas/Fort Worth Class B Airspace Area; TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–11] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4719. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; SD (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–AGL–19] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4720. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Grafton, ND (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–AGL–23] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4721. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Carlisle, AR (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–03] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4722. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Alice, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–05] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4723. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Ponca City, OK (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–06] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4724. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Athens, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–07] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4725. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Altus, OK (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–09] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4726. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada PW100 Series Turboprop Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–ANE–32–AD; Amdt. 39–10107; AD 97–17–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4727. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Puritan-Bennett Aero Systems Co., Cone and Seal Assemblies, part numbers 210543 and 210543–01 (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–CE–75–AD; Amdt. 39–10113; AD 97–18–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4728. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D–200 Series Turbofan Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–ANE–08; Amdt. 39–10106; AD 97–17–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4729. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300–600 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 95–NM–228–AD; Amdt. 39–10097; AD 97–16–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4730. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Railroad/Highway Projects (Federal Highway Administration) [FHWA Docket No. FHWA–97–2681]

(RIN: 2125–AD86) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4731. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials: Withdrawal of Radiation Protection Program Requirement (Research and Special Programs Administration) [Docket No. RSPA–97–2850 (HM–169B)] (RIN: 2137–AD08) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4732. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Inland Waterways Navigation Regulations—Temporary Reduction in Speed Limits on the St. Clair River, Great Lakes (Coast Guard) [CGD09–97–021] (RIN: 2115–AE84) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4733. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety and Security Zones; Presidential Visit, Martha's Vineyard, MA (Coast Guard) [CGD01 97–085] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4734. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety and Security Zones; Presidential Visit, Martha's Vineyard, MA (Coast Guard) [CGD01 97–082] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4735. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Norfolk Harbor, Elizabeth River, Norfolk, Virginia and Portsmouth, Virginia (Coast Guard) [CGD 05–97–007] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4736. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Hampton Offshore Challenge, Chesapeake Bay, Hampton, Virginia (Coast Guard) [CGD 05–97–065] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4737. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aviat Aircraft, Inc. Models S–1S, S–1T, S–2, S–2A, S–2S, and S–2B Airplanes (formerly known as Pitts Models S–1S, S–1T, S–2, S–2A, S–2S, and S–2B Airplanes) (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–CE–23–AD; Amdt. 39–10109; AD 97–17–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4738. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28992; Amdt. No. 1813] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4739. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28994; Amdt. No. 1815] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4740. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28993; Amdt. No. 1814] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4741. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Water Quality Standards for Idaho [FRL–5864–2] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4742. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Nomenclature Changes in the Board's Regulations [STB Ex Parte No. 567] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4743. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—*The May Department Stores Co.* v. *United States* [Citation: 36 Fed. Cl. 680 (1996)] received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4744. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last-in, First-out Inventories [Rev. Rul. 97–32] received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4745. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Procedure for Changing a Method of Accounting under Section 263A (RIN: 1545–AQ94) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4746. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 97–44] received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4747. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Highly Compensated Employee Definition [Notice 97–45] received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4748. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Remedial Amendment Period (RIN: 1545–AV23) received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4749. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Allocations of Depreciation Recapture among Partners in a Partnership (RIN: 1545–AT32) received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4750. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Medical Savings Accounts [Announcement 97–79] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4751. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Reduction in Certain Deductions of Mutual Life Insurance Companies [Rev. Rul. 97–35] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4752. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Designated Private Delivery Services [Notice 97–50] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4753. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Credit [Revenue Ruling 97–34] received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4754. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Electing Small Business Trusts [Notice 97–49] received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4755. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Taxation of fringe benefits [Revenue Ruling 97–33] received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4756. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rules for Property Produced in a Farming Business [TD 8729] (RIN: 1545–AV37) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4757. A letter from the National Director, Tax Forms and Publications Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Filing Information Returns Magnetically/Electronically [Rev. Proc. 97–34] received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4758. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, United States Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Country of Origin Marking [T.D. 97–72] (RIN: 1515–AB82) received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4759. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Annual Report to the Congress on Foreign Economic Collection and Industrial Espionage, pursuant to Public Law 103—359, section 809(b) (108 Stat. 3454); to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

4760. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the eighty-second Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 154(k); jointly to the Committees on Commerce and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on July 31, 1997 the following report was filed on August 5, 1997]

Mr. KOLBE: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2378. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for

the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105–240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted September 3, 1997]

Mr. KOLBE: Committee on Appropriations. Supplemental report on H.R. 2378. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105–240, Pt. 2).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 700. A bill to remove the restriction on the distribution of certain revenues from the Mineral Springs parcel to certain members of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians; with an amendment (Rept. 105–241). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 976. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain funds appropriated to pay judgment in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105–242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1903. A bill to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to enhance the ability of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to improve computer security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105–243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[Submitted September 2, 1997]

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. DEUTSCH):

H.R. 2298. A bill to improve the regulation of radiopharmaceuticals; to the Committee on Commerce.

[Submitted September 3, 1997]

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2379. A bill to designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse located at 251 North Main Street in Winston-Salem, NC, as the ''Hiram H. Ward Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 2380. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to gambling on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKS (for himself, Mr. METCALF, Mr. FROST, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. FURSE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 2381. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to allow certain grant funds to be used to provide parent education; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 2382. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to change the discretionary spending limits to allow the 4.3 cents per gallon Federal gas tax redirected to the Highway Trust Fund to be spent on other domestic programs; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 2383. A bill to authorize the enforcement by State and local governments of certain Federal Communications Commission regulations regarding use of citizens band radio equipment; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 2384. A bill to prohibit reactivation of the high flux beam reactor at Brookhaven National Laboratory; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2385. A bill to repeal the provision providing for crediting the increase in excise taxes on certain tobacco products against payments made pursuant to tobacco industry settlement legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. SPENCE):

H.R. 2386. A bill to implement the provisions of the Taiwan Relations Act concerning the stability and security of Taiwan and United States cooperation with Taiwan on the development and acquisition of defensive military articles; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. OBEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CAPPS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCHALE, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 2387. A bill to repeal the provision crediting increased excise taxes on certain tobacco products against payments made pursuant to the tobacco industry settlement legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCDADE:

H.R. 2388. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the basic formula price for milk of the highest use classification under Federal milk marketing orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 2389. A bill to authorize funding for the National Women's Business Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 2390. A bill to repeal the provision which credits the increase in the tobacco excise taxes enacted by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 against the payments due under the tobacco industry settlement agreement of June 20, 1997; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2391. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend and make uniform the repayment plans available under the various Federal student loan programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2392. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to place a limitation on habeas corpus relief that prevents retrial of an accused; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAXTON (by request):

H.R. 2393. A bill to approve a governing international fishery agreement between the United States and the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2394. A bill to direct the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to transfer certain parcels of land located in the counties of Greene and Calhoun, IL; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CHRISTENSEN:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol rotunda for the Senate Thanksgiving Celebration; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Res. 217. Resolution recognizing the important contributions made by Americans of Austrian heritage; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H. Res. 218. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of Ava Gardner; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH introduced a bill (H.R. 2395) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Elmo;* which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 15: Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 51: Ms. FURSE, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 59: Mr. POMBO, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 64: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 80: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 108: Mr. OWENS and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 145: Mr. FARR of California, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. MANTON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. COBURN, Ms.

SANCHEZ, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 180: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 209: Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 211: Mr. FROST, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 301: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 305: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 306: Mr. SABO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 339: Mr. COMBEST and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 404: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 438: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 480: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 493: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 498: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 530: Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 551: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 611: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 635: Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 641: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 689: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 695: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 758: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ROGAN, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 777: Mr. COYNE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. REYES, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 789: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 805: Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 815: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GREEN Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 859: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 864: Ms. CARSON, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 869: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 875: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. FURSE, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 880: Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, and Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.R. 883: Mr. BOYD and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 906: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 919: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 925: Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 1005: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1009: Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 1023: Mr. PITTS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1037: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 1050: Mr. CLAY and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 1053: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 1054: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1059: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HORN, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1060: Mr. CAMP, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1108: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 1126: Mr. COYNE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 1132: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1134: Mr. JACKSON, Ms. CARSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BAESLER, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1154: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 1158: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1164: Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 1165: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1171: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1178: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1215: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1218: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1231: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 1232: Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1241: Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 1270: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 1345: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1371: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 1398: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 1415: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KLINK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. CAPPS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 1423: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1425: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1427: Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 1434: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1437: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1450: Mr. TORRES and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1456: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1500: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 1507: Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FORBES, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1508: Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 1519: Mr. ACKERMAN and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 1531: Ms. FURSE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1541: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 1542: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.R. 1570: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1571: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1624: Mr. BALDACCI and Mr. GREEN.

H.R. 1636: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1689: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 1715: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1716: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1719: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1733: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 1754: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 1773: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 1776: Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1788: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1799: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1827: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1832: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 1836: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1839: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 1842: Mr. MYRICK, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1849: Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 1861: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1873: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1874: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1903: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1908: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1951: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 1962: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1970: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1984: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. BERRY, Mr. JOHN, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 2004: Mr. MANTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2020: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WELLER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 2023: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2029: Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2034: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 2072: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. REYES, and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 2085: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2103: Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 2110: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2113: Mr. VENTO, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 2116: Mr. CLAY, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. CARSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FAZIO of California, and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 2121: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2122: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 2140: Mr. WAMP, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 2145: Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 2185: Mr. MARTINEZ, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2221: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 2231: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 2232: Mr. COX of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. FOWLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2250: Mr. NEY, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.

H.R. 2251: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2263: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COOK, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. LAZIO of New York.

H.R. 2283: Mr. DICKS, Mr. QUINN, and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 2290: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2317: Mr. TORRES, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 2321: Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 2329: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 2369: Mr. MANTON.

H.J. Res. 66: Mr. WYNN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr.

BECERRA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. FORD, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.J. Res. 89: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. YATES, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. MCHALE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. COOK.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Ms. FURSE.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. WATERS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. REYES, Mr. METCALF, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. RIGGS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. DANNER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H. Con. Res. 96: Ms. FURSE.

H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. PORTER and Mr. NEY.

H. Con. Res. 114: Ms. FURSE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 127: Mr. Burton of Indiana, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Con. Res. 128: Mr. MASCARA and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Con. Res. 134: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COOK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. REYES, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 16: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SABO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. LUTHER.

H. Res. 37: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. LUTHER.

H. Res. 83: Mrs. MORELLA.

H. Res. 139: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. COOK.

H. Res. 171: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mrs. LOWEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1031: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2332: Mr. BOEHNER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MR. CRANE

AMENDMENT NO. 28: Page 79, strike lines 8 through 21.

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

(Substitute Amendment for Amendment No. 24)

AMENDMENT NO. 29: In the item relating to ''HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES'', insert after the first dollar amount (before the comma) ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

In the item relating to ''CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION—DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING'', insert after the first dollar amount (before the comma) ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 30. In the item relating to ''Department of Education—EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED'', AFTER THE FOURTH DOLLAR AMOUNT, INSERT THE FOLLOWING ''(INCREASED BY $200,000,000)''

In the item relating to ''Department of Education—Education for the Disadvantaged'', after the eighth dollar amount, insert the following ''(reduced by $150,000,000)

In the item relating to ''Department of Education—Education Research Statistics, and Improvement'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following ''(reduced by $50,000,000)

In the item relating to ''Department of Education—Education Research Statistics, and Improvement'', after the second dollar amount, insert the following ''(reduced by $50,000,000)

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 31: Page 102, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 516. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ADMISSIONS PREFERENCES IN PUBLIC EDUCATION.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Education to withhold any financial assistance, or to impose, administer, or enforce any other penalty, sanction, or remedy, for the refusal or failure of a Federal grant recipient to enforce a preference or affirmative action plan based on race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin for admissions to public educational institutions.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The limitation established in subsection (a) shall apply only to Federal grant recipients located in a State in which the enforcement of such preference or plan is prohibited by the laws of the State or by an order of a Federal court.

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MR. RODRIGUEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 32: Page 66, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $8,834,000)''.

Page 67, line 2, after ''Act'' insert '', $34,388,000 shall be for comprehensive regional assistance centers under title XIII of said Act''.

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MR. RODRIGUEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 33: Page 66, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $33,970,000)''.

Page 67, line 2, after ''Act'' insert '', $59,524,000 shall be for comprehensive regional assistance centers under title XIII of said Act''.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1997 No. 114

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Bless the Lord, O my soul:
and all that is within me,
bless his holy name.
Bless the Lord, O my soul,
and forget not all his benefits.
—Psalm 103:1.

Gracious God, You have given us souls so we could know You and receive Your spirit of wisdom, guidance, and power. We thank You for the repeated reminders from the psalmist not to neglect the spiritual health of our souls, and Jesus' warning to us of the danger of gaining the whole world and losing our own souls.

Lord, we confess that we don't think very much about the condition of our souls, nor do we always listen attentively to Your voice speaking to us through our souls. It is easy to lose our assurance of abundant, eternal life in the intensity of the pressures and the demands of daily life. We become burdened by the responsibilities when we lose the blessing of our relationship with You. The danger is that we polish our personalities and we shrink our souls.

As we begin this day, we honestly confess to You our deep inner need for a fresh inflow of Your spirit into our souls so that all the faculties You have given us will be used to glorify You and not ourselves. Through our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator LOTT of Mississippi, is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Today the Senate will resume consideration of the Harkin amendment No. 1057 to the Agriculture appropriations bill. Under the previous order, there will be 20 minutes for debate on the amendment equally divided between Senator COCHRAN and Senator HARKIN. Following the use or yielding back of time, a vote will occur on or in relation to the Harkin amendment at approximately 9:50 a.m.

Following the disposition of the Harkin amendment and passage of the Agriculture appropriations bill, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1061, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

I remind Senators that this issue, of course, was considered in July. The Harkin amendment was defeated at that time, I believe, by a vote of 52 to 48. I urge my colleagues to again vote against the Harkin amendment and to, of course, support passage of the Agriculture appropriations bill. I believe Senator COCHRAN in July outlined clearly what is involved in this issue, and I think obviously he has stated the position that we should support which is to defeat this Harkin amendment.

Members can expect a number of amendments to be offered today and votes will occur throughout the day on Labor-HHS. We hope to be able to complete action in short order on the bill. We may not be able to do it tonight, but we will stay with the Labor-HHS appropriations bill until it is completed, either today or, if necessary, tomorrow. We will notify Members when votes can be expected.

In addition, the Senate will recess at 12:30 until 2:15 for the weekly policy luncheons to meet. As announced earlier, Members can expect votes each day this week, including the very real possibility of at least one vote, maybe more, on Friday of this week.

As the Senate continues the session through September and October, we will notify Members, after consultation with the Democratic leadership, when we will definitely have votes on Mondays or Fridays or if there will not be any votes on a particular Monday or Friday. But if we are going to be able to complete our work by a reasonable time this fall and then go back to our constituencies in our respective States, we are going to have to work on some Mondays and Fridays.

I yield the floor, Madam President.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 2160, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

A bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Harkin amendment No. 1057, to provide funding for activities of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the prevention of tobacco use by youth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Harkin amendment No. 1057 is pending on which there shall be 20 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. First, I ask unanimous consent that Ms. Lori Turpin, a detailee in the office of Senator

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

Printed on recycled paper.

INOUYE, be granted floor privileges during deliberations on S. 1061.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I yield myself 3 minutes, after which time I will then yield to Senator CHAFEE, the majority cosponsor of this amendment.

I also ask unanimous consent that Senator BINGAMAN be added as a cosponsor of the pending amendment.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Before I return to the substance of our amendment, I want to address a couple of points raised yesterday.

The distinguished chairman of the agriculture appropriations subcommittee suggested that my amendment should not be adopted because it skirts the rules. Well, the rules governing this body clearly permit this Senator or any other Senator to offer an amendment to the House Agriculture appropriations bill once it comes over to us.

There was a quotation in AP today of Senator COCHRAN saying, ''This is an unfortunate effort to go around the rules and procedures.''

How, I ask, can this Senator, be going around the rules when I am in full compliance with the rules of the Senate? Our amendment is fully within the Senate rules. There is no point of order that lies against offering it. And I will point out that offering this amendment at this time is in full compliance with the unanimous-consent agreement worked out with the majority leader during the Senate's consideration of its Agriculture appropriations bill.

The distinguished chairman, Senator COCHRAN, was involved in those discussions also. I did not wait until after the Senate passed its version of the bill and then spring this amendment on the Senate. Before the Senate passed its bill, there was a unanimous consent agreement worked out which plainly provided an opportunity for me to offer an amendment at this point, an amendment that is clearly permitted under the rules. That was all worked out under the rules openly and aboveboard before the Senate passed its Agriculture appropriations bill.

If, I submit, the argument of the distinguished chairman, Senator COCHRAN, prevails and our amendment is defeated on the basis of his procedural argument that this Senator should not be able to rely upon the Senate rules, every Senator should be concerned about the precedent that outcome would set regarding his or her ability to rely upon the Senate rules. Senators who are inclined to vote with Senator COCHRAN should think again and ask themselves what options under the Senate rules they may be closing off that they may one day critically need. I am not just talking about the rule I am relying on here. I am talking about a whole host of other rules protecting the rights of Senators that could be swept away in the name of expediency, rules that could be eviscerated as mere trifling inconveniences.

This procedural argument made by the distinguished chairman is both dangerous and bogus. Let's get to the real issue here. The issue is whether or not kids under the age of 18 should be able to buy tobacco and whether we ought to fund efforts to stop such sales. That is what this vote is about. It is about our kids and protecting them from the ravages of tobacco. With the death toll of over 400,000 a year, smoking is killing more Americans than AIDS, alcohol, motor vehicles, fires, homicide, illicit drugs, and suicide combined. And I might add, with the addition of the Byrd language, States will be encouraged to crack down on the illegal sales of alcohol along with the illegal sales of tobacco. Teenage smoking rates are climbing—a 17-year high among high school seniors.

Why do we need these FDA rules? Because without the ID checks and a strong rule against underage sales, kids will continue to fall prey to tobacco.

This picture says more than a thousand words about why the FDA rules are needed. Here is Melissa on the left, Amy on the right. ''Can you tell which one is 16? If they walked into a store, would the clerk know which one was under 18? To eliminate the guesswork, FDA requires retailers to card anyone who is under 27.''

You could not tell which one of them is under the age of 18. It just so happens the young woman over here, Melissa, is 16 and Amy, over here, is 25. That is why this rule is needed. That is why the court in Greensboro, NC, upheld this rule.

Our amendment seeks $34 million in funding, minuscule in comparison to the $50 billion in smoking-related medical costs in our Nation each year.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent at this point to have printed in the RECORD the editorial appearing this morning in the Washington Post regarding the upcoming vote.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 3, 1997]

A SMOKING VOTE IN THE SENATE

The Senate is scheduled to vote today on an amendment by Tom Harkin of Iowa to give the administration the entire, modest amount it seeks to enforce new rules meant to prevent the sale of cigarettes to minors. The amendment deserves to pass. This is a clear test of the instincts of the Senate on this issue, which over the years has inspired so many grandiloquent speeches and so little action.

The request is for $34 million instead of the $4.9 million voted by the Senate Appropriations Committee and $24 million by the House. Most of the money would fund enforcement action by the states; no heavy federal hand there. The rest would be used by the Food and Drug Administration for an educational campaign aimed mainly at cigarette retailers.

The amendment nonetheless was beaten 52 to 48 in July, in part because the money was to come from an increased assessment on tobacco companies. Now it will come from another source—an offsetting cut in a minor Agriculture Department program. The question is whether those, including a number of leading Democrats, who voted no on the earlier grounds, will now vote aye. They should.

The rest of the session is likely to include a lot of fights like this, mostly over second- and third-tier issues and small amounts. The same Senate agriculture appropriations bill, for example, contains some $50 million more than the administration sought to pay commissions and otherwise subsidize crop insurance; the House bill contains $30 million more. Critics tried to use some of this money for programs to feed the poor instead. No way, but the issue may still be live in conference.

There are likely to be similar struggles when the Senate takes up the Interior appropriations bill, possibly next week. Subcommittee Chairman Slade Gorton included in the bill two provisions that would make major changes in Indian law harmful to the interests of the tribes. They ought to be excised. An effort will be made to limit further logging in the national forests by cutting construction funds for the roads on which such logging depends. That one failed in the House by only two votes when the administration wobbled in support. It ought to pass.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE].

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I am delighted to be here today to support Senator HARKIN's important amendment in the fight against teenage smoking.

The attorney general of my home State of Rhode Island has urged Congress to provide the full funding level of $34 million requested by the Food and Drug Administration. Our attorney general believes adequate funding is critical to our success in reducing the level of smoking among children and adolescents, and I agree with him.

Furthermore, with the evidence that we now have regarding the epidemic of teen smoking as outlined by the distinguished Senator from Iowa, and all the implications this has for the future, it seems to me there is no excuse for delaying full implementation of this critical program.

As has been pointed out, smoking among high school seniors is at a 17-year high. That is very discouraging. Smoking among 8th and 10th graders has increased by more than 50 percent in the last 6 years. State and local officials need this money for enforcement purposes. And the money is also needed to educate retailers about their responsibilities.

In my home State, even though we have a law prohibiting retailers from selling tobacco products to minors, over 70 percent of high school smokers were not asked to show proof of their age when purchasing cigarettes.

According to our attorney general, Rhode Island stores each year are selling—I was stunned by this figure. We are a small State, a million people—11

million dollars' worth of cigarettes to underage consumers, and the main reason, of course, is the lack of resources at the local level to enforce the law. We have been able to provide the funds for education. We have to be able, in my judgment, to provide funds for education and enforcement of this rule to make it meaningful.

Now, there is a little less than $5 million provided thus far by the Senate. That is nice, but it just plain is not enough. With the improvement of the sunset provisions in the new offset, I believe there is no good reason not to vote for this amendment. Preventing underage smoking should be a national priority and providing full funding of this program is an important step toward achieving that goal. So I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to eradicate teenage smoking.

I thank the Chair and I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his leadership.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for his comments. I thank him for his strong support in the effort to eliminate teenage smoking.

Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes forty-five seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. I will yield 1 minute 45 seconds to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my colleague, the Senator from Iowa.

I rise in strong support of this amendment. Think about this for a moment. Have you ever met a parent who said, ''I had the greatest news last night; I went home and my daughter came home and announced she had started smoking.''

I have never heard that. I never heard a single parent say how proud they were to learn their children started smoking and yet statistics show us across America the fastest growing group of new smokers is children, and particularly young women, who decide in high school or sometimes earlier to start buying this product illegally to start smoking, to develop a nicotine addiction which can haunt them for a lifetime, leading to disease and sometimes to death.

What Senator HARKIN is doing is just eminently sensible. If there is such a thing as a family value, this is a family value amendment because what Senator HARKIN is doing with this amendment is to make sure that the Food and Drug Administration has the resources to enforce existing law. It is not a new imposition of law from the Federal Government. It is just common sense. Keep this dangerous addictive product out of the hands of children. And the people who want to sell it to kids illegally have to be stopped.

If we are going to do that, it takes more than a speech on the Senate floor. It takes a commitment of resources. I am sorry that Senator HARKIN's effort lost last time by a handful of votes. There were a lot of speeches given and a lot of reasons given. I hope my colleagues have had a chance to go home during this break and talk to a number of families, as I have. They should realize, as I do, how critically important it is to pass the Harkin amendment and give the FDA the resources to make sure that our kids are not lured into this dangerous addiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, what is the situation with time? Has all the time been used by the proponent of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 1 minute 35 seconds and the Senator from Mississippi controls 9 minutes 45 seconds.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam President, one comment at the outset has to be made in response to the Senator's statement quoting from an Associated Press article which suggests I said yesterday that the effort to bring this amendment to the Senate on a second vote violates the rules of the Senate. I said no such thing yesterday. I have just completed reading my remarks as reflected in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday's proceedings of the Senate, and that is not contained in my remarks.

What I did say was this, and I will read it again for emphasis. ''So what I am suggesting, Mr. President, as respectfully as I can, is that this is an unfortunate effort to go around the practices and the procedures that have been established for this purpose to facilitate the orderly consideration of appropriations bills, and the Senate ought to reject this effort.''

Now, let me elaborate on that. The procedure being used by the proponent of this amendment creates an unfortunate precedent. If it is rewarded by a majority of the votes on his amendment, that precedent will permit a vote on an amendment to a bill after third reading, and, after a unanimous-consent agreement has ripened, as an order limiting amendments on a bill. Using the tactic employed by the distinguished Senator and my friend from Iowa should not be rewarded by the Senate and such a precedent should not be established.

The reason I am making that point as strongly as I can, and repeating what was said yesterday in the 10 minutes we had to discuss this issue, is that we had worked out a procedure for considering appropriations bills here in the Senate in advance of their being considered by the House. We had markups, in subcommittees and the full committee, of appropriations bills that had not yet passed the House. That is a departure from procedures that had been used as a matter of custom and practice in the past. The reason was to accelerate and expedite consideration of these bills so that we would not get into a situation of winding up at the end of the fiscal year, or right on the brink of the beginning of a new fiscal year, not having passed all appropriations bills because of the slowness of that earlier procedure.

This was working fine. But one little nuance to permit that to work is that when the House-passed bill is received in the Senate, we have to get unanimous consent to hold it at the desk, and then call it up, substitute the Senate action on the appropriations bill for the language of the House-passed bill, and have it passed as amended by the Senate action. We have already had third reading of the Senate bill; we have already adopted all the amendments; we have had orders limiting those amendments; and then the Senator decides to use this opportunity. Under the Senate rules, he is right. Under the Senate rules, any Senator can object to a unanimous-consent request, and that is what he did. The difference is that it was understood that when we completed action on the Senate bill, we would then take up the House-passed bill, substitute the Senate action on it, adopt it, and go to conference. So it was at that little point in the procedure that the Senator decided to use a new tactic, and that is why we are having to vote another time, a second time, on an amendment that was disposed of during the consideration of the agriculture appropriations bill.

We passed the bill on July 24. Here we are in September having to vote on an amendment virtually the same with a different offset. The offset is described as defective and flawed in a statement made by Senator DOMENICI that is in the RECORD of yesterday. I invite the attention of Senators on that subject. What it does, in effect, is instead of spending money in this next fiscal year, we will postpone it to the following fiscal year, and that is scored by CBO as an offset. Are you kidding? There is a statutory maximum to spend, a mandate for computer operations to be funded at the Department of Agriculture. So the offset, while the CBO scores it—and we continue to live under this very interesting obligation to honor, cherish, and obey the decisions of CBO on these issues, the wisdom of the Senate or the will of the Senate notwithstanding—we are bound to respect the CBO decision on whether or not this is an effective offset of the new spending.

The arguments about whether you are for or against smoking—really, we are all for doing everything possible to persuade young people, minors, not to smoke. That is not the issue here. This program by FDA provides some funds to States to help enforce State rules and laws and Federal regulations on sales of tobacco to minors. Only a few States are even getting this money. I mean, the whole point of this argument

suggests that the substance of the amendment deals with that issue in some important or dramatic way. It does not.

The point is, this money, this account, will be negotiated in conference. All Senators understand that. The House has a higher number than the Senate has. We have higher numbers for other things like agricultural research and some other important initiatives protecting farmers, trying to do something about production agriculture and the efficiency and the yields that our farmers can achieve on their crops to remain globally competitive. This is a big bill. It has WIC money, which is very important. A lot of nutrition programs are funded in this bill at higher levels than the House recommends.

So, what I am saying is that we don't agree with the House on every part of the bill. That is why we are going to conference. But to permit this procedure to prevail and have us vote on the same amendment we have already disposed of, I think should be rejected. We are not going to be able to continue the procedures we followed if we reward this strategy, this tactic, this use or abuse of the procedures that we have been following.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I rise today in strong support of this amendment to restore funding to the Food and Drug Administration so it can enforce its rule in the war on teen smoking. At stake are the lives of millions of our children.

This rule prohibits—nationwide—the sale of tobacco products to anyone under the age of 18. It also requires retailers to check the ID of any purchaser of tobacco who appears to be under the age of 27.

Isn't this just common sense as matters of both public policy and public health? Apparently not.

Madam President, if I wasn't seeing this with my own eyes, I would not believe anyone doubted the need to fund FDA enforcement of this rule. The rule against teen smoking is overwhelmingly supported by the American people. It was validated by a North Carolina judge. Yet, here we are on the floor of the U.S. Senate, trying again to save this rule from obliteration.

Madam President, the tobacco lobbyists have spread a great deal of money and misinformation about the need for this initiative. I would like to clear the air.

The tobacco lobby has been telling Senators that we should wait until we pass settlement legislation before we fund the FDA's teen smoking enforcement efforts. That is nonsense. The ultimate disposition of the proposed settlement—which is far from being in place—has nothing to do with this fight against teen smoking. Nothing. The settlement negotiations, assumed that these rules would be in place and fully funded.

Once you eliminate this nonsense, it comes down to a basic question. Should we simply sit back and watch 3,000 kids a day pick up an addiction that will kill or cripple many of them? Or should we fund this program and start saving lives? The money we approve today is a bargain compared to what we'll be forced to spend in later years on treating smoking-related illness.

Everyone, including the tobacco companies, says they are against teen smoking. Our Nation's parents, the medical community, and public opinion support the President's fight against teen smoking.

And make no mistake about it. If you vote against this funding, you gut the President's plan and take a stand for tobacco and against America's kids. I therefore urge you to support this amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I will vote against tabling the Harkin amendment. It is a good amendment with the worthwhile goal of protecting the health and lives of young Americans.

Both the tobacco and alcohol industries have received well-deserved criticism in recent years for a variety of questionable or unsavory practices, including what many of their critics have identified as the use of advertising campaigns specifically intended to entice young people to try, and then become hooked on, their products. In response, the tobacco industry has been attacked at both the State and Federal levels, but, unfortunately, much less attention has been directed toward the alcohol industry.

Certainly, tragedies like the recent alcohol-related death of a Louisiana State University student demonstrate that a national effort to save our young people from the destructive forces of alcohol is warranted.

This amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill will boost the ability of the States to enforce age and identification requirements for the purchase of cigarettes, but, importantly, at my request, the amendment also addresses the need to shore up the enforcement of checks for the purchase by minors of alcohol.

The amendment encourages States to couple their youth-smoking prevention efforts with State laws that prohibit underage drinking. These issues go hand in hand in preventing our youth from using destructive substances.

According to statistics from the Federal Centers for Disease Control's National Center for Health Statistics, the three leading causes of death for 15- to 24-year-olds—accidents, homicides, and suicides—often involve the use of alcohol. Efforts to curb the sale of alcohol to minors, therefore, can be expected to yield high payoffs to our society.

Under the original amendment, Federal funding was to be used to increase supervision of retailers to ensure that they examine the identifications of customers purchasing tobacco products. But language I added calls for coordinating the oversight of identification checks for alcohol sales along with those tobacco-related programs. It only makes sense that store clerks who are already checking ID's for cigarettes also be checking ID's for alcohol. The exercise is called ''carding,'' checking identification cards to verify that the buyer is not under the legal age. It is such an easy step that can help prevent a teenager from getting drunk and getting behind the wheel of a car—''carding'' for age. Perhaps it would be more aptly described as ''carding for life.'' I hope that this amendment may indeed result in saving lives.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, I am in wholehearted agreement with the intent of the amendment before us, and I commend my colleague from Iowa for his sincere attempt to address the crucial issue of youth smoking. However, I remain unconvinced that FDA control and management of a youth antismoking initiative will solve the problem. Let me be very clear, I support a Federal role in restricting teen smoking and in funding a youth antismoking initiative. However, a cursory review of our Nation's history shows that the States have the primary jurisdiction over enforcement over youth smoking laws, just as they do with laws relating to underage consumption of alcohol.

In the aftermath of the tobacco settlement negotiations, our Nation's attention is focused, as never before, on the problem of teen smoking. We have an unprecedented bipartisan commitment to addressing this problem at all levels of government. Currently, seven committees in the Senate alone are tackling the complex issues raised by the settlement. In my opinion, we do the children of America is disservice by thinking we absolve ourselves of responsibility by simply delegating this job to Federal bureaucrats. We have a golden opportunity to put these financial resources to work, and bring about long-overdue solutions. I am not a politician by trade or training, and I find that sometimes that works to my advantage. I haven't been in Washington long enough to lose my appreciation for the truism that the best solutions are often found at home.

Let's talk about some of the initiatives the Federal Government is already funding to prevent youth smoking.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has an Office on Smoking and Health [OSH] which conducts scientific research, communicates health information to the public, and coordinates action with other Federal agencies, State health departments, and other organizations. Their programs include the Smoke Free Kids & Soccer campaign, which collaborates with the U.S. women's national soccer team to promote smoke-free lifestyles among teenage girls. The OSH budget is $21.4 million.

At the National Institutes of Health, the National Cancer Institute funds the American Stop Smoking Intervention Study research program in collaboration with the American Cancer Society

and State and local health departments and other organizations to develop comprehensive tobacco control programs in 17 States. NCI also administers investigator initiated research projects in smoking cessation and education, funded at $94.9 million. The National Institute of Drug Abuse funds research on smoking and nicotine dependency.

The Health Resources and Services Administration provides funding for antismoking education through its health professions education and nurse training programs. The Maternal and Child Health Block Grant funds health services to mothers and children, including antismoking education.

And let us not forget, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration provides discretionary funding for community-based demonstration projects for the prevention and early intervention of alcohol and drug abuse, including tobacco use. Also, SAMHSA is already implementing the Synar amendment, which requires States to enforce laws prohibiting the sale of tobacco products to individuals under age 18. States must conduct random unannounced inspections of retail outlets, and develop a strategy for achieving an inspection failure rate of less than 20 percent. States that don't comply with these requirements may lose their block grants funds, and I would like to point out that these funds may not now be used for enforcement activities.

Now, Madam President, I've named a few Federal antismoking efforts, but there are actually over 17, in different departments and agencies. The settlement which has been negotiated between industry, plaintiffs, the attorneys general, and the public health community has been referred to no fewer than seven Senate committees. I think it's time for a little common sense. The FDA, while they have done many wonderful things, have too often demonstrated a tendency to rely on centralized, heavyhanded bureaucracy rather than practical solutions. Let's proceed with hearings in the Senate, and let's examine the best possible avenues for administration of these funds. Most of all, let us not lose sight of the goal of our public health efforts.

The issue is reducing teen consumption of cigarette smoke. At every level of government, local, State, and Federal, and in every part of our communities, we must commit to do this ourselves. We cannot simply look the other way when a child with a cigarette walks by. Convenience store owners cannot ignore the law, and profit from our children's poor decisions, and legislators cannot allow campaign finances to cloud their judgment on this issue.

We know that one very effective tool is a consistently enforced requirement that retail outlets care young people. This is primarily a task for local law enforcement. Any Federal agency that Congress authorizes to police retail outlets will in the final analysis turn to local agencies to conduct the compliance checks. As we seek to partner with governments at home, we can and should build in Federal compliance standard for States who refuse to cooperate. Together, we can put some teeth into the laxly enforced statutes already on the books.

Let me add that I think we should have some concern for what could happen if we stray too far from the obvious connection between personal responsibility and health. Personal responsibility is the key to good health. As a physician, I urged everyone of my patients and my constituents to stop smoking if they had started, and more importantly not to start. There is a clear link between smoking and many types of cancer and other diseases. As a heart and lung transplant surgeon, I have seen firsthand the harmful effects of smoking. I have held tar-laden lungs in my hand and removed malfunctioning hearts from failing bodies. As the father of three sons, whom I relentlessly urge not to smoke, I agree with columnist James Glassman that ''Kids shouldn't smoke; parents, taxes, and laws should deter them.'' But before we entrust $29 million of taxpayers hard-earned money to the Food and Drug Administration, let's make sure that this is the wisest use of our resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa controls 1 minute 53 seconds, the Senator from Mississippi 2 minutes 47 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, Senator COCHRAN said that only a few States are getting FDA funding right now. That is the point. Six States right now are receiving FDA enforcement money, and only 10 States are expected to receive such money in fiscal 1997, because FDA does not have the money for all States. What this amendment provides is enough money to expand the FDA initiative to all 50 States. I thank my friend from Mississippi for pointing that out. That is the essence of this amendment; to expand to all interested States FDA funding for enforcement of rules providing for ID checks and prohibiting illegal sales to kids who come in to buy cigarettes and tobacco.

Madam President, we hear time and time again the tobacco companies saying they want to stop kids from smoking. This amendment does that. Yet has one tobacco company stepped forward to support this amendment? A deafening silence. Not one penny comes out of their pockets under this amendment, and yet not one tobacco company has come forward to say, yes, this amendment by Senators HARKIN and CHAFEE is good because it will keep kids from smoking and buying tobacco. They say they want to help stop kids from smoking. Not one of them has come forward to support this amendment. Shame on them.

We debated the previous version of this amendment on July 23, and it was tabled 52 to 48. Since that time another 125,000 young Americans have gotten addicted to smoking, and every day that we delay, thousands more kids like these young women here walk into stores, buy cigarettes and tobacco products, and get hooked. That's why the tobacco companies are not here supporting this amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, I will yield to my friend from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend for fighting this battle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. One quick point is the tobacco companies have increased their contributions to colleagues so they will not support you, and I hope we overcome that this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Mississippi controls the remaining time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I have made the arguments that I intended to make. If Senators are interested in a little more detailed discussion of the procedures and why I think it would be such an unfortunate precedent for us to reward the strategy being used by the proponent of the amendment, I invite attention to yesterday's RECORD.

Let me just say one other thing about the effort to resolve this issue. We have plenty of room within the amount provided by the House in its version of this bill and the amount provided by the Senate in the bill that passed the Senate 99 to 0 to negotiate an appropriate level of funding for the FDA's program. We are not suggesting that this program ought not be funded, that assistance ought not be made available to States which need the assistance. But has it occurred to anybody that the States are bringing lawsuits and collecting from the tobacco companies money to do this very thing? Our State of Mississippi is the first to obtain a cash settlement with the tobacco industries, and it can use the money for a wide variety of purposes: to help defray expenses, medical expenses, that have been paid out to those who have suffered health problems because of smoking, antiteenage smoking campaigns and efforts and initiatives—and that is what this program is. Here we are asking people around the country to use their tax dollars to go to States, whether they have brought law suits, whether they have taken action—these are applicants for funds under a new FDA program that has just begun.

So, I am saying there is more to this than is being discussed. There is more to this than is being admitted. Florida has just now undertaken to consummate a settlement that is similar to the one in Mississippi, and there will be others. Where has been the Department

of Justice? Where is the Federal Department of Justice on these issues? Where is the proposal of the administration on these issues? We are asked to spend more taxpayer dollars, but I am not sure it is for a coherent, comprehensive way to deal with the overall issue. That is what I am suggesting. The States are doing a much better job and a much more aggressive job getting after this than we are. And an amendment is being suggested here to solve all those problems. Well, that is just not an accurate reflection of the facts, is it, Madam President?

So I urge, when we make a motion to table the amendment, once all time has been used or yielded back, that the Senate vote for the motion to table to permit us to continue to consider appropriations bills in this orderly fashion so that we can expedite their consideration and be fair to all Senators who offered amendments when the Senate considered the bill. I thank the Senators very much for their careful attention to this discussion.

Madam President, if all time has been used——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then I move the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Iowa be tabled.

Madam 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 1057. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 28, nays 70, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 212 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Ashcroft	Gorton	Roberts
Brownback	Gramm	Santorum
Burns	Grams	Sessions
Coats	Hagel	Shelby
Cochran	Helms	Smith (NH)
Domenici	Hutchinson	Stevens
Enzi	Hutchison	Thomas
Faircloth	Inhofe	Thurmond
Ford	Lott	
Frist	McConnell	

NAYS—70

Abraham	Campbell	Feingold
Akaka	Chafee	Feinstein
Allard	Cleland	Glenn
Baucus	Collins	Graham
Bennett	Conrad	Grassley
Biden	Coverdell	Gregg
Bingaman	Craig	Harkin
Bond	D'Amato	Hatch
Boxer	Daschle	Hollings
Breaux	DeWine	Inouye
Bryan	Dodd	Jeffords
Bumpers	Dorgan	Johnson
Byrd	Durbin	Kempthorne
Kennedy	Mack	Roth
Kerrey	McCain	Sarbanes
Kerry	Mikulski	Smith (OR)
Kohl	Moseley-Braun	Snowe
Kyl	Moynihan	Specter
Landrieu	Murray	Thompson
Lautenberg	Nickles	Torricelli
Leahy	Reed	Wellstone
Levin	Reid	Wyden
Lieberman	Robb	
Lugar	Rockefeller	

NOT VOTING—2

Murkowski	Warner

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the Harkin amendment.

The Senate will please come to order.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Chair please state the question that is now before the Senate on which we are about to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 1057, the Harkin amendment.

The amendment (No. 1057) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the text of S. 1033, as amended, including amendment No. 1057, is substituted for the text of H.R. 2160, and the bill is read for the third time and passed.

The bill (H.R. 2160), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair is authorized to appoint conferees.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. ALLARD) appointed Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. INOUYE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. COCHRAN. On behalf of the distinguished Senator from Virginia, [Mr. WARNER], I ask unanimous consent, in accordance with paragraph 2 of rule VI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, that Senator WARNER be permitted to be absent from the work of the Senate for this morning to serve as a pallbearer in Warrenton, VA, for Robert Canard, a former farm employee and friend of more than 30 years. Bob and his wife Dorothy have long been considered members of the Warner family.

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

Who seeks recognition?

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to proceed for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I had sought recognition before the Chair ruled on the unanimous-consent request. I wonder if I could engage in a colloquy, a brief colloquy, regarding the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona may proceed.

Mr. KYL. I was prepared to begin a debate at this point on an amendment which I laid down yesterday, which my understanding was we were going to try to conclude prior to roughly the noon hour because of a request by two other Senators, I believe Senator MOYNIHAN and another Senator, to speak during that period of time.

I just wonder if Senator SPECTER could be involved here and if we could quickly get an agreement. I am perfectly willing to accommodate the Senator from Delaware, but we need to get an agreement on how we are going to proceed here because I was going to conclude my part of this and then attend a committee hearing, which may not be possible if the Senator moves forward.

I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania what his intentions are.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleague from Arizona for his inquiry.

If it is consistent with the scheduling of the Senator from Arizona, I suggest that we defer to the Senator from Delaware for a period of time for morning business.

Would that be acceptable to the Senator?

Mr. KYL. Would this mean we could take up my amendment at roughly 11 o'clock?

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I will attempt to keep this under 15 minutes, if that will help.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that we proceed with the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Arizona at 10:45.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, that is certainly fine with me if it does not inhibit the Senator.

Mr. BIDEN. That is fine.

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

The Senator from Delaware is now recognized.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee, Senator SPECTER, for accommodating me and my friend from Arizona.

AMERICAN POLICY IN BOSNIA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, having just returned from a trip to Bosnia, I would like to describe my impressions

and offer my views on American policy there, if I may.

As many of my colleagues will remember, and some would rather not remember, over the last 6½ years I have been bipartisan in my criticism and my critical statements about our policy toward the states of the former Yugoslavia. I began criticizing the Bush administration early in 1991 and continued to criticize the Clinton administration until September of 1995 when it finally carried out the airstrikes that I had called for 3 years earlier and subsequently lifted the immoral and illegal arms embargo on Bosnia as part of the Dayton accords.

Now, Mr. President, for the first time I find myself in general agreement with the direction of American policy. My change of opinion does not, however, reflect either complete satisfaction or complacency. We have reached a very critical point in our policy toward Bosnia, Mr. President, as all of my colleagues know. Resolute American action, combined with allied support and local compliance, can turn the corner. But I respectfully suggest, absent any one of those factors—resolute American action, combined with allied support and local compliance—we will not only not turn the corner; I believe we will return to the genocide and chaos that prevailed 6 years ago.

To that end, we can, Mr. President, and we must, in my opinion, act decisively to bring indicted war criminals to trial before the International Tribunal in the Hague.

We can, and must, Mr. President, induce the authorities in the Federation and the Republika Srpska to greatly expand the number of refugees returning to their prewar homes.

We can and must, Mr. President, ensure that the countrywide municipal elections in mid-September and the parliamentary elections in the Republika Srpska in October, are held and that they are free and fair.

We can and must, Mr. President, guarantee free access to electronic media for all points of view in both the Federation and the Republika Srpska. I hope that the agreement on the television transmitter reached yesterday with the Karadzic forces is a move in that direction. If they go back on the bargain, SFOR troops should reoccupy that transmitter and take it back.

We can and must continue to support the Republika Srpska's President Biljana Plavsic in her struggle against indicted war criminal Radovan Karadzic.

We can and must, Mr. President, ensure that the decision of the arbitrator on Brcko in March 1998 is accepted peacefully.

In short, Mr. President, a lot remains to be accomplished in the coming months. But it is critically important for the American people and for my colleagues in the Congress to be clear on one fundamental point: Contrary to what is frequently stated, there has been progress on the civilian provisions of the Dayton accords, as well as on the well-publicized military side of the equation.

To guarantee that this progress continues and expands, the international community must not withdraw its entire military stabilization force after June 1998. The negative consequences of backsliding into renewed warfare in Bosnia would far outweigh the cost of a continued, if scaled-down commitment with no or much fewer American troops.

Let me then, Mr. President, discuss the current situation in Bosnia. First, the war criminals issue. The type of operation carried out in Prijedor in July in which British and Czech SFOR troops, supported by American forces, captured one indicted criminal and killed another indicted war criminal after being fired upon, must be repeated against Dr. Karadzic and General Mladic.

After conversations with leading American military officers in Bosnia, I am confident that such an operation is feasible. No American wishes casualties to occur, but if all other means fail, force must be employed and risk taken in order to arrest these war criminals. I am confident that the opportunity will present itself, and if it is seized upon, the operation will succeed.

Moreover, I suspect that after an initial angry response, most people in the Republika Srpska would be content to go about improving their impoverished lives, relieved of the plague of the authoritarian extortionists in Pale. Apprehension of the war criminals will not be a panacea for Bosnia's ills, but in my view it is a necessary precondition for the Dayton accords to have a chance of continuing to work.

I met with opposition leaders in the Republika Srpska. I met for well over an hour with President Plavsic. I met with a Russian military commander. I met with the American military. I met with the French military. In fact, I met with most of the major players in Bosnia during the time I was there. There is not anyone who will privately tell you that Karadzic and Mladic on the loose and continuing to run the Republika Srpska does anything, anything at all positive. As a matter of fact, all will tell you privately, and most will tell you publicly, that these two must be withdrawn from the scene. They will say it in different ways. They will say, ''withdrawn, captured, tried and convicted,'' or they will say ''driven out of the country.''

But the bottom line is that nobody believes there is any possibility of the Dayton accords being fully implemented if, in fact, the most notorious of the war criminals continue to run the Republika Srpska like a thug operation, undermining free elections in the Republika Srpska within Bosnia and undermining Mrs. Plavsic. Now Mrs. Plavsic is no shrinking violet, is clearly a nationalist, and is not someone we would choose if we could invent a President for the Republika Srpska. But she is, at a minimum, honest and not running the rackets. She has greatly undermined Mr. Karadzic's power by pointing out the corruption he has engaged in and how he is literally robbing the people of the Republika Srpska.

There is still 90 percent unemployment there. At least in the Federation it has dropped from 90 percent to 50 percent. As I will discuss in a moment, there is progress being made in the Federation, slow as it may be, but there is a gigantic impediment in the Republika Srpska, and his name is Karadzic, an indicted war criminal. I have met him in the past. I told him more than 4 years ago that he was—I will not precisely repeat what I said—but I said bluntly to his face that he was a war criminal and should be tried as one. He looked at me and resumed talking as if he were saying, ''Lots of luck in your senior year. No problem; thanks for talking to me.'' This guy is a madman, and he is undermining the prospects of any peace for the people of Bosnia—Serb, Croat, or Muslim alike.

Over the last year, the government of the Federation, comprised mainly of Muslims and Croats, has slowly begun to take meaningful shape. New national, entity, and cantonal governments were chosen in the September 1996 elections and are starting to function. The Bosnian Presidency and the council of ministers meet in regular sessions.

In Sarajevo, I had a lengthy discussion with Kresimir Zubak, the Co-President of the National Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with many leading figures in the Federation administration and the Cabinet, and with nonnationalist Muslim and Croat opposition leaders.

No one attempted to gloss over the friction that persists, Mr. President. As a matter of fact, I invited a group—and I will submit the list of people we invited—of leading Muslims, Croats, and Serbs to a dinner the first night I arrived. The first comment made by, I think, Federation Vice President Ejup Ganic, a Muslim, was ''Senator, we have not sat down at a table like this for 6 years. You have accomplished something all by itself just by getting 15 of us to show up.''

I do not want to paint a picture here that things in the Federation are rosy and wonderful. They are not. But everybody agreed on two things: First, enormous progress was being made in the Federation; and second, it is absolutely essential for the international military force to remain in Bosnia after June 1998 to guarantee that progress will continue.

I made clear that a partnership is a two-way street. Politicians from all three principal religious groups in Bosnia must make redoubled efforts to carry out the terms of the Dayton accords, especially the return of refugees.

As Americans see evidence of increased success in civilian implementation, our willingness to stay the course in Bosnia will increase accordingly.

And, Mr. President, there is much evidence to support the view that positive change is already occurring. Approximately 150,000 refugees have returned to Bosnia from abroad and another 160,000 internally displaced persons have returned to their homes, including a few to areas where they will be a distinct minority.

Meanwhile, the Train and Equip Program, led by private American military instructors, retired military, is molding a Muslim-Croat defense force for the Government of Bosnia guaranteeing the Federation's security in the future. Agreements on the Federation force structure and command have been reached, and over 300 million dollars' worth of military equipment has been procured.

Remember, Mr. President, the big problem was initially that we could not get the Muslim and the Croats in the Federation to agree to a joint military command. They would not train together. Now we have a joint military command. Muslims and Croats are sitting in the same classrooms. The officer corps and the enlisted men are all training together. There has been solid progress.

In Hadzici, west of Sarajevo, I visited the headquarters of the Train and Equip Program and spoke with the Federation's Minister of Defense and his deputy, with the commanders of the Muslim and Croat forces, and with soldiers of both armies. The cooperation is excellent, and their American trainers had high praise for their eagerness to learn and their aptitude.

In the Federation, joint police forces are being formed, including in the city of Mostar, site of the worst warfare between Muslim and Croats.

Within the framework of this modicum of stability, the economy is beginning to revive. Real gross domestic product has nearly doubled since 1995. As I mentioned, unemployment has dropped from 90 percent to 50 percent. Corruption, though, remains a major problem.

Nonetheless, if there is continued security, political progress, and international technical and financial assistance, the Federation, I believe, can be a going concern within a few years.

One of the nonnational opposition leaders with whom I met, Stjepan Kljujic, an ethnic Croat, offered the opinion that the Federation had to be better than the Republika Srpska politically, economically, and morally. Making an intriguing historical parallel, he continued that the Federation should become Bosnia's West Germany against the Republika Srpska's East Germany, even attracting guest workers from the latter as the economic disparity between the two entities widens. In this way, he felt, the two halves of the country could eventually grow together.

Whatever the validity of this vision, conditions in the Republika Srpska are already quite different from those in the Federation because of Mr. Karadzic's heavy hand. The Bosnian Serb member of the tripartite Presidency, Momcilo Krajisnik, an ally of Karadzic, has refused all but minimal fulfillment of the Dayton provisions. As a result, the international community has withheld most of its development aid from the Republika Srpska.

The economy there remains in shambles with less than 10 percent of the work force gainfully employed. In the midst of this misery, Dr. Karadzic—it is hard to even call him a doctor, but he is a doctor—and his cronies ostentatiously flaunt the wealth they have amassed through smuggling and protection rackets.

It is no wonder, then, that Mrs. Plavsic's anticorruption message has struck a chord with wide segments of the population in the Republika Srpska. I met with her for an hour and a half in Banja Luka. We must not have any illusions that President Plavsic, who loudly supported Serbian ultranationalists and ethnic cleansing during the war, has suddenly become a Jeffersonian Democrat. She is, however, a realist who understands that the Bosnian Serb entity is in danger of total disintegration unless it rids itself of the lawlessness, corruption, and warped religious hatred of the Karadzic gang and begins to cooperates with the West.

In all likelihood, by seizing the Banja Luka police headquarters, SFOR prevented a coup d'etat against Mrs. Plavsic last month. Our support of her police forces and television journalists may be turning the tide against the thugs in Pale, at least in the western part of the Republika Srpska.

Since two-thirds of the population of the Republika Srpska lives in the western part of the entity, there is a good possibility that President Plavsic's supporters can win control of the Parliament in next month's election. If that occurs, we should be able to leverage the promise of reconstruction assistance to induce President Plavsic to begin to cooperate on refugee returns.

Moreover, a lively antinationalist Serbian opposition exists in the Republika Srpska. In Banja Luka, I met with three of its leaders—Miodrag Zivanovic, Mladen Ivanic, and Milorad Dodik. They feel that democracy is unstoppable and that Mrs. Plavsic, of whom they have been sworn enemies, is only a transitional figure whom they will support during this election as a step toward genuine democracy.

Actually, the beginnings of refugee returns are already occurring, including some into areas controlled by other religious groups. I visited two such sites, one in the zone of separation near the critical northern town of Brcko, the other in Vogosca, a suburb of Sarajevo which was returned to the Federation as part of the Dayton settlement.

In the Brcko area, rebuilding is proceeding under the skillful direction of the U.S. supervisor, Ambassador Bill Farrand, and the protection of the local American SFOR contingent, based nearby in Camp McGovern. I might add that I was amazed at how high the morale was in Camp McGovern and how greatly impressed I was by Brig. Gen. Mark Curran and Lt. Col. Bill Greer, the two senior officers, who were doing a phenomenal job there.

Hostility in Brcko lies just below the surface, as shown by the riots organized by Karadzic loyalists less than 2 days after I left the city. The soldiers from Camp McGovern handled that potentially explosive situation with consummate professionalism, and I am confident they will continue to do so.

I will digress briefly at this point, Mr. President, to mention that an important feature of SFOR are the Russian troops under the command of General Clark, the SACEUR, the [Supreme Allied Commander Europe]. At Camp McGovern, I met with the commanding officer of the Russian SFOR airborne brigade who was enthusiastic about the cooperation with our forces and totally supportive of our action.

To return to refugee resettlement, unlike the palpable hostility in Brcko, in the Sarajevo suburb the situation was peaceful. There I saw Muslims, Croats, and one or two Serbs who were returning to rebuild their devastated homes under an imaginative program run by the United States Agency for International Development in cooperation with Catholic Relief Services.

Mr. President, it is worth underscoring here that not only are our magnificent Armed Forces under the inspired command of Gen. Eric Shinseki playing the largest single role in SFOR, but our United States Government development specialists have won universal respect among the Bosnians for being the international community's most efficient providers of assistance.

As a matter of fact, one of the Bosnian Serb opposition leaders said to me in Banja Luka that the Europeans are incapable of solving Bosnia s problems. By way of contrast he characterized the Americans as ''not always sensitive but very efficient.'' That is just what I would like us to be—''not always sensitive but very efficient.''

In summation, where do I see Bosnia and Herzegovina heading if the United States and our allies stay the course? Personally, I would like to see a multiethnic, multireligious society reemerge like the one that existed in Sarajevo before the war. I fear, however, that too much blood has been shed and too many atrocities committed for that to happen in the near future.

More realistic, and politically feasible, is the development of a multiethnic state, most likely in the form of a confederation with a good degree of decentralization.

My sense from this trip is that the ardor has cooled in the Republika Srpska for union with Serbia, since President Milosevic is regarded as a betrayer of the Serb cause and as a figure totally incapable of providing the basic material prosperity that the Bosnian Serbs so desperately crave.

Unreconstructed Croat nationalists in Herzegovina may still long for union with Croatia, but as the leadership changes in Zagreb, the new government there will be more intent on integrating with Western Europe than on annexing provincial bandits.

In short, for the first time in years, developments are moving in the right direction. As I have outlined, much hard political and economic work remains to be done, most of it by the Bosnians themselves. The United States and its allies can, and must, provide the framework for the Dayton accords to be fully implemented.

I do not minimize the cost to the American taxpayer of our efforts. Neither, however, can I underestimate the cost of a failure of the Bosnian operation. In the near future, I will indicate in some detail what I think the costs would be to the United States if, in fact, Bosnia were to erupt once again. Suffice it to say now that not only would all that has been accomplished go up in smoke as fighting reignited, but a failure in Bosnia would signal the beginning of the end for NATO, which is currently restructuring itself to meet Bosnia-like challenges in the 21st century.

Therefore, I call upon the Clinton administration immediately to begin discussions with our allies about creating a post-SFOR force after June 1998. For months, I recommended a combined joint task force with our allies, which the Senate overwhelmingly advocated in July in the 1998 defense authorization Bill.

The question of whether American participation in a post-SFOR force will be limited to air, naval, intelligence, and communications support with a rapid deployment force in reserve in Hungary, or also might include a greatly reduced ground contingent can be resolved in these negotiations.

The immediate priority is to begin the negotiations now—to make clear to all parties in Bosnia that, if they cooperate, the security framework will continue for a limited time—and to make clear to the skeptics that the new NATO can and will be the driving force in the European security architecture of the 21st century.

I thank my colleague from Arizona for his indulgence. I thank the President for the time.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1061) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Kyl amendment No. 1056, to increase funding for Federal Pell grants, with an offset from fiscal year 1998 funding for low-income home energy assistance.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, yesterday I had announced our hope to be able to conclude this bill by this evening. Senator LOTT was on the floor when we were talking about scheduling and I discussed it briefly with our distinguished majority leader, and also with Senator HARKIN, the ranking Democrat, and asked that anybody who intended to file amendments to let us know by the close of business yesterday, or in any event no later than noon today. We have been advised of a number of possible amendments. I believe it is possible to work some of those out. Others will have to go to votes.

But I would restate at this time our urging anybody who intends to file an amendment to contact us by noon today so that we may proceed. There is one item which may not be completed by the close of business today, and that relates to the funding on testing which is now proposed by the administration.

There was a statement in the media by Congressman WILLIAM GOODLING of Pennsylvania, chairman of their authorization committee, of his intention to oppose funding. And there was comment that a similar prohibition may be offered on this bill.

Yesterday I was contacted by the Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, who urged support of their program, and we had a discussion. After sleeping on it I decided it would be a good idea to have a hearing on the subject, which we have put into effect for tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, with the concurrence of Senator HARKIN and also our chairman of the appropriations committee, Senator STEVENS. So, if that amendment is offered, that one item of business might most appropriately be concluded tomorrow morning. But aside from that one item, it is my hope that we will be able to finish action on this bill this evening.

I thank my colleague, Senator KYL, for offering his amendment yesterday.

I yield the floor so that Senator KYL may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 1056

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate that.

I also appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Delaware preceding this. I think he makes very cogent points on a different subject.

Mr. President, I don't think the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment. 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. KYL. Thank you, Mr. President.

At this time, let me explain the reasons for my amendment to increase Pell grant funding. I submitted a statement for the RECORD yesterday. But I would like to discuss it in a little bit more detail today.

There is particular reason for us to take this action which would bring us closer to the administration's request and into line with the recommendation from the House of Representatives. It seems odd to me that the Senate would not be willing to support Pell grant funding at the same level as recommended by the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives. This amendment would conform the Senate funding level to the House funding level, and there is a particular reason for this amendment coming up. That is, a problem that was created in a previous law with respect to two different groups of students that are funded. I would like to discuss that in a little bit more detail.

First, let me note the numbers. This amendment would provide an additional $528 million for the Pell Grant Program. It would boost funding to the level recommended by the House Appropriations Committee. The Pell grant funding would go from $6.91 billion to $7.438 billion. The offset is from the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which I will discuss in just a moment.

The Pell grant funding amendment, as I said, is intended to finance changes in eligibility—that is, to correct problems that have arisen as a result of the current law phaseout of certain independent students at income levels that are lower than those for dependent students. Like the House bill, this funding level is contingent upon the authorization committee providing authorization.

We have letters from both the chairman and ranking members of the House and Senate authorizing committees indicating that should the additional funding be approved they would work for that authorization to be established.

It is also my understanding that the administration is in agreement with the House of Representative numbers with respect to the Pell grant funding.

So I think we ought to put at least as high a priority on Pell grants as the President and the House of Representatives in this version of the Labor-HHS bill.

Here is the problem that was created. In the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 we established a separate allowance for independent students without dependents—independent students, not dependent students—independent students who do not themselves have dependents.

The problem is, the separate allowance established under the 1992 act. It creates a substantial disparity among these groups of students very much to the disadvantage of the independent students without dependents. The proposed change in eligibility which the

funding in my amendment is intended to finance would bring the proportion of students in this group who would be eligible for Pell grants closer to the proportion that existed prior to the establishment of the separate allowance in the 1992 act. Students, incidentally, in this group are typically older students with annual family incomes of between $10,000 and $20,000.

I obtained from the Department of Education a statistical list for the States of the number of students who lost eligibility under the separate allowance that we created in the 1992 act. Just for the benefit of some of the Senators who are here, I might note some of the numbers with respect to the States involved here.

In California, for example, 24,314 students lost eligibility as a result of what we did. My amendment would provide a way for these students to go to school.

In Iowa, the State of the distinguished ranking Member, 4,247 students lost eligibility as a result of what we did. My amendment would reassert their eligibility to provide the funding for that.

In the State of Michigan, the number of students who lost eligibility, according to the Department of Education, is 15,254;

In the State of Minnesota, 7,432;

In the State of Pennsylvania, the State of the distinguished chairman of the committee, 9,535 students lost eligibility as a result of what was done.

My amendment will restore the funding so that these students will be eligible—will have the funding to get the Pell grants to get their education.

So we are talking here about a significant number of students that will not be helped if our amendment is not adopted.

The offset, as I said, is from the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, the so-called LIHEAP Program. I know there are some Members who rather reflexably react to any reductions in this program because there is a contingent of their constituency that relies on this program and that reacts very badly if there is an attempt to cut it. But, Mr. President, I think in this case we have to balance the interests of those people with the people who have lost their eligibility under the Pell Grant Program. And, if we do not act, these students are not going to have the opportunity to advance their education.

So let's talk for just a minute about this tradeoff and about the LIHEAP Program.

The LIHEAP Program was set up 16 years ago as a temporary program for just a few months to help people get over the energy crisis. The energy crisis is long gone. This is a typical program of the liberal welfare state. It gets established, and then can never be disestablished notwithstanding the fact that the reason for it has long ago disappeared.

The world is a very different place than it was in 1981. Gone are the long lines at the gas pumps and the skyrocketing energy prices.

It seems to me, as we prepare for the 21st century, that we should look beyond programs designed to cope with an energy crisis of nearly 20 years ago—a crisis that has come and gone—and focus instead on how to prepare young people for the high-tech more competitive economy of the future.

That is what this amendment does.

Mr. President, fuel costs have not only stabilized since 1981, they have declined significantly in real terms; that is, in inflation-adjusted terms.

For example, I would refer to figures from the Clinton administration itself. In its 1995 budget submission the Clinton administration recommended substantial reductions in the LIHEAP Program because it too recognized that the fuel costs had gone down significantly. As noted in the President's budget, ''fuel prices have decreased by 40 percent in real terms; the cost of electricity has dropped by about 13 percent in real terms; and the percent of income spent for home heating for households at or below 150 percent of poverty guidelines has dropped by about one-third.'' The President's budget went on to propose a 50-percent reduction in funding for the program that year.

Last year, President Clinton proposed outyear costs in LIHEAP—a $90 million reduction in 1999, and a $181 million reduction in the year 2000. The Office of Management and Budget advised my office that the declining figures were due to the standard percentage reductions applied to programs that were not considered a high priority—because of the statistics that I cited earlier from the Clinton administration.

So, Mr. President, you have the Clinton administration recognizing that we need to increase the Pell grant funding, you have the Clinton administration recognizing that the LIHEAP Program can no longer be justified at its present level, you have the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee recommending that we end this disparity between the two different groups of students funded by Pell grants, and it seems to me that we have an opportunity here with very little detriment to increase the funding for these students.

The States themselves as I have noted, have already shown a significant ability to meet the energy needs of those that require assistance.

For example, many States refuse to allow public utilities to shut off power to delinquent customers. And they have set up payment plans and other options. So we do not need the old subsidy to deal with the problem that may exist for some people.

It just seems to me given the States' track record, obviously, that they care as much about their low-income citizens as people here in Washington, DC, do. Given their track records and the stable or declining price of energy, this is a good time to begin, as the President recommended a couple of years ago, to begin cutting back on LIHEAP so that we can target these resources to other more pressing needs.

In closing, Mr. President, the bipartisan budget agreement that we passed in July was intended to create new opportunities in education for middle- and upper-income families. It will through a variety of new tax breaks and tax credits. But we have the chance today to target additional Pell grant assistance to more lower- and middle-income people so that all American families will have the same opportunity to secure a brighter future.

For those, as I said, who react somewhat automatically against this amendment because, as one friend put it, they come from a cold State, I simply think it is very hard to explain why you voted against the level of Pell grant funding recommended by the House of Representatives and the President of the United States simply because you wanted to preserve a 16-year-old temporary subsidy program, the justification for which has long since disappeared.

This amendment literally represents a choice between an old welfare state subsidy and a brighter future for more young people through education that they might not otherwise receive.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment to add more money to the Pell Grant Program.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I agree with 50 percent of what the distinguished Senator from Arizona has said; that is, the part about the increasing Pell grants. I think he is exactly right about that. I wish we had more money to increase the Pell grants.

What we have done is to increase the Pell grants by $1 billion. It has moved from fiscal year 1997 where it was at $5.919 billion to $6.910 billion which is a very, very substantial increase—in the 16- to 17-percent range.

Senator HARKIN and I, who have looked over these figures, take second place to no one on our concern for education and that created in the budget we have here, and what we have done over the years—most notably last April when we added $2.6 billion over some very considerable objection and instead having those funds go largely to education.

As I said yesterday, on a very personal level, my concern about education goes to the roots of my own family. Both of my parents were immigrants. And my brother, my two sisters, and I have been able to share in the American dream because of our educational opportunities.

We have not only added to the Pell grants the $1 billion here but have also increased the funding on guaranteed student loans so that every young man and woman—and this goes for the people who are not quite so young—would

have an opportunity for educational advancement in this country.

So that I agree totally with what my distinguished colleague from Arizona has had to say about the value of the Pell grants. But we have stretched and stretched very, very far.

It is true that the House has an additional $500 million in the Pell grants, and they have a larger sum of money to work with than we are allocated in the Senate. Without going into any extensive explanation, there are different technical rules which apply to the two bodies.

I might say to my colleague from Arizona that with the additional arguments he has advanced today in a very cogent way, to the extent we can yield to the House figure, we will try to do so when we get to conference, recognizing his interest and being even more persuaded by his eloquence here this morning.

The part of his presentation that I cannot agree with is the part relating to cutting the funding on low-income heat and energy fuel assistance. What we have done here, Mr. President, for those who may be listening in-house or on C–SPAN 2, is made an allocation of the almost $80 billion here by trying to place the funding on a priority basis, and having taken care of other priorities including Pell grants with the additional $1 billion, have made the allocation of $1 billion to the LIHEAP 1998 program and an advanced appropriation of $1.2 billion, which is slightly different.

This program is on the decline from 1985 when it had $2.1 billion. We believe that this is an appropriate allocation of priorities. Some 55 Senators have written to Senator HARKIN and myself asking that LIHEAP be preserved. If you add 55 to 2, that is 57, and there may be some other votes out there.

I make this comment not to prejudge the tabulation of the votes, because you never know until the votes are counted, but there are 57 Senators who have been concerned enough about this one item who have spoken up—55 having written to us. And I can tell you how strongly Senator HARKIN and I feel about this. I know obviously my own sense of it, and I have talked to Senator HARKIN enough to know his sense.

This program is for low-income families. Almost 70 percent of the recipient families have an annual income of less than $8,000—think of that, $8,000; 44 percent have at least one member who is elderly, and 20 percent have a member disabled. Currently, the number of families served has been reduced to 5 million families, 1 million less than 2 years ago, and this is part of our effort to target those who need it the most. The funding has been cut by more than 50 percent, from $2.1 billion to this figure. There is no replacement for this funding.

Thirty-five percent of all recipient households heat their homes by using oil, propane, wood, or coal. These sources of fuel do not have a monopoly control over their territories and cannot raise prices to cover the cost of providing discounted or free energy supplies to their low-income members. What we really face here is that in this category, many of the elderly, many of the disabled are faced with an alternative of either heating or eating, and that is a choice obviously that no American should face.

Without LIHEAP, there would not be an opportunity for these low-income families to utilize their other scarce resources for sustaining themselves. Obviously, in a civilized society, if the choice is heating or eating, we have to do both, and that is why this funding is so very important.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I was just going to comment on a couple things very briefly.

Mr. HARKIN. Go ahead.

Mr. KYL. I certainly appreciate the comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the committee. I just wanted to comment on two of the points he made.

It is, indeed, true that the total amount of money to be expended on Pell grants has been increased by about $1 billion. That goes to increase the maximum Pell grant to $3,000. It does not, as the Senator, of course, is well aware, fund this category of people who I contend have been disadvantaged as a result of the 1992 act, the independent students without dependents. So the increase in the funding in the bill has made it better for those who receive the grants, but it has not enabled us to cover the people that I am proposing to cover.

Second, with respect to the LIHEAP Program, just to make it very clear, this offset does not eliminate the LIHEAP Program. It reduces by about one-half the funding for the LIHEAP Program, which, incidentally, is almost the same amount of reduction that was recommended by President Clinton in his 1995 budget submission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise—and I am sure this is no surprise to anyone—in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend from Arizona. Again, I would concur with what my distinguished chairman said. About half I agree with; half I do not agree with in terms of the Senator's comments.

We are all in favor of increasing Pell grants and making sure everyone is covered, but I would say this committee, under the able leadership of Senator SPECTER, has done a great job of increasing the Pell grants to historically high levels—a maximum grant of $3,000, up from $2,700 last year. Certainly you always perhaps could have more. But I haven't heard from any institution of higher learning or anyone that is involved in the Pell grant program saying that this is insufficient. I think what I have heard is that they are very, very happy with what this committee has done in meeting these requirements and getting the level up.

In taking the cut out of LIHEAP for this, though, talk about robbing Peter to pay Paul, because we are talking about the same kind of universe. We are talking about low-income families.

Again, just to reiterate and reaffirm what the chairman said, the LIHEAP Program has gone down 50 percent in the last decade. We started out at about $2.1 billion in 1985 and it is down now to $1 billion—a 50–percent drop in the amount of money, yet the eligible population for LIHEAP has grown by about 30 percent—33 percent in that same period of time. So the eligible number has gone up and the pie piece has gone down. Over 70 percent of the families receiving LIHEAP assistance have incomes of less than $8,000 a year; 7 out of every 10 have incomes—that is not individuals—family incomes less than $8,000 a year, and 44 percent of the households receiving it are elderly, over age 65. So that is the universe we are talking about.

The Senator from Arizona said this is a program that's outlived its usefulness; the energy crisis is gone. Well, it may be that for those who are making more money it is gone, but my figures show that the prices of natural gas, electricity, if you adjust for inflation, are about as high now as they were in 1979. But if you look at the universe of people who are getting LIHEAP, their inflation-adjusted incomes have not gone up. So they are basically in the same position they were in, or like families were in, when the energy crisis hit in 1979.

As Senator SPECTER said, 50 percent of these families in LIHEAP use natural gas, 15 percent use electricity, 35 percent use oil, propane, wood, and coal. So for these families the energy crisis still exists, and it especially exists when the weather gets the coldest.

The Senator from Minnesota is in the Chamber, and as we found out last year when we had some extremely cold weather, we found anomalies in the upper Midwest where in some States the cost of propane and oil spiked, went up 25 percent during the coldest times of the year as compared to some other States. In other words, in those areas where it was the coldest, where it was needed the most, the price went up the highest.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield for a question? And I say to my colleague from Maine, I will not go with other questions as I know she wants to speak, and I had a chance to speak yesterday.

Isn't it also true, taking the experience of last winter—and I could ask this of the chairman as well, Senator SPECTER—what has been happening, because we have really been underfunded, we depend on the emergency funding and we go through this drill every year where then what we have to do is seek this additional emergency funding? We certainly had to do that last year. And then, of course, States never know what they are going to be able to do. So the last thing we should be doing, am I correct, is cutting $500 million?

It would gut the whole program.

Mr. HARKIN. It would gut the whole program. To answer the Senator's question, we always come in for emergency funds. But here is what happens. When you don't fund the LIHEAP Program enough, what happens is family—let's face it; the average family gets about 215 bucks. It's what, around 30 percent, I think, of their heating bill. But what happens—and we know this from experience in my State of Iowa especially—when they don't know if they are going to get the money to pay their heating bills—and you know elderly people are very proud. They don't want to be on welfare and most of them are not on welfare. They are getting Social Security, very small Social Security checks. What they do is they turn the heat down and they put their shawls on, they put on coats, they wear coats around the house. And then what happens. Well, they get ill and then they have to go to the hospital, and they go to the emergency rooms.

We have found this time and time and time again. That is what poor people, and especially elderly people, will do when they don't know if they are going to get their heating money. And so again, the crisis is real for these people, very, very real.

As I pointed out, last year we had—and I have called for an investigation of it—in some States, a 25–percent increase, and I do not think there is any need for it other than the demand was there, it was very cold, and a lot of these elderly people simply could not pay these prices.

Lastly, let me sort of respond philosophically to the Senator from Arizona. I couldn't help but notice the comment that this was a program of the liberal welfare state; like a lot of programs of the liberal welfare state, it just goes on and on and on even when the need is not there.

Well, I could ask the Senator from Arizona, what about the Pell Grant Program? That was a program of the Lyndon Johnson Great Society just as well as—well, not LIHEAP; that came later, but the Pell grant was a program from under the Great Society, and the need was there and the need is still there for the Pell Grant Program.

So I would submit to the Senator from Arizona that this is not a program of the liberal welfare state. It is a program of a caring and compassionate and fair state. We are, as I said the other day, fulfilling our obligation under the Constitution of the United States.

A lot of people do not realize this, but twice in the Constitution the word ''welfare'' is mentioned—twice—first, in the preamble when it says, ''We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare.''

''Promote,'' it does not say just stand by. It says ''promote the general Welfare.'' That is why we established the Constitution. So that is the first place it is mentioned. And then in article I, section 8 of the Constitution. Article I is, of course, Congress and what Congress is supposed to do. Section 8 outlines the responsibilities of Congress: To borrow money, regulate commerce, to establish post offices and roads, provide and maintain a Navy, et cetera, et cetera. Here is the first paragraph of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

> The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

It is our obligation, first, to promote the general welfare and then, using the powers that we have to lay and collect taxes and disburse those moneys, to provide for the general welfare of the people.

That is what we are talking about. Whether we are talking about Pell Grant Programs or whether we are talking about heating energy assistance programs for the elderly and the poor, we are fulfilling our obligation as a caring and compassionate state to promote the general welfare and to use our taxing and spending powers outlined in the Constitution of the United States to provide for the general welfare of our people.

So, no, this is not a program of a liberal welfare state. It is a program of a caring and compassionate and fair state, just as the Pell Grants Program is. These are good programs. We should not be robbing one that hits at the poorest, those with the lowest incomes of our people—70 percent of these families have less than $8,000 a year income—to use that to try to help other low-income people to get an education. Don't tell me there are not other sources of funds here. There are.

I might submit that we now have this B–2 bomber we are building that cannot even sit out in the rain, $1 billion a copy, and now we have to build special hangars for them because they cannot sit outside. We can't forward deploy them. All this is coming out now. We are going to put money in that, but we are going to take money out of the heating energy assistance programs to help other poor people get an education? I am sorry, that doesn't quite compute for this Senator.

So I am hopeful—and I know the Senator from Arizona means well. As I said, I support half of what he is talking about, in terms of getting the Pell grants up. I just think his sources of getting the money are just not good for this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine, who is going to speak next, but I ask if I can have just 1 minute to respond to one point the Senator from Iowa just made. I think it is important for me to respond to it.

He said, first, that the inflation-adjusted prices are about the same and then challenged my assertion that the liberal welfare state program, as I described the LIHEAP Program, which I said the need for had largely been eliminated, is similar, in terms of welfare, to the Pell grant funding and suggested perhaps I was failing to appreciate the similarity in both programs being welfare programs.

I simply wanted to respond to the Senator from Iowa in this fashion. What I said was that once a welfare state program is instituted, it is very difficult to get rid of it even if the need for it has been eliminated or reduced. That, in my opinion—and I know the distinguished Senator from Iowa disagrees with this opinion—but in my opinion, the LIHEAP Program is a program which was originally intended to be temporary. That is a fact. But it has now become permanent notwithstanding, in my opinion, the fact that the need for it has largely been eliminated or reduced, thus demonstrating a program instituted for very good reasons but, in my view, which no longer is justified—as distinguished from the Pell Grant Program. I think none of us would argue the need for that has been reduced or eliminated.

So my point is not that one is welfare and one is not welfare in the broadest sense of the term, as the Senator from Iowa noted, but rather that the need for one has largely been eliminated, yet it is very difficult if not impossible for us to eliminate these programs once they have begun.

To the point that the energy costs are about the same as they were, I can only cite the statistics from the Clinton administration budget submitted in 1995. And I am quoting now.

> [F]uel prices have decreased by 40 percent in real terms; the cost of electricity has dropped by about 13 percent in real terms; and the percent of income spent for home heating for households at or below 150 percent of poverty guidelines has dropped by about one-third.

That is the reason for my assertion that the energy costs have indeed gone down dramatically.

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator will yield for this colloquy, just yield for a question. Even taking the Senator's figures, if the real prices have dropped by a third, the fact is that since 1985 the LIHEAP Program has come down 50 percent. So we are spending half as much money today. Of course, in real terms it would be even less than that, if you adjusted for inflation. I am just talking about the actual dollars. It's $2.1 billion in 1985, it's $1 billion now. So, even if the cost—I ask the Senator to think about this and see if my reasoning is wrong here—even if the cost of energy has come down by a third, if in fact the amount of money we are putting in the program has come down by over a half, does that not compute out to the fact that there is less money going into the program today and that less money is there to meet the heating

needs of those families who are getting the money?

Mr. KYL. Relatively speaking, the Senator from Iowa is certainly correct. We would simply then engage in a philosophical debate as to whether or not, if that number continued to drop to one-third and one-tenth and so on, whether the program should continue. My view would be this was a temporary program designed to meet a temporary need, that it was never designed to pay for 100 percent of the bill for heating, and therefore there is a point at which the need for the program should go away, when the prices have been reduced to a certain point. He and I obviously simply disagree about what that point would be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, which would cut funding severely for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and increase funding for the Pell Grant Program.

There is no stronger supporter of the Pell Grant Program in the U.S. Senate than I. In fact, very shortly I will be introducing legislation to expand working students' eligibility for Pell grants. However, when faced with this amendment, I must ask the question: Are we so poor a country that some must be cold, go hungry, forgo medications so that others may learn? The answer is obvious. This amendment presents a false choice.

Maine is well known for its cold and very long winters. Many of Maine's residents, along with the citizens of other Northern States, are heavily dependent on the aid provided by LIHEAP in order to heat their homes during the cold winter months. Without the assistance of LIHEAP, 33,000 of Maine's most vulnerable and needy citizens—I am talking about elderly people, the disabled, and very low-income families—will go without adequate heat during the coming winter or will be forced to forgo medications or even food. We must not allow this to happen.

As Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN have noted, 70 percent of the people receiving this home heating assistance have incomes under $8,000 a year. We are talking about people who are very needy. This bill's funding for LIHEAP is not excessive. In fact, it's approximately the amount that was spent last year, and that amount was not adequate to serve all of the people needing assistance. Last year this program provided 33,000 Mainers with an average subsidy of $308. That is only enough to buy a couple of tanks of heating oil. For many, this small amount of help is, however, the difference between being in a comfortably heated home and freezing.

This is not an excessive expenditure. Failure to appropriate at least this amount will only result in a call for emergency funding later this year, an event that has occurred in each of the past 4 years. I agree with the able and distinguished Senator from Arizona that funding for Pell grants should be increased, but I cannot support a reduction in LIHEAP as a means of accomplishing this.

A recent editorial from the Portland Press Herald in my State put it well when it stated:

> The idea of LIHEAP may seem frivolous to lawmakers from warm, southern States. However, the subsidy remains essential to residents in colder climates. That's especially true now when welfare cuts and a rising cost of living have pushed so many poor families so much closer to the edge. Asking low-income and elderly Mainers to choose between filling their fuel tanks or their cupboards is not fair.

I conclude my remarks by stating that asking the U.S. Senate to choose between LIHEAP and Pell grants is also not fair. It is a false choice and I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am advised that the vote will not occur until 3 o'clock under our scheduling. So, if there are any additional speakers who wish to come to the floor at this time, we invite them to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I am aware the Senator from Minnesota, Senator WELLSTONE, had desired to speak against my amendment here. I am not aware of anyone else who intends to speak on it.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Do I understand there has been an agreement reached to have the vote at 3?

Mr. HARKIN. 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. SPECTER. 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. SPECTER. Mr. President, as is usually the case, there are absent Senators, one not due to return until 1 o'clock. We then have a conference until 2:15. Then there are hearings. So it will be our expectation, subject to checking with the distinguished majority leader, that the vote on this amendment would occur at 5 o'clock. But it would be our expectation that this would conclude the debate on the amendment. It wouldn't absolutely foreclose somebody who wanted to come down and speak on the matter, perhaps, briefly, but that would conclude the debate and we would hope to set the vote here for 5 o'clock and perhaps stack it with other votes at that time.

Mr. HARKIN. If I might just ask the distinguished chairman.

Mr. SPECTER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HARKIN. Obviously, we are open for business now. There are other amendments that I have heard about that are out there. So if other Senators have them, now is the time to come over, and perhaps if amendments are offered now and after the caucuses, after the 2:15 time, we could stack a bunch of votes at 5 o'clock. I know Senators like to do that, because they can schedule their time a little bit better. I hope any Senators who have amendments will come over now before we break for our party caucuses or come over at 2:15 and then we can stack the votes at 5 o'clock.

Mr. SPECTER. If my distinguished colleague will yield, Mr. President, I think that would be a good arrangement. I said earlier, repeating what we said yesterday, it is our hope to finish action on this bill this evening. That is what we said yesterday after concurring with the majority leader. There is one possible exception to that, and that would relate to a possible amendment to preclude any funding for the administration testing, and an issue arose yesterday as to whether that amendment might be offered. Secretary Riley called Senator HARKIN, myself and others yesterday, and we have scheduled a hearing for tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock so that we may have a better factual understanding on that matter before the vote comes up, if it does come up. It would be our hope we can conclude action on the bill this evening, with the exception of that possible vote following the hearing tomorrow morning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so that we might receive an amendment by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, Senator ASHCROFT, on a matter which I believe is acceptable to both sides. This involves an issue which has been resolved after laborious debates on related subjects, and it is one where the House of Representatives has worked out an accommodation. The amendment will now be offered by our colleague from Missouri.

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

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Iowa for their allowing me to bring this amendment to the floor at this time.

AMENDMENT NO. 1061

(Purpose: To provide for limitations with respect to expenditures for abortions)

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] proposes an amendment numbered 1061.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 77, strike lines 6 through 11, and insert the following (and redesignate the following section accordingly):

SEC. 508. (a) None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be expended for any abortion.

(b) None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be expended for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

(c) The term ''health benefits coverage'' means the package of services covered by a managed care provider or organization pursuant to a contract or other arrangement.

SEC. 509. (a) The limitations established in the preceding section shall not apply to an abortion—

(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

(2) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed.

(b) Nothing in the preceding section shall be construed as prohibiting the expenditure by a State, locality, entity, or private person of State, local, or private funds (other than a State's or locality's contribution of medicaid matching funds) for abortion services or coverage of abortion by contract or other arrangement.

(c) Nothing in the preceding section shall be construed as restricting the ability of any managed care provider or organization from offering abortion coverage or the ability of a State or locality to contract separately with such a provider for such coverage with State funds (other than a State's or locality's contribution of medicaid matching funds).

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, as a result of this amendment having been agreed to by both sides, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1061) was agreed to.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to have updated our appropriations legislation so that the traditional Hyde amendment, which forbids and prohibits the utilization of Federal funds in abortions, could be a part of what we are doing as it relates to HMO's. Government's role is to help people to respond to their highest and best in life. However, I don't believe the highest and best utilization of Federal funding would be to fund the destruction of children in this country. For a long time, the Congress of the United States has agreed that Federal funds would not be used in conducting abortions.

Yet, as developments transpire in health care, and as we change from one sort of service delivery system to another, old policies might need clarification to make sure that we do not change the prohibition on Federal funding for abortions. Let me explain.

Twenty-one years ago, Congressman HENRY HYDE offered an amendment to the then Labor-HEW bill to ban Federal funding of abortions. Every year since then, Congress has adopted that amendment. While there is substantial disagreement in America over the practice of abortion—very substantial disagreement—there has never been majority support in this body for Federal funding of abortions. As a matter of fact, there has been substantial agreement that we should not force Americans to pay with their Federal tax dollars for elective abortions.

Many individuals simply feel that as a matter of conscience, they should not be participants in the destruction of unborn lives. I happen to be one of those individuals.

The opposition to Federal funding for abortion has been so consistent in Congress and in America that normally the Hyde amendment is just included in Labor-HHS appropriations bills and passed with no discussion. In fact, that traditional Hyde amendment is in the bill which we are debating today. However, after 21 years, the language needs to be clarified, and I say ''clarified'' because we are not expanding it nor weakening it, we are just making its meaning crystal clear.

To keep up with rapidly changing health care delivery modifications in Medicaid, and to prevent misinterpretations of the life-of-the-mother exception, a technical change to the Hyde amendment is necessary if the amendment is to continue to prevent Federal tax dollars from subsidizing elective abortions. Such a subsidy would be a mandate on the U.S. taxpayers to pay for elective abortions. It would literally be an affront to the American people to take their money and demand that it be used to destroy unborn children. Such a Federal taxpayer subsidy would further sear the American conscience. It would offend the moral sensitivity of a great many Americans.

The Hyde amendment in its current form may allow such subsidies to occur in today's health care environment. Just as other laws have had to be tweaked to function appropriately with HMO's, so does the Hyde amendment.

The Medicaid Program has traditionally been a fee-for-service health care delivery system, and the Hyde amendment was written with that kind of system in mind. Under the system, it was relatively easy for the Government to block any utilization of Federal tax resources for subsidizing abortion.

However, as the Medicaid structure is rapidly changing, many States are experimenting with delivery systems such as managed care, in which Federal funds are used to help pay for premiums for complete benefit packages instead of reimbursing for specific procedures after the fact.

According to HCFA, 9 percent of Medicaid patients were served in managed care plans in 1991. By 1996, that figure had risen to 40 percent, and it is important to make sure that those health care packages, which are purchased with Federal resources, do not include the destruction of children in elective abortions. The use of Medicaid managed care is expected to continue to increase in the future, and there is a legitimate concern that since the Federal Government no longer receives billings for specific medical services under these managed care contracts, but simply pays for a portion of the overall premium, that some States might allow coverage of abortion on demand with these federally funded contracts.

For example, under a fee-for-service structure, we would never allow a bill from a provider to be paid for an elective abortion. However, when you are paying for medical services in advance in a lump sum to an organization like an HMO, and in return for that lump sum they are meeting the medical needs of individuals, you don't get individual bills. So there would be no way to make sure that you weren't paying for elective abortions in such a setting, absent the clarifications which we are placing in the law today.

Federal subsidy of elective abortions has never been the intent of Congress. The amendment which we have adopted today will make sure that we continue to state with clarity that, regardless of the method of payment for Medicaid services, Federal resources are not to be used to destroy the lives of unborn children in elective abortions.

How will this new change apply in practice? Federal funds are currently used to pay the premium or capitation fees to enroll Medicaid patients in managed care plans. Without any accountability to the Federal Government, those plans could routinely provide abortion alongside other benefits as part of their complete packages. The HMO gets an amount of money. It provides a complete package of health care service. Technically, under this payment structure, the Federal funds are never used to pay for a particular service or a particular abortion, but, in practice, they could be used to subsidize abortions beyond those permitted by the Hyde amendment. To prevent this from happening, today we have updated the Hyde amendment to specify that States may not use Federal money to purchase health care coverage that includes abortion coverage.

Precedent exists for clarifying such a Federal funding limitation. Congress already considered this indirect funding situation when it gave almost unanimous approval to similar language in the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act which Senator DORGAN and I introduced earlier this year. President Clinton signed this legislation on April 30, so we have an existing law on the books that deals with this issue. The Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act stated that no funds could be appropriated for the purpose

of paying, directly or indirectly, for health benefit coverage for assisted suicide, euthanasia, or mercy killing. We are using similar health benefits coverage language in this bill.

In the abortion context itself, we have precedent, in that a similar provision was included in the so-called kid care legislation passed in the reconciliation legislation which the President signed on August 5. Congressional leaders and the administration negotiated this language, which the Senate approved by a vote of 85 to 15.

Also, similar language on abortion funding was approved by the 104th Congress without controversy as a part of Medicaid revisions in the fiscal year 1996 OBRA bill which the President vetoed for reasons unrelated to this issue.

It is important to point out that we should not have the wrong incentives in our Medicaid Program, and it is true that it is cheaper to abort a child than it is to care for the mother through the pregnancy and to deliver the child. I would be very leery about having a system where the Federal Government provided an amount of money to an HMO which, having a financial incentive to do the cheaper thing, aborts the child rather than encouraging the mother to have the child and provide for delivery. And similarly, I have serious reservations about the potential for assisted suicide, where the HMO could deliver lethal drugs to a patient and, as a result, reduce the cost of doing business. We want to have incentives to life and incentives to health, especially for HMO's who might otherwise be tempted by financial situations not to encourage individuals to fight the fight for life.

Whenever the lives of unborn children are destroyed, I believe there is a toll on the American conscience, and I think it is substantial. When Government provides an opportunity for abortion with Federal funds, we certainly find ourselves in a serious situation where the moral fabric of the country would be stretched, if not permanently torn. I am pleased today that the Senate has agreed to say that we should not provide the opportunity for elective abortions to be funded by Federal resources, even in the HMO setting.

In each such instance where Government is making a judgment, it needs to make a judgment that favors life, that respects the lives of children, that provides for the dignity of the lives of older Americans as well. Any time we unduly disregard and devalue life, we have carved something important out of the American personality.

If we are to indelibly stamp the next century with American values, the values of opportunity and freedom, as we have in this century, if we are to be a leader in the world, as we have in this century—and there are hundreds of millions of people that are free today around the globe because we have been strong and we have been free and we have been dedicated to freedom—we need all of our resources, we need the moral fabric of America, and we cannot destroy it or unduly sear the conscience of Americans by requiring the payment for elective abortions out of Federal tax dollars.

I say as well that we need our children. As we look to the next century, America will not survive without our children. Destroying children is contradictory to preparing for the future.

I believe that the assault on the sanctity of life is a moral crisis and that any use of taxpayer funds to pay for such an assault and perpetuate the destruction of America's children would be disabling to the moral compasses of all Americans.

When he wrote on slavery in America, Thomas Jefferson, the South's first and greatest President, confronted the great moral issue of his time. Jefferson said of slavery, ''I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just and that his justice cannot sleep forever.'' Sometimes I tremble when I reflect on abortion's terrible toll on lives and the siphoning off of our moral indignation and our capacity to prepare for the next century.

I am pleased the Senate today has taken a very clear step in saying there will be no Federal funding of elective abortions in the Medicaid HMO setting, just as we have for over 20 years provided that there would be no Federal funding for elective abortions in Medicaid fee-for-service programs.

I thank the Chair, and I thank the managers of the bill.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this amendment conforms the provisions of the Hyde amendment, which were developed for fee-for-service, so that the same limitations would apply on Medicaid, on managed care.

This has been a very controversial issue for many years and has taken up the attention of this Chamber and the House of Representatives. After many votes and a lot of deliberation and a lot of negotiations, the Hyde amendment has been crafted in its existing form as it applies to fee-for-service, and this carries it forward to managed care.

I am advised that in the House of Representatives they have worked through this same amendment and have made the request, through their staff, that we have it accepted here. We had intended to put it in a managers' package. I have conferred with my distinguished colleague, Senator HARKIN, who is on the floor at the present time. The distinguished Senator from Missouri discussed it with the managers and sought to offer it in the form that it has been offered and to make a statement. I think that concludes the matter in a way that has existed for many, many years as an accommodation of many complex and conflicting issues.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his accommodation in this respect. He is entirely correct; this extends the same protections and the same regime of Federal funding to the HMO setting that we have had in the fee-for-service setting, and it is appropriate that we extend the commitment of the Congress in this respect.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, despite their many disagreements, supporters of both the pro-life and pro-choice positions on abortion have been able to agree on one fundamental point: American taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize abortions. This is a consensus view of long standing.

Back in 1976, Congress first passed what has come to be called the Hyde amendment. First introduced by Congressman HENRY HYDE of Illinois, this amendment prevents the use of Federal funds to pay for abortions. Specifically, the Hyde amendment prevents Federal Medicaid reimbursement for abortion procedures, with certain exceptions. This provision has proven effective without being excessively onerous.

Now, however, the nature of health care services is changing. Traditional fee-for-service Medicaid programs in many cases are giving way to managed care. Indeed, according to the Health Care Financing Administration [HCFA], 40 percent of Medicaid recipients were served by managed care plans in 1996.

This surge in managed care requires that we alter the Hyde amendment language to ensure that taxpayer dollars will continue to be protected from use in abortion procedures. This is necessary, Mr. President, because, under managed care delivery, Federal funds are used to help pay premiums for complete benefits packages instead of reimbursing for specific procedures.

I would like to thank Senator ASHCROFT for offering an amendment that would close this loophole. This updated language specifies that States may not use Federal funds to purchase, in whole or in part, health care packages that include abortion coverage. States should be able to use their own separate funds to purchase additional abortion coverage.

Mr. President, this language represents no departure from our existing policies. Rather, it is a measured attempt to maintain current policies, regarding the use of Federal funds for abortion, in the face of changing circumstance. Similar language to that being proposed has been used already, in the Assisted Suicide Funding Restrictions Act, and in the Fiscal Year 1998 Budget Reconciliation Act.

This language is the product of a compromise reached by Congressman HYDE and pro-choice Congresswoman NITA LOWEY. It should, in my view, be noncontroversial.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, Senator HARKIN and I are now looking for business. A solicitation, I believe, is appropriate under these circumstances. As we had announced yesterday and today, it is our hope we will finish this

bill today. We ask that any Senator who intends to offer an amendment to let us know by noon today.

There may be one amendment which we cannot complete today. That involves the limitation of funding on testing proposed by the administration. As I had said earlier, Congressman GOODLING has stated publicly his intention to offer such an amendment on the House appropriations bill. It had been suggested that a similar amendment be offered on this bill.

Secretary of Education Riley contacted Senator HARKIN and I, and others, yesterday on this subject. Senator HARKIN and I, in collaboration with our committee chairman, Senator STEVENS, have scheduled a hearing tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock. So if that vote is to occur on the bill, it would occur after we have been informed on some of the specifics of the administration's proposal.

So we are now looking for amendments.

In the absence of any Senator seeking recognition, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. 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. THOMAS. I will talk for just a few minutes on the bill before the Senate. Of course, we are talking about the Labor, HHS, Education bill, one of the largest bills before the Senate. As a matter of fact, a total of about $270 billion of expenditure. Only about $80 billion of that are we really discussing because that is discretionary. The rest are entitlements.

However, I do think it is illustrative of one of the things I feel very strongly about, and that is the opportunity to have oversight on the expenditure of large amounts of tax money, or small amounts for that matter.

I want to make it clear that I will support this bill. I think the appropriations folks have worked hard on it. I have no particular quarrel with what they have done, but I want to make a point that it seems to me this system needs to be reviewed. The system needs to be changed. I cannot think of another institution in the civilized world that spends $270 billion annually and has no more oversight than we do in the U.S. Congress. We have a remedy for that. We think we ought to go to a biannual budget so that we would do this on a 2-year basis, which has some advantages. It allows the agencies to know what their funds will be for a longer period of time. But more importantly, in this instance it allows the Congress to have some oversight of the efficiency of the spending of these dollars.

For example, Mr. President, we are talking here about drug abuse prevention and treatment programs, $2.8 billion. I am for that. We certainly need drug abuse prevention and treatment programs. But how are they working? Is the $2.7 billion giving us the kind of results we hoped it would? I do not think we know that. Now, certainly there is some oversight.

We are also talking about Head Start, $4.3 billion for Head Start. I am a fan of Head Start. I think it is a program that brings young people, in their early formative ages, into a position of having some hope, to help form their lives. Is it doing the job? Are we spending the money as efficiently as we might? Are the dollars going to the people that really need the help? I do not know that. I do not know that.

Job Corps; I am not a particular fan of Job Corps. Nevertheless, we are spending $1.3 billion on Job Corps. What are the results? What are we doing? Who is being helped? Is the help getting there? What is the administrative cost and the overhead?

It seems to me those are things that we ought to be as interested in as we are in providing funding for the programs, and I think taxpayers are entitled to have that kind of oversight.

Individuals for Disabilities Education, IDEA. I am very, very impressed with that. My wife is a special ed teacher. I was chairman of the Disabilities Council in Wyoming. There is nothing more important. But the question is, are we spending the money as well as we might? I find some administrators in schools who say, ''Look, we have to change this or we will never be able to afford the kinds of services for the handicapped because we are always in court,'' and we do everything to avoid courts.

If that is the case, it seems to me we ought to take a long look at what is happening to the bucks. Who are they going to? Are they as efficient as they possibly could be? Are the regulatory constraints something that disallow the efficient spending of this money?

With respect to the Government Performance and Results Act, which I also support and think may have some merit, this is to improve the management of Federal agencies, to require emphasis on planning, hopefully on results. Planning, I hope has in it measurable activities so we can see if we are making progress. Here is what the committee says: ''We were encouraged the Federal agencies are making an effort to fulfill their requirements.'' Frankly, Mr. President, that is not good enough—we are hopeful they are making an effort to fulfill the requirements. Give me a break. We are spending $280 billion, $70 billion on the things we are talking about here in discretionary spending.

Let me make it clear one more time that I am not opposed to these ideas. These are programs we need to have but we also need to have oversight. We need to make as sure as we can, as the U.S. Congress, that those dollars are producing the best results that we possibly can.

I hope we will take a long look—I think we should—at the idea of biannual budgeting, and give us an opportunity to have oversight. The authorizing committee should, in fact, have the opportunity to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Would the distinguished Senator from Wyoming have the goodness to remain on the floor for a moment—I know he has a party conference to go to—just to allow me to congratulate him on his remarks.

Two of the programs he mentioned, the Job Corps and Head Start, it happens I was a member of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. I was an Assistant Secretary of Labor and was on the group that put together the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964 which led to Head Start and to the Job Corps. These are not new initiatives. They go back now a third of a century. I didn't mean to think of myself as that ancient already.

It is the case, sir, that we have had very little evaluation, very little longitudinal evaluation, where we follow things over time—persons who entered the Job Corps in the 1960's will now be getting into their own fifties—and what has been the result cumulative, one way or the other. This is not something very attractive to governments that live on 2-year cycles, 4-year cycles and, at most, 6-year cycles, yet if we want to do something about these matters we ought to attend them in exactly the mode the Senator spoke of. This can be done.

The mathematics, if you like, of evaluation have been very much in place since the Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorized the Coleman study. It was called an equality of educational opportunity in which we learned great things which surprised us. We thought we knew all about education in those days and we found out we knew very little. I am not sure we have learned much since.

I take the opportunity to thank the Senator from Wyoming for what he has said, and I hope he will stay with the issue.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from New York. I suspect there is nobody in this body who has the kind of background institutional knowledge about these programs as the Senator. I appreciate your comments.

I yield the floor.

(The remarks of Mr. MOYNIHAN and Mr. D'AMATO pertaining to the introduction of S. 1144 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having long since arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:38 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the

Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. GREGG].

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is amendment 1056, offered by Senator KYL of Arizona.

The Senator from Maine.

AMENDMENT NO. 1056

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the Kyl amendment to the fiscal 1998 Labor, Health and Education appropriations bill, which would devastate an already underfunded Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. Although I am a strong supporter of the Pell Grant Program, which provides critical assistance and access for needy students, I cannot support the Kyl amendment, knowing that it will reduce the low-income fuel assistance limited funding.

I regret the Senator from Arizona has offered this amendment to reduce the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program in order to provide an increase to the Pell Grant Program. I hope we can follow the House lead in this regard, by providing an increase in the Pell Grant Program but without affecting the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. The bottom line is LIHEAP provides invaluable assistance to low-income and elderly households in America that must not be sacrificed. Make no mistake about it, this means-tested program is specifically targeted to those who already are in desperate need of financial assistance. To be precise, according to the Department of Health and Human Services, more than two-thirds of the households receiving Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program assistance have annual incomes of less than $8,000 a year, and more than half have incomes below $6,000 a year.

While I believe that all programs must be asked to contribute their fair share in our efforts to balance the budget, it is worth noting that the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program has already taken more than its fair share of budget cuts in recent years. Overall, the funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program has fallen consistently and dramatically since 1985. In fiscal year 1985, the program received $2.1 billion. This year, it will receive $1 billion. In real terms, this represents a cut of more than 65 percent. Yet, despite this dramatic cut, the Senator from Arizona is proposing we further reduce this critically important but limited low-income assistance funding by an additional $528 million, or 53 percent of its already paltry budget.

Furthermore, we should not be proposing a cut to a program that is already woefully underfunded and serves only a minority of its eligible recipients. Because of past spending cuts, LIHEAP now provides benefits to only 20 percent of all eligible households. This means that 80 percent of America's households meet the income qualifications to receive benefits, but there is simply not enough money to provide assistance to them all. Needless to say, this proposed $528 million reduction represents a very real risk of keeping many low-income families from being able to heat their homes in the winters ahead, even as it eviscerates a program that has already contributed more than its fair share to deficit reduction.

It is also worth noting that even for those families that do receive Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program benefits, it is not a very high sum. In my home State of Maine, the average benefit last year was $308. In the midst of a severely cold winter, that $308 was the only way that 33,000 low-income and elderly Mainers were able to heat their homes. So, although a $528 million reduction may seem small in the overall budget of the U.S. Government, and $308 may not sound like much to many people, it means a great deal to the residents of my State who do not want to be forced this winter into the position of choosing between heat and food.

The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program has already taken more than its fair share of reductions since its inception back in 1981, and simply cannot afford any further reductions in this very critical program. Any additional cut in this already underfunded program represents a very serious risk to low-income and elderly households in my State of Maine and all the cold weather regions of this country that rely on this very important, essential program.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Kyl amendment and adopting the approach that has been taken by the House that provides for increased support for the Pell Grant Program but without reducing LIHEAP that is so critical to many people in my State and so many other States who are located in cold weather areas of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like to begin by thanking Senator SPECTER and the members of the Labor, Education, HHS appropriations subcommittee for bringing this bill to the floor.

This bill contains a much needed funding increase for the National Institutes of Health. Earlier this year I joined with 97 of my colleagues in this Senate body in voting for a sense-of-the-Senate amendment calling for a doubling of NIH funding over the next 5 years. The bill that we have in front of us today represents a substantial step forward. It increases funding for NIH from $12.7 to $13.69 billion. This funding, simply, Mr. President, will save lives.

There are two measures in this bill that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, and that I believe deserve special mention. Earlier this year I introduced, along with Senator KENNEDY and Senator BOND, a bill which would establish a pediatric research initiative within the Office of the Director of NIH. Senator KENNEDY and I and Senator BOND, along with many sponsors of that bill, have worked hard to develop a proposal that we feel helps place appropriate emphasis on pediatric research while at the same time supporting the scientific judgment so important to the success of NIH.

The value of this initiative really is without question. Research breakthroughs to treat pediatric illnesses have been enormously effective both in reducing costs and, more important, in freeing young children from a lifetime of illness and disability. From vaccines to treat polio to surfactant replacement to prevent respiratory distress syndrome, research has saved hundreds of millions of dollars and improved the lives of millions of children.

Recently, the Public Health and Safety Subcommittee of the Labor and Human Resources Committee held a hearing on NIH reauthorization. During the hearing, a distinguished panel of pediatric researchers from NIH and also from the private sector described some of the enormous opportunities that now exist for scientific progress in combating and in preventing diseases affecting children. Their testimony dramatically underscored the critical need for additional emphasis and increased support for pediatric research.

Last year, the Labor, Education, and HHS appropriations subcommittee, chaired by Senator SPECTER, allocated $5 million as an initial downpayment toward the pediatric research initiative. This year the appropriations subcommittee has allocated $20 million toward this initiative. I personally thank Chairman SPECTER and the members of his subcommittee for their continued commitment to pediatric research. By recognizing the critical need to encourage and promote pediatric research, the committee has really helped ensure the next generation of Americans grows up to be healthy, productive members of our society.

Mr. President, the second provision I would like to talk about in this bill is the funding for substance abuse and mental health services. Without the provision contained in this bill, some States would have faced massive cuts in the funding for their programs to help people with substance abuse and/or mental health problems. My own State of Ohio would have faced a devastating funding cut of more than 20 percent, our neighboring State to the north, Michigan, would have received a cut of 19 percent, and other States would have also been seriously hurt. Among the important programs threatened by these cuts would have been the

agencies promoting early intervention with young people to help them find alternatives to getting involved with drugs and crime. I have long believed that the problem of at-risk youth in this country is one for which an ounce of prevention truly is worth a pound of cure. The sooner we can reach these young people, the better off we will be in our efforts to help them avoid the tragedy of lifetime addiction.

The SAMHSA provision contained in this bill averts the awful consequences of the proposed funding cuts. It is a good measure and deserves strong support of the entire U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

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. SPECTER. 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. SPECTER. Mr. President, starting yesterday morning at 11 o'clock, in conjunction with scheduling from the majority leader, Senator LOTT, and the ranking member on this subcommittee, Senator HARKIN, we asked that amendments be brought with the hope of concluding action on this bill today, and that all amendments be submitted, first, by the end of business yesterday or no later than noon today. We have not had a great deal of business.

The one exception would be an amendment which would deal with prohibiting Federal funding for testing, which the administration has in mind. Congressman GOODLING had announced his intention to seek that kind of prohibition in the House.

There had been comments yesterday that someone would offer that kind of legislation on the Senate side. The distinguished presiding officer, Senator JUDD GREGG, said, with a pointed finger, it was he. I don't want to name names here, but I am prepared to identify those who are willing to be identified.

I received a telephone call from the Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, yesterday afternoon, as did Senator HARKIN and others. It seems to me that might be one matter we might put over until tomorrow and schedule the hearing at 9 o'clock to find the specifics as to whether that ought to be done. There is a sense that testing, in general, would be a good idea, but maybe it ought not to be done by the Federal Government. There is a great deal of concern about having the Federal Government move into the field of education. So we are going to move ahead at that time.

Mr. President, I intend to offer an amendment later this afternoon calling for a sense of the Senate for the appointment of independent counsel. Although that is obviously not germane to an appropriations bill on Labor, Health, Human Services and Education, it is a practice in the Senate, with some repetition, to offer extraneous amendments, certainly sense-of-the-Senate resolutions.

I had stated my intention to deal with this issue last July 24 and spoke extensively on the Senate floor on the appropriations bill pending at that time about my concern that independent counsel ought to be appointed based on the state of the record. Then when it was apparent that would tie up that bill, and the majority leader and the minority leader both wanted to move ahead, I said on July 25 that I would not pursue this sense-of-the-Senate resolution at that time and waited an additional month.

I do believe that we urgently need appointment of independent counsel at the present time. I base that judgment on a series of letters which have been written by a variety of Members of Congress to the Attorney General, and she has declined to do so—a formal letter written by the majority members of the Judiciary Committee calling on the Attorney General to appoint independent counsel, and she has declined to do so.

Then we had extensive hearings last April 30 on the Judiciary Committee where I questioned Attorney General Reno about the withholding of information from the President on national security matters, which appear to me to be a highly questionable thing to do, and that the President was publicly quoted saying that those national security matters had been withheld from him and he thought he should have been given access to those matters.

In our constitutional Government it is my judgment that the rule is plain, that those are matters for the President as long as he is the President. There are ways to alter his status as President, but as long as he is the President, it is not up to an appointed Attorney General to make the decision that the President does not get national security information because, as the Attorney General testified, he was a potential suspect in a pending investigation. The damage about such a disclosure to a potential subject, in my view, is far, far less dangerous than having national security information withheld from the President of the United States.

But it did seem to me that in that context that if the matter was serious enough to withhold information from the President, that certainly the independent counsel statute ought to be triggered. That is the statute which provides for an independent lawyer to come in and handle the case where it involves certain levels of Federal Government enumerated officials such as the President and the Vice President and Cabinet officers, especially in the context where Attorney General Reno testified in her confirmation hearings about her view of the importance of independent counsel.

There is also the question about the advertisements. According to Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, and also Dick Morris, the President's political adviser, advertisements had been edited, drafted, essentially written by the President himself. There would be no question that there would be coordination in violation of the Federal statute prohibiting coordination if those in fact were advocacy commercials. We went through the commercials with the Attorney General. This was done on both sides. But the ones that were edited by the President extolled the President's virtues and decried his opponent's alleged failings, but fell short of saying vote for x or vote against y. By any reasonable standard, those were advocacy commercials, but they were viewed as being instead issue commercials and did not constitute a violation of the statute which prohibits coordination.

Well, that plus a great many other factors, I think, have set the stage for the need for independent counsel. We have had disclosures in this morning's Washington Post about funds being raised by the Vice President which were hard money and not soft money. The Attorney General had previously said that if it is soft money it is not a contribution under the Federal election laws, a judgment or interpretation which is inexplicable, in my opinion. It is a contribution nonetheless.

Hundreds of millions of dollars were put into the campaigns on both sides, Democrats and Republicans. But now there has been the forceful allegation made, information that a good bit of the money raised by the Vice President was hard money, and that would take away the last vestige as to what Attorney General Reno had said justified her refusal to appoint independent counsel.

So it is my intention, Mr. President, to call for a vote on this amendment that I send to the desk at this time so that it may be filed and reviewed by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Later this afternoon I do intend to offer it, and in fact had thought I would offer it when I sought recognition. But I see my colleague, Senator DORGAN, has come to the floor. I understand he intends to offer an amendment of his own. So I will defer offering this amendment at this time, but I will speak about it to this extent, to put my colleagues on notice that this issue will be on the floor at the conclusion of the Dorgan amendment.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor so my colleague, Senator DORGAN, may proceed.

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. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1068

(Purpose: To increase the funding for heart and stroke research by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health, with an offset relating to funding for the buildings and facilities of the National Institutes of Health)

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I rise to offer an amendment.

I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment will be laid aside. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], proposes an amendment numbered 1068.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 30, line 21, strike ''$1,531,898,000.'' and insert ''$1,539,898,000''.

On page 35, line 22, strike ''$211,500,000'' and insert ''$203,500,000''.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Jeff Hoffman of my staff.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I appreciate the Senator from Pennsylvania allowing me to offer this amendment at this time. I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Iowa for their work on this legislation. I am going to talk just a bit about my amendment. Before I do, however, let me commend both Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN for the work they have done on this piece of legislation.

My amendment specifically deals with funding for the National Institutes of Health National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute and specifically an interest I have in trying to provide additional resources for NHLBI to be used to provide funding vitally needed for cardiovascular disease research.

I am proposing $8 million be added to the Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute that I hope would be used for that purpose. The offset is from a corresponding reduction in the NIH buildings and facilities account. I believe that both the chairman and the ranking member, at the conclusion of my comments, will accept this amendment and for that I am grateful.

It is undoubtedly true, as people watch the proceedings of the U.S. Senate, that many of us come to the floor of the Senate to talk about legislation that we think is necessary based on our personal experiences and observations. That has certainly been true with respect to a couple of issues I have worked on, including cardiovascular disease research.

Madam President, I have a very personal interest in this, as others do. I have lost a daughter to heart disease. I have another daughter who has a heart defect that we hope, God willing, will not need surgery in the future. But I have spent enough time in cardiologists' offices and I have spent enough time talking about cardiovascular disease to understand that we must continue to substantially increase funding for research on cardiovascular disease.

I have been involved, along with Senator FRIST, as a Senate cochair of the Congressional Heart and Stroke Coalition to try to provide additional attention to the issue of heart disease and stroke and the need for greater research into these diseases.

Many Americans are unaware of the extent and scope of heart disease and stroke, even though virtually all of us has a friend or loved one who has been affected by cardiovascular disease, so I would like to share some startling facts.

Heart disease has been this country's No. 1 killer since 1919 for both men and women.

Stroke continues to be the No. 3 killer in this country and the leading cause of disability in America.

One in five Americans, more than 57 million people, suffer from one or more types of cardiovascular disease, including close to 14 million living with symptomatic coronary heart disease.

One in two women will eventually die of heart disease or stroke.

About one-sixth of cardiovascular disease deaths are among people under the age of 65.

In 1979 there were 1.2 million cardiovascular operations and procedures performed in this country. That number climbed to 4.65 million in 1994, close to a fourfold increase.

The number of Americans suffering from congestive heart failure has grown to about 5 million, with hospital discharges rising from 377,000 in 1979 to 874,000 in 1994.

More Americans die from heart attack and stroke each year than from AIDS, cancer, and diabetes combined. Let me repeat that because I think it is important. More Americans die from heart attack and stroke each year than from AIDS, cancer, and diabetes combined.

I do not come to the floor of the Senate to in any way suggest that we ought to enhance research funding on one disease at the expense of critically needed research funding for others. I have supported substantial research for AIDS, supported efforts to improve research and treatment of diabetes and cancer. In fact, I have supported a substantial increase in funding for the National Institutes of Health and I voted earlier this year to double funding for the National Institutes of Health over the next five years. I think this would be a wonderful investment for our country.

I have become increasingly concerned, however, with what has been happening with respect to the amount of money spent on heart disease research. Even with the significant increases that Congress has been giving the National Institutes of Health over the past decade, funding for heart disease research specifically has simply not kept pace. In fact, heart disease research at the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute has decreased by 4.8 percent in constant dollars over the last decade, while the NIH overall budget has increased by 31 percent in constant dollars.

A step toward rectifying this concern was taken this year. For that I commend Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN. They have provided in this bill a $99.4 million increase for the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, the third largest dollar increase among the NIH institutes. But even with this increase, if we look beyond the surface, we can see that, without my amendment, the funding for cardiovascular disease research would continue to decrease relative to the overall budget.

The $8 million that my amendment would add would bring the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute budget up to the same 7.5-percent level of increase as the overall budget at the National Institutes of Health. It is my hope that this funding would be devoted to cardiovascular disease research.

It is interesting to visit the Bethesda campus of the National Institutes of Health. I encourage my colleagues to do so. There are wonderful men and women working there doing remarkable, breathtaking research on a wide range of issues. I have talked to physicians doing research in the area of cardiovascular disease and what they are doing is remarkable. It has already saved lives and can save even more lives with additional resources.

We now routinely see people with advanced heart disease with symptoms that in previous decades would have caused death. Today, these patients are able to undergo procedures and operations that allow them to continue to lead productive, active lives. These advances are the wonderful result of an investment in research. We can do much, much more.

I said I don't want to decrease research funding for other diseases. In fact, I would like to substantially increase the amount of funding for the NIH generally, far above its current level, because I think the rewards for the people in our country and around the world would be substantial.

It should be noted, however, that heart disease and stroke receive one-twentieth of the research funding per death of AIDS, cancer, and diabetes combined. Now if you divide the amount spent on research into the number of people who are dying from various diseases, it is clear that the amount of research funding invested in cardiovascular disease is not keeping pace. That is why I offer this amendment.

This amendment has the strong support of the American Heart Association, the Association of Black Cardiologists, Mended Hearts, Inc., and the

National Coalition for Heart and Stroke Research. I ask unanimous consent that letters from these organizations in support of my amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, August 29, 1997.

Hon. BYRON DORGAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DORGAN: On behalf of the 57.5 million Americans suffering from heart attack, stroke and other cardiovascular diseases, the American Heart Association strongly supports your amendment to the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriation bill. The AHA commends your leadership and initiative in offering an amendment to increase the funding pool for the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) by $8 million, targeted specifically for additional heart and stroke-related research. Cardiovascular diseases, America's No. 1 killer and a leading cause of disability, suffer from disproportionately low research funding.

As various indicators show, there has been a dramatic increase in the prevalence of heart disease and stroke, with an unparalleled cost to our society that threatens our future. More than 1 in 5 Americans of all ages suffer from heart attack, stroke and other cardiovascular diseases. These diseases consume about 1 of 6 health care dollars, with a price tag of an estimated $259 billion in medical expenses and lost productivity in 1997. Heart diseases and stroke represent 4 of the top 5 hospital costs to the health care system for all payers, excluding childbirth and its complications, and 4 of the top 5 Medicare hospital costs.

In constant dollars from FY 1986 to FY 1996 funding for the NHLBI extramural Heart Program decreased 5.5 percent. In a recent nationwide survey 79 percent and 77 percent of respondents support more federal funding for heart and stroke research, respectively.

Our government's response to the heart disease and stroke problem today will help define the health and well being of Americans in the next century. Now is the time to capitalize on progress in understanding cardiovascular diseases when breakthroughs are on the horizon. Promising research opportunities will result in better treatment, prevention and even cures for heart attack, stroke and other cardiovascular diseases. A significant increase in research funding will reduce premature death, improve quality of life, cut health care costs and enhance America's scientific competitiveness.

Thank you for your consistent leadership in the battle against heart attack, stroke and other cardiovascular diseases.

Sincerely,

MARTHA HILL, Ph.D., R.N.,
President.

ASSOCIATION OF BLACK CARDIOLOGISTS, INC.,
Atlanta, GA, September 2, 1997.

Hon. BYRON DORGAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR DORGAN: The Association of Black Cardiologists (ABC), is pleased that you have offered amendment S. 1061, the FY 1998 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill to increase resources for the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLB) by $8 million, targeted specifically for additional heart and stroke-related research. The Association of Black Cardiologists (ABC), enthusiastically supports your amendment. Our 600 plus members vigorously support this amendment, and believe it is vital to the health of our constituents.

Despite progress, heart attack, stroke and other cardiovascular diseases remain the leading cause of death in the United States and a main cause of disability. Over 57 million Americans . . . more than 1 in 5, are afflicted by one or more cardiovascular diseases. It is even severe contact more in African Americans. Heart attack, stroke and other cardiovascular diseases will cost this nation an estimated $259 billion in medical expenses and loss of work place productivity in 1997.

An increase in research funding for NHLB heart and stroke-related research is critical to reduce premature death, improve quality of life, cut health care costs and enhance America's economic competitiveness. An overwhelming number of respondents in a recent nationwide survey supports more federal funding of heart and stroke research, 79% and 77% respectively. However, in FY 1986 constant dollars, funding for the NHLBI Heart Program decreased 5.5% from FY 1986 to FY 1996.

Promising scientific opportunities in the battle against cardiovascular diseases could be realized with more resources for research. This is the time to capitalize on the progress in understanding cardiovascular diseases.

The Association of Black Cardiologists applauds your leadership in the fight against these killer diseases and commends your initiative in offering this amendment.

Sincerely,

B. WAINE KONG, Ph.D., M.D.,
Chief Operating Officer.

THE MENDED HEARTS, INC.,
Dallas, TX, September 2, 1997.

Hon. BYRON DORGAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DORGAN: Mended Hearts is a national voluntary organization of people who have heart disease, their spouses, family members, caregivers and medical professionals. Mended Hearts actively supports your floor amendment to the FY 1998 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies Appropriation bill that increases the funding pool for the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) by $8 million, targeted specifically for additional heart and stroke-related research.

About 20 million Americans of all ages live with the ramifications of heart disease. Of this group, nearly 13.7 million, including about 7 million under age 60, live with the effects of heart attack and about 5 million suffer from congestive heart failure, the leading cause of hospitalization for Americans age 65 and older. Heart defects are the most common birth defect, the major cause of birth defects-related infant deaths and a considerable cause of childhood disability.

The prevalence of heart disease is rising rapidly, with a tremendous economic toll on the economy of the United States. For example, in 1994 there were 4.7 million cardiovascular operations and procedures, compared to 1.2 million in 1979—a fourfold increase.

It is estimated that heart attack, stroke and other cardiovascular diseases will cost this nation $259 billion in medical expenses and lost output in 1997. Despite the seriousness and overwhelming costs of these diseases, in constant dollars from FY 1986 to FY 1996 funding for the NHLBI Heart Program decreased 5.5 percent.

On behalf of the 24,000 members of Mended Hearts in 220 chapters nationwide, I commend your championship and leadership in the battle against heart disease. Your amendment will have a far reaching impact on the main cause of death in the United States—heart disease. Promising research opportunities for innovative cost-effective approaches to the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of heart disease can be developed with these needed resources.

Thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

CHARLES CHRISTMAS,
National President.

NATIONAL COALITION FOR HEART AND STROKE RESEARCH,
Washington, DC, September 2, 1997.

Hon. BYRON DORGAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR DORGAN: The National Coalition for Heart and Stroke Research, enthusiastically supports your amendment to S. 1061, the FY 1998 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriation bill to increase resources for the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) by $8 million, targeted specifically for additional heart and stroke-related research. Your amendment is critical to the health of all Americans.

About 57 million Americans—more than 1 in 5—are afflicted by one or more cardiovascular diseases. Heart attack, stroke and other cardiovascular diseases will cost this nation an estimated $259 billion in medical expenses and lost productivity in 197. These diseases place a heavy burden on America's health care system, absorbing about 1 of 6 health care dollars. Excluding childbirth and its complications, heart diseases and stroke make up 4 of the top 5 hospital costs for all players, and 4 of the top 5 Medicare hospital costs.

Despite progress, heart attack, stroke and other cardiovascular diseases remain the leading cause of death in the United States and a main cause of disability.

An increase in research funding for NHLBI heart and stroke-related-research is critical to reduce premature death, improve quality of life, cut health care costs and enhance America's economic competitiveness. Many Americans agree! An overwhelming number of respondents in a recent nationwide survey support more federal funding for heart and stroke research, 79 percent and 77 percent, respectively. However, in FY 1986 constant dollars, funding for the NHLBI extramural Heart Program decreased 5.5 percent from FY 1986 to FY 1996.

Promising scientific opportunities in the battle against cardiovascular diseases could be realized with more resources for research. This is the time to capitalize on progress in understanding cardiovascular diseases.

The National Coalition for Heart and Stroke Research applauds your leadership in the fight against these killer diseases and commends your initiative in offering this amendment.

Sincerely,

RENEE SMITH, *Representative.*

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, it is my hope that in some small way, with this small step, a researcher will now unlock one more mystery of how the human heart works.

I mentioned the wonderful discoveries that are made through research and the wonderful treatments that are provided in our hospitals in the area of cardiology, and yet there is so much we still do not know. Those of us who have waited through heart surgery with members of our family know that when you talk to the cardiovascular surgeons they will tell you that there are times when they simply don't know what has caused this or that condition.

It seems to me more and more research can unlock those mysteries and give us the opportunity to save more and more lives in this country that otherwise would be lost to this insidious enemy called heart disease.

With that, I thank very much the chairman and the ranking member and ask that my amendment be favorably considered. I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I thank my distinguished colleague from North Dakota for offering this amendment. I agree with him about the importance of additional funding for pulmonary research, for heart research. It is a major killer in the United States. We ought to be doing everything we can to investigate, find cures and implement them.

The amendment which has been offered carries an offset on administration and it has been modified from what the Senator from North Dakota had originally suggested, which would have been earmarking, which poses problems, because we do not earmark but instead leave that designation to the National Institutes of Health so we do not have excessive management or micromanagement by the Congress as to what the NIH funds must have. I think Senator DORGAN made a forceful statement that those funds ought to be directed in that way, and the officials at NIH will have that before them. I am confident they will make every effort they can to carry out the intent with which my colleague has expressed here.

We have vast sums of money at NIH. We are increasing it. It is $952 million now, and is up to $13.7 billion. Notwithstanding all that funding, there are many applications which are not granted. This one expresses what the Senator from North Dakota thinks ought to be done.

I am advised Senator HARKIN is off the floor now attending a committee meeting and necessarily absent, but I am advised by his staff that Senator HARKIN finds this amendment acceptable, as do I, as manager for the majority. We accept the amendment.

I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1068) was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GREGG. I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1070

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be set aside, and I send an amendment to the desk.

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

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] proposes an amendment numbered 1070.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . (a) PROHIBITION OF FUNDS FOR NATIONAL TESTING IN READING AND MATHEMATICS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to develop, plan, implement, or administer any national testing program in reading or mathematics.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the following:

(1) The National Assessment of Educational Progress carried out under sections 411 through 413 of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 9010–9012).

(2) The Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS).

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, as the excellent chairman of the labor subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee mentioned earlier, there is a pending issue which is of considerable significance which has arisen in the last few weeks as a result of the question of how we are going to pursue national testing. The chairman of the committee has mentioned he would hope this issue, from the standpoint of an amendment to the bill, would be taken up for final vote tomorrow sometime. I am certainly agreeable to that.

However, it had been my intention, along with Senator COATS, to offer an amendment today on this issue, and in talking it over with the chairman he suggested we offer the amendment and then hold the vote until tomorrow. That certainly is an approach which I am perfectly happy to follow.

This amendment, which is basically directed at codifying what we understand now to be the President's position—and we say ''now'' because the President's position on national testing appears to have undergone a transformation at some fairly high level of significance. It reflects that decision by the President to no longer push national testing as something that should be controlled and directed by the Department of Education but rather to have national testing to the extent it be developed by independent agencies. Using the term ''independent,'' I mean agencies which are independent of the Federal Government and which are not under the Federal Government or even under the Federal Government's control through the use of the appropriations process.

Why is this important? There are a large number of us involved in the issue of reforming education who feel very strongly that national testing makes sense, but to have it controlled by, designed by or in any way managed by the Department of Education here in Washington does not make sense. That would be a fundamental flaw.

We are encouraged, and we think it is appropriate that the President appears to have come to this conclusion himself over the weekend. Although his initial reaction was to have the Department of Education run this type of a national testing program, his decision now is to move it to the private sector and allow the private sector and the private nonprofits to develop the proper testing standards.

Why is this important? Because the issue of national testing is important at a variety of different levels. In a positive way it is important because it will give communities an opportunity to compare how their students are doing with other students, to compare how their schools are doing with other schools, compare how their educators are doing with other educators across the country. That is very significant.

It is not unique, national testing. We have in this country one of the most expansive national testing programs probably anywhere in the world called the SAT test. It comes at the end of the school system, the end of the educational experience, at least as far as elementary and secondary schools are concerned, and juniors and seniors and sometimes sophomores, students in their high school years, will take tests. They have the SAT, the SAT 2, they have achievements, they have advanced placement tests, a whole series of tests which they take, quite a battery of tests. Anybody who has a child going through the SAT experience understands its intensity and recognizes this is one heck of a testing system which we have which is nationally driven which is, in fact, nationally directed, which is, in fact, nationally developed, and which is, in fact, a heck of a good system. I think the reason it worked so well is it has been energized and directed by the private sector of our country, not by the Federal Government.

The downside of national testing is that if it is done by the Federal Government, at the direction of the Federal Government, under the control of the Federal Government or funded by the Federal Government, you are stepping, in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of many of us who view education as a critical asset of the community, of the State, of people at the lowest level of government who have the right to control how their children's lives are determined in their school systems rather than having it be controlled from Washington, those of us who view that education should be directed locally and not nationally, you are stepping on the slippery slope of once again the issue of national control over curriculum, national control over contents, national control over teachers' standards in the educational system because a federally designed, federally paid for, federally controlled national educational testing system would be, in my opinion and I think the opinion of many people who view this issue and who have looked at it for a while as I have, as being one of the first steps toward a nationally directed curriculum, a nationally directed content in education, and a nationally directed standard for our teachers.

That is something that I would most vehemently object to and have objected to, and in fact when we went through Goals 2000, raising the issue of national curriculum was the core question. We amended that law dramatically from its initial structure so that it would not end up as a national curriculum exercise.

Now that we have pushed forward onto the playing field a national testing system, at something other than the end of your high school years, a national testing system which will probably be targeted on the third grade or the eighth grade or maybe both grades, to determine competency, especially in objective types of discipline such as mathematics and science, such a national testing system has to be entered into with some caution to be sure that we do not end up going down the wrong path, that we use it for the purposes for which it should be used, which is to give our local communities the capacity to evaluate how their local school systems are doing in educating their children—not use it with the capacity of taking away from our local communities the capacity to control their local school systems by taking away control over curriculum or taking away control over content.

So this amendment is basically directed at saying it is not appropriate for the Department of Education to be an aggressive participant, a funded participant in the designing of a national testing system. Rather, that should be left to the private or quasiprivate or nonprofit sector which presently does such a good job in areas such as SAT's.

The view, which was not the original view of the President and now is the view of the President, is something which we congratulate him on changing his position on and coming to a conclusion that is of that position and which we want to support by passing this amendment.

Senator COATS and I have put this amendment together. It tracks what was passed in the House, or what is being proposed in the House—I am not sure it has been passed yet—by Representative GOODLING from Pennsylvania, chairman of the authorizing committee which deals with education in the House.

I appreciate the courtesy of the chairman of the committee in allowing us to go forward with it and in his support in going forward with it. We are certainly sensitive to his desire to have the vote tomorrow if there is to be a formal vote, if it is not adopted by agreement, which I hope would be because it does reflect, we believe, the administration position.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I expect we will have a rather spirited debate about this amendment, and we should have. I think this is an interesting, timely, and important subject for the Senate at this point. My understanding is that there will be lengthy debate and a hearing in the Senate tomorrow morning, followed by a vote tomorrow on this subject.

This debate is not about developing some sort of enforced Federal standard. Rather, this is a very important question about this country's educational system and whether parents, no matter where they live, have an opportunity and the ability to measure how well their children are doing at two levels. Can they read at the fourth-grade level, and how do they read relative to other kids in this country, and can they achieve basic proficiency in mathematics at the eighth-grade level?

We have some significant choices to make in this country on the subject of education. No one that I know of suggests that we wrest the control of educating our kids in the elementary and secondary schools from the local school boards. No one. That is where we make decisions about how to educate our kids. But we do as a country have an obligation, I think, to begin asking the question: Should we not have some basic standard of measurement to find out what our children are achieving in our schools to be able to measure community to community, school to school, State to State? How are they doing? Are they able to read at the fourth grade level? Are they proficient in mathematics at the eighth grade level?

I want to read a couple of comments as we begin.

Jim Barksdale, the CEO and president of Netscape Communications, one of the new communications companies in our country, and L. John Doerr, a partner in the firm of Kleiner, Perkins, Caulfield & Byers, on behalf of 240 technology industry leaders in a bipartisan call for high national education standards in reading and math, say this:

> Every State should adopt high national standards, and by 1999, every State should test every fourth grader in reading and eighth grader in math to make sure these standards are met. President Clinton's national testing initiative offers a new opportunity to use widely accepted national benchmarks in reading and math against which States, school districts, and parents can judge student performance.

This national testing initiative is not about suggesting a national or Federal system by which anyone from up here can control someone down there.

The Senator from New Hampshire, I think, began by saying he was not opposed to developing some kind of national testing program. I think from that statement we ought to be able to find a way to develop a program of achievement standards. I am not wedded to the notion that it be here or there or with this money or that money. I am wedded to the notion that this country deserves to know what it is getting for the money it is spending for elementary and secondary education.

We spend a substantial amount of money sending our children to school. A substantial amount of money is spent sending our children into the classrooms of our country. The question is, what are we getting for that? What are we achieving? What kind of accomplishments exist at the fourth grade level? Are our fourth graders able to read? In which schools? In which States? And if not, why not? Before one can embark on a plan to improve education, you must first know where you are. And we don't have a basic approach by which we can measure achievement.

You get to 17 or 18 years of age, and guess what? You want to go to college. You are going to show up someplace, and you are going to have to take a test. That test is going to measure what you have achieved, what you know, what you have studied, and what you have retained from that. So when you get to be 17 or 18 and begin to take the college entrance tests, then at that point somebody is going to measure what you have been given, what you have learned, and what you are prepared to do. But by that point, we have spent a substantial amount of money.

Why don't we decide, as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and literally hundreds of other business leaders in this country have, that we ought to get more for our education system by measuring whether our students, student to student and school to school and State to State, are reaching certain levels of achievement?

I am a parent. I have two little children sitting this afternoon in a public school classroom. They are the most wonderful kids in the world. I assume that every father would say that about their children. I want those children to have the best possible education that our school system can give them. But I, as one parent, believe that it is important for us to measure as we go along what our children have learned from that school system.

Things have changed. This is not 40 years ago when we as a country could tie one hand behind our back and beat anybody else in the world at almost anything, and do it easily. We now face shrewd, tough international competition in every direction that we look. We now face competition, yes, in the job market, yes, in our economies, in our schools, and we face competition with countries who send their kids to school 240 days a year. We send our kids to school 180 days a year.

You have seen and I have seen some of the comparisons of students in the United States with students from Japan, students from Korea, students from Jordan, and students from around the world.

What the business leaders in this country, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, technology industry leaders, and others, including education leaders, are saying, is let us find a way by which we establish a measurement of achievement, by which we aspire to a goal that says that by the fourth grade children ought to be able to read competently, and let's measure to make

sure that our school system makes that happen so that by the eighth grade they have certain proficiency in math. That is what this is about.

From the discussion I just heard—I expect there will be a lot of it today—the issue is, should there be a Federal mandate by a Federal agency that federally enforces some Federal test? No, of course not. No one has proposed that. I would not support that.

If you say, however, that with the money we spend for education, we ought to measure the output as taxpayers, and as parents we ought to find out what are we getting, if you say that ought to be the goal—it is my goal, I expect it is probably your goal—then let's find a way to do that. Parents have a right to know whether their kids have mastered the basics in education, no matter what State they live in, no matter what city or school district they live in.

Those in this country who are concerned about our education system know that we must make some improvements. How do we make improvements? You create a blueprint, a plan, or a design for how you fix what is wrong. But before you can do that, you must assess what you have. What are the achievement levels? What are you getting for what you are now spending? That is what this is about.

I think that the debate—I guess I shouldn't prejudge; I will listen to it—will not be so much about whether it is useful for parents to learn how their kids or how their schools stack up against other kids or other schools in other cities or in other States. I think the debate will not be about that because I would expect most parents and taxpayers would want that kind of information.

Incidentally, this effort to develop tests to measure achievement is all voluntary. There is nothing here that is mandatory. Any school can opt out. Any student can opt out. Any State can opt out.

If there is heartburn over the question of who develops these benchmarks, let us find agreement on some independent entity that would establish appropriate goals for ourselves and for our children.

Occasionally, I—as I am sure everybody in the Senate does—get on a radio call-in show. Inevitably, someone will call in and say, ''This is some one-world international conspiracy. This is the Federal Government wanting to run the local school system.'' You have heard all of the debate about all of these issues. In fact, going back, that became the argument that was used to say, ''Let's get rid of the Department of Education at the Federal level.'' We do not hear much about that anymore. I don't expect we will see an amendment about that, although there may be Members in the Chamber who believe that we should offer that amendment and have that debate.

Does education reach a level of national importance sufficiently so that we have a Department of Education? I think so. Most of the American people think so. But we have had in the not-too-distant past those who say, ''Let's abolish the Department of Education. What on Earth should we be doing thinking nationally about education?'' Well, the American people know what we should be doing nationally about education. It is not running the school systems—not at all. What we should be doing nationally is worrying about whether we as a country are able to measure achievement—basic achievement in a range of areas, especially reading and mathematics, sufficient so that our students are prepared to be everything they can possibly be. Achievement that allows them to contribute not only to themselves but to this country, and to help us compete internationally. That is what all of this is about.

We are faced with tougher and tougher tests as a country. We are faced with a changing world economy and global markets. Companies these days are not national companies. They are international conglomerates. They want to produce where it is cheaper to produce. They want to go wherever they can find the skilled labor at the least cost, and so on. So it is tougher competitively for us than it was before. That is why our education system is so much more important now than it was. That is why it is so important that the education system work well. It is important that we as parents have information with which to measure what we are getting from this education system.

So let me, so that no one misinterprets what I have just said, say it again. I think parents and taxpayers have every reason to believe that we ought to be able to measure what we are getting from our education system student to student, school to school, school district to school district, or State to State. We ought to be able to measure that. The first standard ought not be when you reach 18 decide to take a test to go to college. But the development of achievement standards ought not be confused with some of the discussion about a Federal agency developing a federally enforced standard that they will use to mandate Federal policy for local education. That is totally hogwash. That is not what this effort is about.

I will be interested in listening to the later debate because my hope is that through this discussion perhaps we can find common ground to say, Yes, let's aspire to some achievement levels that we can measure across this country in order to better prepare our children for the future. If you measure achievement levels, you know how your children are doing relevant to other children; you know how your schools are doing; you know how your teachers are doing. If we aspire to do that and have the tools that give parents the ability to better manage the school, to better help their children, then we will be better off as a country. If that is a goal—and I hope it is—then we should be able to find a way to cooperate in reaching that goal through the development of some kind of entity that does not impose the specter of Federal control over local schools, because that is not the desire at all.

The proposal originally by the President was a proposal for a voluntary system in which any State, any school, or any student can opt out. But even if that causes heartburn because it has the specter of a Federal entity creating the tests, then let us find a method by which we create that same kind of measurement and give parents the same kind of opportunity without inciting the fear that some would ascribe to it as representing a Federal initiative. We can do that. I think we can do that. But we cannot do that if we stand up and mischaracterize the initiative in the first place. This is not about Federal control and a federally enforced test and Federal usurpation of local prerogatives with respect to education.

Having given that initial discussion, I will anxiously listen to the debate by two of the Members for whom I have the greatest respect. I think both are bright and interesting people who have contributed a great deal to this Senate, and while we might disagree on this, the purpose of my standing up is that my hope is perhaps we can find an area of agreement. Both of my colleagues are parents. I think they probably want the same output here that I want from this system, the best possible education our schools can give our children and along the way as parents the best opportunity to measure how our kids are doing and how our schools are doing. If we have those opportunities, we will improve not only our children's future but the future of this country.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1071 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1070

(Purpose: To prohibit the development, planning, implementation, or administration of any national testing program in reading or mathematics unless the program is specifically authorized by Federal statute)

Mr. COATS. Madam President, let me first say I very much appreciate the efforts of the Senator from New Hampshire in addressing this issue. I think it is an important issue and one which goes to a topic which deserves and needs a great deal of discussion and debate.

Clearly, our public education system in this country has many cracks in the once solidly supported and, I think, respected position that it once had. We have many failing public schools, not just in our major cities, but across our land. The goal that we share, whether you are Republican, Democrat, liberal or conservative, is that we want to improve education in this country and we want to address some of the shortcomings that we find in education.

The Senator from North Dakota raised a point which in many instances I think I do not disagree with. We do want to find ways of assessing where we are educationally, and giving parents a better idea of where their schools are in terms of preparing their children for a successful future.

The proposal to look at reading levels of achievement at the end of the third grade in reading and in eighth grade in math is not necessarily a goal that we should not attempt to reach. The concern that was raised by the Senator from New Hampshire is that if we address this in a way in which the Department of Education controls and designs the way this will be tested and then potentially uses this to establish standards, we continue a process of Federal Government knows best in terms of how to fix the education system in this country.

Frankly, the positive changes that are being brought about in the education of the young people in this country are not coming from Washington. They are coming from local and State initiatives. We do not want to do anything that deters that. In fact, we want to do everything we can to encourage that. I think it is safe to say if the initiatives that have been proposed and tried and are being tested and used in a number of our local educational jurisdictions and in a number of our States had to have the approval of the Federal Government, we would have gotten nowhere. We would not have charter schools in this country if the Department of Education had to approve it. We would not have had many of the experimental programs aimed at better addressing the situation of our at-risk children who are learning very little, or not at all, in many of our public schools, and particularly our public schools in urban areas across this country, because the national education unions have a lock on the public school process and a lock on the Department of Education.

I have been in the Chamber proposing a number of new initiatives, most in the form of demonstration programs which merely ask that we test a new idea to gauge its effectiveness. I do this so often because the only thing we know about the current system for sure is that it is failing many of our children. So why not try something new, why not experiment with some new ideas? And if it works, then decide how we want to encourage it. And if it does not work, throw it out and try something else. But what we have is a Department of Education locked into a no-change system because the teachers unions, not merely the teachers but the teachers unions, say don't touch it—no merit pay for teachers, no changes in the rules on tenure. They just fight every change that is proposed.

And so when the idea comes along of OK, let's set a testing standard so that we know where we stand, it looks good on its face—I think we all want that information; it can be useful to local jurisdictions and useful to States. But what we do not want is to get into the situation we got into with the national history standards whereby Federal bureaucrats and the organizations that currently control funding for public education basically say we will define what those standards ought to be, and we will set those standards and then we will measure the test against those standards.

We don't want to get into that trap again. We went through that not a short time ago, and those standards were soundly rejected because they were taking us in absolutely the wrong direction.

Now, I think that we can address the goals raised by the Senator from North Dakota, which I think Senator GREGG and I share in, of trying to find a way to provide local educational institutions and States with information about where students stand relative at least to reading and to math at fourth and eighth grade levels without falling into the problem that we would have if the administration were allowed to go forward with its original plan.

What the Senator from North Dakota apparently was not aware of was that the Department of Education has already begun developing tests, and has already contracted with a consortium of testing agencies whereby the Department of Education defines how this is going to be done, without using an independent agency.

Now, the President just this past Saturday in his national radio address wisely concluded that was not the direction the American people wanted to go, or that was not the way in which we ought to pursue this concept of trying to find where we stand at certain levels in regard to the subjects of reading and mathematics. And so the President announced on Saturday that he would defer to the critics' complaints that this should be done by an independent agency and should not be administered or controlled by the Department of Education.

What Senator GREGG and I are trying to do is to hold the President to his word, so that it is not just something said on a radio address but it is something that is actually fulfilled by members of his own Department of Education. So the amendment that was offered was intended to prohibit the use of funds in this act, or any act, for the development or implementation of a national testing program.

Now, we know that the Department has already signed a contract to begin developing this testing program, and as a consequence of that we are now trying to send a signal to the Department encouraging them to slow down. This is something that the Congress should debate, as the Senator from North Dakota said. This is something that the Congress should authorize. This is something on which the will of the people should be heard, that the input from the education institutions at the local and State levels ought to be heard before we proceed with this national effort. This truly should be a decision that is not first made in Washington and imposed on the States, but rather one that is first supported in State capitols and local jurisdictions around the country and only then decided on by Congress.

Because there is a question raised about what the underlying amendment is intended to accomplish, I propose that we pause here, and agree to work together, as the Senator from North Dakota said, to achieve what many feel is a desirable goal. I think it would be helpful for local educational agencies and for States to have an assessment of where their students are. I think it would be helpful for parents to know how their schools are performing and measuring up in relation to other schools. I think that puts pressure for change on the system.

I am trying to avoid the situation that we have frequently encountered after the passage of education legislation of parents getting involved because they don't like what is going on in Washington. For instance, if we don't take the time to check whether parents really want national testing, if they are unhappy, they will call up their Congressman and they will call up their Senators. They'll say, wait a minute; we are not so sure about this new Federal initiative to fix the problem of poor student performance because it looks like more Federal control. Federal control in education hasn't worked very well in the past, and we are not sure it is going to work in the future. Besides how does the Department of Education conclude it knows what is best for the education system when it has been over 15 years since a blue ribbon commission came out with a shocking report talking about the mediocrity of public education in America, and since then the only real reforms that have taken place have not been at the Federal level; reforms have been at the local and the State level, and we want to preserve the right of local jurisdictions and States to make those reforms.

So I am offering a second-degree amendment to the underlying amendment which says that no Federal funds can be used for national testing until Congress has specifically authorized those tests. It does not say that we should not pursue the goal of some type of national testing. But what it does say is that the Congress ought to debate this and it ought to be authorized by the Congress before the administration, through the Department of Education, simply goes forward.

My second-degree amendment says that none of the funds made available in this act, or any other act, will be used to develop, plan, implement, or administer any national testing program in reading or mathematics unless the program is specifically authorized by Federal statute.

The operative phrase is that you can't go forward with this and use Federal funds unless it is specifically authorized by the Congress. That allows us to engage in the debate that the Senator from North Dakota thought we ought to engage in, and I agree that allows us to define how this testing will take place, that allows us to acknowledge the concern that the Senator from North Dakota expressed that maybe we do not want the Department of Education running this.

Having been involved in the issue of student loans over the past several years and raising objections to the Department of Education taking over the student lending business, which it says it can do more effectively and more efficiently than the private sector, I find it ironic that Congress Daily reports that the Department of Education has had to suspend all direct loan consolidation efforts because it is overwhelmed by the effort. It cannot handle the work. And so students who want to consolidate their loans in terms of paying them back are now not able to do so because the Department of Education cannot handle it.

A number of us, including Senator GREGG and many others, have raised concerns about the ability of the Department of Education to properly manage and administer the very complex business of making and collecting student loans. Frankly, we have never thought that they have the capacity to handle it. It is not that they are not well intended. The problem is there are no competitive pressures. They do their own thing. And it is the nature of bureaucracy—that is why it is called bureaucracy—to become bureaucratized and inefficient.

I remember when the First Lady was here promoting her health plan, and in her first presentation to the Congress to two of the committees here, one of which I sit on, I said it seems to me that this massive national health plan is based on a number of faulty assumptions, one of which is that Government can accomplish an objective more efficiently and effectively than the private sector. I said that in my experience in 18 years in government and in my reading over the history of this Government, I have not been able to identify an area where the Federal Government has performed a service more effectively or efficiently than the private sector. I said, can you name me one? And the First Lady said, ''Well, Senator, I think you are correct in terms of past performance of the Federal Government, but this time we think we have it right.'' We think, in terms of the health care plan that was being proposed here by Mr. Magaziner and herself, that we can avoid that problem.

As we have learned, that health care plan was rejected overwhelmingly by the American people because they had no faith that the Federal Government could take 15 percent of our economy, the entire health care system of the United States, and turn it over to Government to run with any assurance that it would be run effectively and efficiently. And, therefore, those of us who have a philosophy grounded in the free enterprise system are very skeptical about new proposals to inject the Federal Government further and further into those efforts handled by the private sector.

So, at the very time the Department of Education now admits that it can't handle a small fraction of the lending business that is the consolidation of loans, and that it is going to take months and months and months for it to get its act together, if then, it now wants to enter into a new area of national testing, who knows where this is going to take us. And of course, who knows how many additional people will have to be assigned to have to administer this, to oversee the contracts and define the standards.

Those are the concerns that Senator GREGG and I have, and those are the concerns we are trying to address. What we would like to do with this amendment, then, is simply follow up on the President's concession last Saturday and basically say, No. 1, this should not be done by the Federal Government, should not be done by the Department of Education, it ought to be done, if done at all, through an independent agency. And since we are dual players in this town, both the administration and the Congress, in doing the people's business, this is something the Congress ought to authorize. Therefore my second-degree amendment would prohibit funds from being used to further this national testing program until it is authorized by Federal statute.

The chairman of the relevant appropriations committee, Senator SPECTER, will be holding hearings as early as tomorrow whereby the Secretary of Education will come forward, as well as Mr. GOODLING, whom I deeply respect in terms of his experience with education. They will both come to testify as to the pros and cons of national testing. I think we need hear those pros and cons. I think we need to debate those pros and cons, and then I think we need to go forward and make a decision as to how we proceed.

Again, I say this as someone who is not unalterably opposed to national testing for reading in fourth grade and math at eighth grade. Frankly, one of the reasons I want these tests is because I think it will draw more attention to the failure of the public system to educate our children. When we look at the disparities that exist in public education in some of our schools and we look at some of our efforts, I think it will put additional pressure on the public system to open up, to try new alternatives, and parents will be demanding that we provide better education for their children and different ways of providing that education. So, from that standpoint, I think national testing can be of benefit.

With that, Madam President, I send my second-degree 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 Indiana [Mr. COATS], for himself and Mr. GREGG, proposes an amendment numbered 1071 to amendment 1070.

Mr. COATS. Madam 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:

At the end of the pending amendment, add the following:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act, may be used to develop, plan, implement, or administer any national testing program in reading or mathematics unless the program is specifically authorized by Federal statue.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. GRAMS. Madam President, I ask what is the current business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the second-degree amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. GRAMS. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be set aside and I be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. GRAMS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAMS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1145 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the second-degree amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana, Senator COATS, to Senator GREGG's amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment be temporarily set aside and the Kyl amendment, No. 1056, be temporarily set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1072

(Purpose: To fund demonstration projects on Medicaid attendant care services, within amounts available)

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I now offer an amendment and send it to the desk for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] proposes an amendment numbered 1072.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 39, before the period on line 25, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That $2,000,000 of the amount available for research, demonstration, and evaluation activities shall be available for carrying out demonstration projects on Medicaid coverage of community-based attendant care services for people with disabilities which ensures maximum control by the consumer to select and manage their attendant care services".

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, as noted, that $2 million will be utilized from an existing fund for a demonstration project to test the effectiveness of providing attendant care services to individuals with disabilities, regardless of age.

Every State in the country currently provides long-term services to eligible individuals who require the assistance of an attendant in nursing homes or other institutions. However, under a curious provision of the current Medicaid law, these individuals are not guaranteed the right to remain in their own homes and communities while receiving the assistance of an attendant as an alternative to institutional care.

I have sought to persuade the Secretary of Health and Human Services to change this provision in the Medicaid Program, and I wrote to Secretary Shalala accordingly on February 28, 1997. I ask unanimous consent a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPECTER. The amendment that I am introducing today directs the Department to test the cost effectiveness of this policy option to allow the disabled to remain at home and to obtain the Federal Medicaid benefits. It is clear that the current long-term care system is highly regulated and very costly. It is my thought that there is a clear-cut need for a program to be put into effect which will enable the disabled to stay at home or in the community as an alternative to institutional care.

On February 17 of this year, I had the privilege of visiting a group of disabled individuals, many of whom have substantial disabilities, struggling to live independent lives. They gave me a sweatshirt, and I now display it for my colleagues and for those on C–Span II, showing, "Our Homes, Not Nursing Homes." And it is the symbol of someone who is disabled.

When I met with these individuals, who were struggling in their wheelchairs, with enormous disabilities, and found that they could not receive Medicaid benefits unless they were in an institution, it seemed to me manifestly unfair. It is clear that it would be less costly to have the disabled remain in their communities or in their own homes so they could care for themselves and could receive the Medicaid benefits.

So I said to these people in North Philadelphia that I would bring the matter to the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the view of having an administrative change. But I find that it is very complicated because the preliminary estimates from the Congressional Budget Office say that this would be an enormously expensive change to enable the disabled to have benefits to live in their communities or in their homes.

I wondered why. The best explanation which I have been able to receive so far is that, at the present time, these people, the disabled, are cared for by their relatives, by friends or somehow by themselves because they don't want to go into an institution, so they forgo the assistance which Medicaid offers the disabled. The Congressional Budget Office asserts that if these individuals were to have the ability to have this care outside of the institution, the costs would skyrocket.

It seems to me, Madam President, unfair that where the Medicaid law says the disabled are entitled to certain benefits if they are in an institution, that they should be compelled to be institutionalized when they want to live in their homes or their own communities. This is quite a conundrum, quite a Catch-22. So the best course that I see at the present time would be for us to undertake this program on a test basis, and to have a study, made to see what the costs would be in order to try to arrive at some fair determination.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, February 28, 1997.

Hon. DONNA SHALALA,
Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SHALALA: I am writing to alert you that I intend to raise with your at next week's Subcommittee hearing a matter concerning Medicaid coverage of attendant care services for people with disabilities.

It has been brought to my attention that considerable savings to the Medicaid program could be achieved by redirecting long-term care funding toward community-based attendant services, and by requiring States to develop attendant service programs meeting national standards to assure that people of all ages with disabilities have full access to such services. Please be prepared to summarize the current status of Medicaid services to the disabled population, and to discuss your views on establishing a national program of community-based attendant services. I would also appreciate your thoughts on what further could be done, both administratively and through legislative action, to better enable people with mental and physical disabilities to live independently.

I look forward to discussing this and other issues with you next Tuesday when you appear to present the Administration's fiscal year 1998 budget request for your Department.

My best.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, Senator HARKIN is now attending a committee meeting, and I have been advised by his staff that this amendment is agreeable to him, so I ask unanimous consent that it be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1072) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1070 AND AMENDMENT NO. 1071

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, now briefly addressing the amendments offered by Senator GREGG and Senator COATS, it is my hope that the amendments will be debated today for all those who have views and care to express them; that is, as I said earlier, because this is a complicated matter. In my conversation yesterday in a telephone call which I received from the Secretary of Education, he asked for my support, and I told him that I did not know enough about the matter to render a judgment and had said earlier it seems to me that testing is desirable, but I do not know that it ought to be undertaken by the Federal Government.

We have scheduled a hearing tomorrow which we have advanced from 9 o'clock to 8:30 in the morning because we have since had a request from Congressman GOODLING to testify at the hearing. So we are now going to have the Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, we are going to have the chairman of the House Education Committee, and we are looking, as a matter of balance, to find someone in opposition to the Department of Education program. So that hearing will be conducted from 8:30, hopefully until 10 a.m. It is my hope that we will complete action on the remainder of this bill today, with the exception of the vote on the Gregg amendment, and take that up tomorrow.

Madam President, I now call up amendment No. 1069.

AMENDMENT NO. 1069

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the Attorney General has abused her discretion by failing to appoint an independent counsel on campaign finance matters and that the Attorney General should proceed to appoint such an independent counsel immediately)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside, and the clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] proposes an amendment numbered 1069.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT COUNSEL.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) press reports appearing in the early Spring of 1997 reported that the FBI and the

Justice Department withheld national security information from the Clinton administration and President Clinton regarding information pertaining to the possible involvement by the Chinese government in seeking to influence both the administration and some members of Congress in the 1996 elections;

(2) President Clinton subsequently stated, in reference to the failure by the FBI and the Justice Department to brief him on such information regarding China: ''There are significant national security issues at stake here,'' and further stated that ''I believe I should have known'';

(3) there has been an acknowledgment by former White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta in March 1997 that there was indeed coordination between the White House and the DNC regarding the expenditure of soft money for advertising;

(4) the Attorney General in her appearance before the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 30, 1997 acknowledged a presumed coordination between President Clinton and the DNC regarding campaign advertisements;

(5) Richard Morris in his recent book, ''Behind the Oval Office,'' describes his firsthand knowledge that ''the president became the day-to-day operational director of our [DNC] TV ad campaign. He worked over every script, watched each ad, ordered changes in every visual presentation and decided which ads would run when and where;''

(6) there have been conflicting and contradictory statements by the Vice President regarding the timing and extent of his knowledge of the nature of a fundraising event at the Hsi Lai Buddhist Temple near Los Angeles on April 29, 1996;

(7) the independent counsel statute requires the Attorney General to consider the specificity of information provided and the credibility of the source of information pertaining to potential violations of criminal law by covered persons, including the President and the Vice President;

(8) the independent counsel statute further requires the Attorney General to petition the court for appointment of an independent counsel where the Attorney General finds that there is a reasonable likelihood that a violation of criminal law may have occurred involving a covered person;

(9) the Attorney General has been presented with specific and credible evidence pertaining to potential violations of criminal law by covered persons and there is a reasonable likelihood that a violation of criminal law may have occurred involving a covered person; and

(10) the Attorney General has abused her discretion by failing to petition the court for appointment of an independent counsel.

(b) It is the Sense of the Senate that the Attorney General should petition the court immediately for appointment of an independent counsel to investigate the reasonable likelihood that a violation of criminal law may have occurred involving a covered person in the 1996 presidential federal election campaign.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, this is the amendment that I had referred to earlier on sense of the Senate for independent counsel.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Senator MCCAIN to Attorney General Reno dated October 11, 1996, requesting independent counsel be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
October 11, 1996.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL RENO: I am writing to you to request that you use the authority granted to you in the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act to immediately appoint an Independent Counsel to investigate charges raised in the media regarding the Democratic Party and Clinton-Gore Reelection Committee's use of soft money contributions which appear to have been in violation of election law.

These allegations charge that foreign nationals have been circumventing the law in order to funnel large campaign contributions to the Democratic party. I have enclosed copies of recent New York Times, Washington Post, and Wall Street Journal articles regarding this situation.

During this election season, I believe it is impossible for any Administration officials to determine whether any illegalities or ethical lapses have been committed regarding this situation. Therefore, it is crucial for the sake of the integrity of the Office of the President and the political party fundraising apparatus that this matter be investigated by an Independent Counsel.

Your immediate attention to this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOHN MCCAIN,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated October 29, 1996, from five Members of the House of Representatives requesting independent counsel be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, October 29, 1996.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL RENO: We are writing to request that you immediately apply for the appointment of an Independent Counsel to investigate the serious allegation that Federal criminal laws may have been violated by a number of high ranking officials in the Clinton Administration and at the Democratic National Committee (''DNC'').

This investigation should include, but not be limited to, the following specific reports that indicate violations of Federal law may have taken place:

1. The involvement of President Clinton, Vice President Gore, and officials of the Democratic National Committee in the solicitation, acceptance, and receipt of $250,000 from Cheong Am America, when the corporation had little or no domestic income, in direct violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act, and in the solicitation or receipt of over $300,000 from Arief and Soraya Wiriadinata at a time when the Wiriadinatas no longer resided in the United States, violating the plain language in Federal law prohibiting contributions by non-citizens outside the United States. Although the Cheong Am America contribution was returned following media inquiries, the $300,000 from the Wiriadinatas has been retained by the DNC for use in influencing American elections.

2. Incorrect reporting to the Federal Election Commission by officials of the DNC of the residence address of Arief and Soraya Wiriadinata, which presented the public appearance that the Wiriadinatas were in the United States and potentially intended to conceal the fact that their contributions were in fact unlawful. News reports indicate that the contributions apparently came after the Wiriadinatas had returned to Indonesia and that the Vice Chairman of Finance of the Democratic National Committee knew that the Wiriadinatas were out of the country (Los Angeles Times, 10/14/96). Property records on file in Fairfax County, Virginia show that the home reported on DNC Federal Election Commission (''FEC'') Reports as the Wiriadinata home address was sold by the Wiriadinata family on December 15, 1995, yet contributions received as late as July, 1996 continued to be reported as coming from that address.

3. The solicitation, acceptance and receipt of contributions from individuals, including Arief and Soraya Wiriadinata ($450,000), Yogesh Gandhi ($325,000), and individuals who made contributions in connection with the April 29, 1996 event at the Hsi Lai Temple in Hacienda Heights, California (an estimated $140,000) and a fundraiser at the Hay-Adams Hotel in Washington, D.C., in February 1996 (an estimated $1,000,000), when DNC officials involved in fundraising may have had good reason to know that these contributors did not have the financial resources to make contributions in the large amounts reported, and the contributors may therefore have been conduits for prohibited funds from foreign sources.

4. Fundraising activities on behalf of the DNC by John Huang while he was a Presidential appointee at the Department of Commerce, possibly with the knowledge of officials of the DNC, in violation of the Hatch Act. Contributions from the Wiriadinatas to the DNC were received in November of 1995, while Huang was serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Economic Policy. DNC Press Secretary Amy Weiss Tobe has stated to the press (Washington Post, October 12, 1996) that Arief and Soraya Wiriadinata contributed to the DNC after meeting John Huang in 1995, during the time he was employed at the U.S. Department of Commerce.

5. Possible improper influence on official government decisions as a result of large contributions made to the DNC or other entities by associates and allies of the Riady family and the Lippo group of foreign-owned and foreign-controlled corporations. Press reports indicate that a series of events, which would economically benefit the Lippo Group and the Riady family, took place after meetings between President Clinton, Clinton Administration officials, John Huang and James Riady. Federal bribery statutes prohibit the performing of any official government act in return for campaign contributions or other payments.

6. Knowing use of tax-exempt facilities at the Hsi Lai Temple by the DNC for fundraising purposes and knowing solicitation and acceptance of prohibited in-kind contributions from a non-profit entity to a political campaign through the DNC's failure to reimburse the Temple for its expenses in connection with the event until questioned by the media. Further, despite statements by Vice President Gore that the event was not a fundraiser, news reports have indicated that Mr. Huang called it a fundraiser, contributions were collected at the event, and attendees believed that they had to pay to attend.

7. The possible attempt by Mr. John Huang, an employee of the DNC, with either the knowledge or implicit approval of the DNC, to obstruct any investigation of his activities by evading the service of a subpoena for the purpose of preventing the release of information about his fundraising activities until after the November 5, 1996 election. Mr. Huang is reported to have raised as much as

$5 million in contributions for the DNC, and has so far refused to answer questions in public about his fundraising activities. Until a U.S. District Court Judge intervened, the DNC refused to cooperate or assist in having its employee, John Huang, provide information which would resolve questions as to the legality of the contributions which he solicited and which the DNC is now using to influence American elections.

8. Reports filed by the DNC with the Federal Election Commission for the period ending September 30, 1996 list the home address of at least thirty-one contributors to the DNC (with contributions totaling over $225,000) as 430 South Capitol Street SE, Washington, D.C. This address is not a residence, it is the address of the business offices of the DNC. By filing false and misleading information with the FEC, DNC officials may have sought to conceal and impede investigation into the true source and nature of these contributions.

Equally important as each of these individual acts is the overall pattern of questionable fundraising activity and the apparent deliberate flaunting of federal election law and usurpation of power and official privilege by the DNC's Vice Chairman of Finance, John Huang, for the benefit of and with the apparent cooperation of President Bill Clinton, Vice President Gore, and the Democratic National Committee. The magnitude of the funds involved, the high-rank of the officials involved and the potential knowing and willful violations committed make it impossible for any officials of this Administration's Justice Department to carry out an investigation that will be considered fair and free of outside influence!

Therefore it is crucial for the sake of the integrity of the Office of the President and the Office of the Vice President that this matter be investigated promptly by an independent counsel.

We look forward to a reply to this communication by Friday, November 1, 1996. Your early reply will reassure the American people that you are committed to preserving the integrity and independence of the Department of Justice.

Sincerely,

BILL THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on House Oversight.
BEN GILMAN,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations.
BILL CLINGER,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.
GERALD B. SOLOMON,
Chairman, Committee on Rules.
JOHN MCCAIN,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated March 13, 1997, from the 10 Republican members of the Senate Judiciary Committee requesting independent counsel be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, March 13, 1997.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Attorney General of the United States, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM ATTORNEY GENERAL: This letter serves as a formal request, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §592(g)(1), that you apply for the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate possible fundraising violations in connection with the 1996 presidential campaign. The purpose of this letter is not to provide an exhaustive list of the particular allegations that, we believe, warrant further investigation. Indeed, since the Department of Justice has been conducting an extensive investigation into fundraising irregularities for several months now, you presumably have far greater knowledge than do we of the various matters that are being, and will need to be, investigated, and we presume that your judgment as to the necessity of an independent counsel is based on all of the information before you. Rather, the purpose of this letter is to articulate why we believe this investigation should be conducted by an independent counsel. As you know, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has, to date, refrained from joining the assortment of other individuals who have called upon you to initiate an independent counsel appointment. Recent developments over the past few weeks, however, have persuaded us that such an appointment is now necessary.

When you appeared before the Senate in 1993 when we were considering reenactment of the Independent Counsel statute, you stated:

''There is an inherent conflict of interest whenever senior Executive Branch officials are to be investigated by the Department of Justice and its appointed head, the Attorney General. The Attorney General serves at the pleasure of the President. Recognition of this conflict does not belittle or demean the impressive professionalism of the Department's career prosecutors, nor does it question the integrity of the Attorney General and his or her political appointees. Instead, it recognizes the importance of public confidence in our system of justice, and the destructive effect in a free democracy of public cynicism.''

You further testified that:

''It is absolutely essential for the public to have confidence in the system and you cannot do that when there is conflict or an appearance of conflict in the person who is, in effect, the chief prosecutor. * * * The Independent Counsel Act was designed to avoid even the appearance of impropriety in the consideration of allegations of misconduct by high-level Executive Branch officials and to prevent * * * the actual or perceived conflicts of interest. The Act thus served as a vehicle to further the public's perception of fairness and thoroughness in such matters, and to avert even the most subtle influences that may appear in an investigation of highly-placed Executive officials.''

We believe that, in light of recent developments, a thorough Justice Department investigation into possible fundraising violations in connection with the 1996 presidential campaign will raise an inherent conflict of interest, and that the appointment of an independent counsel is therefore required to ensure public confidence in the integrity of our electoral process and system of justice.

First recent revelations have demonstrated how officials at the highest level of the White House were involved in formulating, coordinating and implementing the DNC's fundraising efforts for the 1996 presidential campaign. Recent press reports, the files released by Mr. Ickes, and public statements by very high ranking present and former Clinton Administration officials indicate how extensively the Administration was involved in planning, coordinating, and implementing DNC fundraising strategy and activities. All this has led The New York Times to a conclusion which we find hard to challenge; namely, that ''the latest documentation shows clearly that the Democratic National Committee was virtually a subsidiary of the White House. Not only was [President] Clinton overseeing its fund-raising efforts, not only was he immersed in its ad campaigns, but D.N.C. employees were installed at the White House, using White House visitors' lists and communicating constantly with [President] Clinton's policy advisers.'' The New York Times, February 27, 1997. As a consequence, we believe that a thorough investigation of all but the most trivial potential campaign fundraising improprieties necessarily includes an inquiry into the possible knowledge and/or complicity of very senior White House officials in these improprieties. We believe that, without questioning in the slightest the integrity, professionalism or independence of the Attorney General or the individuals conducting the present Justice Department fundraising investigation, the fact that the Department's investigation will inescapably take it to the highest levels of the Executive Branch presents an inherent conflict of interest calling for the appointment of an independent counsel under 28 U.S.C. §591(c).

Moreover, these revelations raise new questions of possible wrongdoing by senior White House officials themselves, including but not limited to whether federal officials may have illegally solicited and/or received contributions on federal property; whether specific solicitations were ever made by federal officials at the numerous White House overnights, coffees, and other similar events, and whether these events themselves, often characterized in White House and DNC memoranda as ''fundraising'' events, constituted improper ''solicitations'' on federal property; whether government property and employees may have been used illegally to further campaign interests; and whether the close coordination by the White House over the raising and spending of ''soft''—and purportedly independent—DNC funds violated federal election laws, and/or had the legal effect of rendering those funds subject to campaign finance limitations they otherwise would not be subject to. It seems to us that, even accepting the narrow constructions of some of the governing statutes that have been suggested—which are not necessarily the constructions an independent counsel would render—the answer to whether criminal wrongdoing has occurred will of necessity turn on the resolution of disputed factual, legal, and state of mind determinations. Because the inquiry necessary to make these determinations will inescapably involve high level Executive Branch officials, we believe they should be left to an independent counsel in order to avoid a real or apparent conflict of interest. Moreover, where individuals covered by the independent counsel statute are involved, as they plainly were here, see 28 U.S.C. §591(b), the Ethics in Government Act requires that these inquiries be conducted by an independent counsel. Whether the Act simply permits or requires the appointment of an independent counsel, however, we believe that prudence and the American people's ability to have confidence that the investigation remains free of a conflict of interest, requires it.

Second, the emerging story regarding the possibility that foreign contributions were funneled into U.S. election coffers to influence U.S. foreign policy further highlights the conflict of interest your ongoing investigation inescapably confronts. A March 9, 1997, Washington Post article quoted ''U.S. government officials''—presumably familiar with the Department's ongoing investigation—as stating that investigators have obtained '''conclusive evidence' that Chinese government funds were funneled into the United States last year,'' and quoted one official as stating that ''there is no question that money was laundered.'' This article reported that U.S. officials described a plan by China ''to spend nearly $2 million to buy influence not only in Congress but also within

the Clinton Administration.'' If the FBI truly is investigating these allegations, as is reported, and this investigation extends to high level Executive Branch officials, it raises an inherent conflict of interest.

Moreover, a closer look at the activities and associations of some of the particular individuals who are reported to be the principal figures in the ongoing investigation further illustrates why this investigation ultimately must involve high levels of the Executive Branch. Especially troubling is the information revealed to date regarding the Riady family and their associate, Mr. John Huang, but serious questions are also raised by the activities and associations of Mr. Charles Yah Lin Trie, Ms. Pauline Kanalanchak, and Mr. Johnny Chung, among others. Taken together, these reported events raise a host of serious questions warranting further investigation: To what extent were illegal contributions from foreign sources, in particular China, being funneled into the United States, and with whose knowledge and involvement? To what extent was U.S. policy influenced by these contributions, and with whose knowledge and/or involvement? To what extent were the decisions to hire Huang at the Commerce Department, to support most-favored-nation status for China and Chinese accession to the World Trade Organization, or to normalize relations with Vietnam, influenced by contributions, and with whose knowledge and/or involvement? To what extent was the standard NSC screening process for admission to the White House waived or modified so as to permit special access to large donors and their guests where it would ordinarily be denied, and with whose knowledge and/or involvement? To what extent was John Huang placed at the DNC to raise money in exchange for past and future favors, and with whose knowledge and/or involvement?

It is evident that these questions cannot be properly investigated without a conflict of interest, since investigating most of these questions will require inquiring into the knowledge and/or conduct of individuals at the highest levels of the Executive Branch. Moreover, several of the principal figures in this investigation, including the Riadys and the Lippo Group and Charlie Trie, reportedly have longstanding ties to President Clinton.

Indeed, the conflicts at issue here are precisely the sort of ''inherent conflict[s] of interest'' to which you testified during Senate hearings in 1993 on the re-enactment of the Independent Counsel Act. Avoiding an actual or perceived conflict of interest was the basis not just for your application for the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate James McDougal, but also for your recent requests to extend that counsel's jurisdiction to include investigations of Anthony Marceca and Bernard Nussbaum. The same concern warrants your application for an independent counsel here, where public confidence can be assured only by the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate any alleged wrongdoing in connection with DNC, Clinton Administration, and Clinton/Gore Campaign fundraising during the 1994–1996 election cycle. As you yourself testified, applying for an independent counsel, and our request that you make such an application, in no way detracts from the integrity and independence of the Attorney General or the career prosecutors presently investigating these allegations.

Pursuant to the statute, please report back to the Committee within 30 days whether you have begun or will begin a preliminary investigation, identifying all of the allegations you are presently investigating or as to which you have received information, and indicating whether you believe each of these allegations are based on specific information from credible sources, and either pertain to a covered individual or present a conflict of interest. Please also provide your reasons for those determinations. See 28 U.S.C. §592(g)(2). In the event you conduct a preliminary investigation, but do not apply for the appointment of an independent counsel, or apply for an independent counsel but only with respect to some of the various allegations on which you have received information, please identify all those allegations which in your view do not warrant appointment of an independent counsel, and explain your view whether those allegations warrant further investigation, pertain to a covered individual, and/or present a conflict of interest. See 28 U.S.C. §592(g)(3).

Sincerely,

Orrin Hatch, Chuck Grassley, John Ashcroft, Spencer Abraham, Mike DeWine, Strom Thurmond, Arlen Specter, Jon Kyl, Fred Thompson, Jeff Sessions.

Mr. SPECTER. And I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter from Attorney General Reno dated April 14, 1997, responding to Senator HATCH be printed in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, DC, April 14, 1997.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On March 13, 1997, you and nine other majority party members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate wrote to me requesting the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate possible fundraising violations in connection with the 1996 presidential campaign. You made that request pursuant to a provision of the Independent Counsel Act, 28 U.S.C. §592(g)(1), which provides that ''a majority of majority party members [of the Committee on the Judiciary] * * * may request in writing that the Attorney General apply for the appointment of an independent counsel.'' The Act requires me to respond within 30 days, setting forth the reasons for my decision on each of the matters with respect to which your request is made. 28 U.S.C. §592(g)(2).

I am writing to inform you that I have not initiated a ''preliminary investigation'' (as that term is defined in the Independent Counsel Act) of any of the matters mentioned in your letter. Rather, as you know, matters relating to campaign financing in the 1996 Federal elections have been under active investigation since November by a task force of career Justice Department prosecutors and Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) agents. This task force is pursuing the investigation vigorously and diligently, and it will continue to do so. I can assure you that I have given your views and your arguments careful thought, but at this time, I am unable to agree, based on the facts and the law, that an independent counsel should be appointed to handle this investigation.

1. THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL ACT

In order to explain my reasons, I would like to outline briefly the relevant provisions of the Independent Counsel Act. The Act can be invoked in two circumstances that are relevant here:

First, if there are sufficient allegations (as further described below) of criminal activity by a covered person, defined as the President and Vice President, cabinet officers, certain other enumerated high Federal officials, or certain specified officers of the President's election campaign (not party officials), see 28 U.S.C. §591(b), I must seek appointment of an independent counsel.

Second, if there are sufficient allegations of criminal activity by a person other than a covered person, and I determine that ''an investigation or prosecution of [that] person by the Department of Justice may result in a personal, financial or political conflict of interest,'' see 28 U.S.C. §591(c)(1), I may seek appointment of an independent counsel.

In either case, I must follow a two-step process to determine whether the allegations are sufficient. First, I must determine whether the allegations are sufficiently specific and credible to constitute grounds to investigate whether an individual may have violated Federal criminal law. 28 U.S.C. §591(d). If so, the Department commences a ''preliminary investigation'' for up to 90 days (which can be extended an additional 60 days upon a showing of good cause). 28 U.S.C. §592(a). If, at the conclusion of this ''preliminary investigation,'' I determine that further investigation of the matters is warranted, I must seek an independent counsel.

Certain important features of the Act are critical to my decision in this case:

First, the Act sets forth the only circumstances in which I may seek an independent counsel pursuant to its provisions. I may not invoke its procedures unless the statutory requirements are met.

Second, the Act does not permit or require me to commence a preliminary investigation unless there is specific and credible evidence that a crime may have been committed. In your letter, you suggest that it is not the responsibility of the Department of Justice to determine whether a particular set of facts suggests a potential Federal crime, but that such legal determinations should be left to an independent counsel. I do not agree. Under the Independent Counsel Act, it is the Department's obligation to determine in the first instance whether particular conduct potentially falls within the scope of a particular criminal statute such that criminal investigation is warranted. If it is our conclusion that the alleged conduct is not criminal, then there is no basis for appointment of an independent counsel, because there would be no specific and credible allegation of a violation of criminal law. See 28 U.S.C. §592(a)(1).

Third, there is an important difference between the mandatory and discretionary provisions of the Act. Once I have received specific and credible allegations of criminal conduct by a covered person, I must commence a preliminary investigation and, if further investigation is warranted at the end of the preliminary investigation, seek appointment of an independent counsel. If, on the other hand, I receive specific and credible evidence that a person not covered by the mandatory provisions of the Act has committed a crime, and I determine that a conflict of interest exists with respect to the investigation of that person, I may—but need not—commence a preliminary investigation pursuant to the provisions of the Act. This provision gives me the flexibility to decide whether, overall, the national interest would be best served by appointment of an independent counsel in such a case, or whether it would be better for the Department of Justice to continue a vigorous investigation of the matter.

Fourth, even this discretionary provision is not available unless I find a conflict of interest of the sort contemplated by the Act. The Congress has made it very clear that this provision should be invoked only in certain narrow circumstances. Under the Act, I must conclude that there is a potential for an actual conflict of interest, rather than merely an appearance of a conflict of interest. The Congress expressly adopted this higher standard to ensure that the provision

would not be invoked unnecessarily. See 128 Cong. Rec. H 9507 (daily ed. December 13, 1982) (statement of Rep. Hall). Moreover, I must find that there is the potential for such an actual conflict with respect to the investigation of a particular person, not merely with respect to the overall matter. Indeed, when the Act was reauthorized in 1994, Congress considered a proposal for a more flexible standard for invoking the discretionary clause, which would have permitted its use to refer any ''matter'' to an Independent Counsel when the purposes of the Act would be served. Congress rejected this suggestion, explaining that such a standard would ''substantially lower the threshold for use of the general discretionary provision.'' H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 511, 103rd Cong., 2nd Sess. 9 (1994).

2. COVERED PERSONS—THE MANDATORY PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

Let me now turn to the specific allegations in your letter. You assert that there are ''new questions of possible wrongdoing by senior White House officials themselves,'' and you identify a number of particular types of conduct in support of this claim. While all of the specific issues you mention are under review or active investigation by the task force, at this time we have no specific, credible evidence that any covered White House official may have committed a Federal crime in respect of any of these issues. Nevertheless, I will discuss separately each area that you raise.

a. *Fundraising on Federal Property*. First, you suggest that ''federal officials may have illegally solicited and/or received contributions on federal property.'' The conduct you describe could be a violation of 18 U.S.C. §607. We are aware of a number of allegations of this sort; all are being evaluated, and where appropriate, investigations have been commenced. The Department takes allegations of political fundraising by Federal employees on Federal property seriously, and in appropriate cases would not hesitate to prosecute such matters. Indeed, the Public Integrity Section, which is overseeing the work of the campaign financing task force, recently obtained a number of guilty pleas from individuals who are soliciting and accepting political contributions within the Department of Agriculture.

The analysis of a potential section 607 violation is a fact-specific inquiry. A number of different factors must be considered when reviewing allegations that this law may have been violated:

First, the law specifically applies only to contributions as technically defined by the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA)—funds commonly referred to as ''hard money.'' The statute originally applied broadly to any political fundraising, but in 1979, over the objection of the Department of Justice, Congress narrowed the scope of section 607 to render it applicable only to FECA contributions. Before concluding that section 607 may have been violated, we must have evidence that a particular solicitation involved a ''contribution'' within the definition of the FECA.

Second, there are private areas of the White House that, as a general rule, fall outside the scope of the statute, because of the statutory requirement that the particular solicitation occur in an area ''occupied in the discharge of official duties.'' 3 Op. Off. Legal Counsel 31 (1979). The distinction recognizes that while the Federal Government provides a residence to the President, similar to the housing that it might provide to foreign service officers, this residence is still the personal home of an individual within which restrictions that might validly apply to the Federal workplace should not be imposed. Before we can conclude that section 607 may have been violated, we must have evidence that fundraising took place in locations covered by the provisions of the statute.

Thus, while you express concerns about the possibility of ''specific solicitations * * * made by federal officials at the numerous White House overnights, coffees, and other similar events,'' we do not at this time have any specific and credible evidence of any such solicitation by any covered person that may constitute a violation of section 607.

We do not suggest, of course, that our consideration of information concerning fundraising on Federal property is limited to whether the conduct constituted a violation only of section 607. However, at this point in time, we have no specific and credible evidence to suggest that any crime was committed by any covered person in connection with these allegations.

b. *Misuse of Government Resources*. You next assert that Government property and employees may have been used illegally to further campaign interests—conduct which might, in some circumstances, constitute a theft or conversion of Government property in violation of 18 U.S.C. §641. Again, we are actively investigating allegations that such misconduct may have occurred. However, we are unaware at this time of any evidence that any covered person participated in any such activity, other than use of Government property that is permitted under Federal law, such as the reports that the Vice President used a Government telephone, charging the calls to a nongovernment credit card. Federal regulations permit such incidental use of Government property for otherwise lawful personal purposes. See, e.g., 5 C.F.R. §2635.704; 41 C.F.R. §201–21.601 (personal long distance telephone calls). Thus, for example, allegations that a Government telephone or telefacsimile machine may have been used on a few occasions by a covered person for personal purposes does not amount to an allegation of a Federal crime. To the extent that there are allegations warranting investigation that individuals not covered by the Independent Counsel Act diverted Government resources, it is my conclusion, as I explain below, that there is at present no conflict of interest for the Department of Justice to investigate and, if appropriate, prosecute those involved in any such activity.

c. *Foreign Efforts to Influence U.S. Policy*. You next cite reports suggesting the possibility that foreign contributions may have been made in hopes of influencing American police decisions. These allegations are under active investigation by the task force. The facts known at this time, however, do not indicate the criminal involvement of any covered person in such conduct.

It is neither unique nor unprecedented for the Department to receive information that foreign interests might be seeking to infuse money into American political campaigns. That was precisely the scenario that underlay the criminal investigations, prosecutions and congressional hearings during the late 1970s involving allegations that a Korean businessman was making illegal campaign contributions, among other things, to Members of Congress to curry congressional support for the Government of South Korea. In a more recent example, in 1996 an individual was prosecuted and convicted for funneling Indian Government funds into Federal elections through the cover of a political action committee.

Absent specific and credible evidence of complicity by a covered person, it has never been suggested that the mere allegation that a foreign government may have been trying to provide funds to Federal campaigns should warrant appointment of an independent counsel. Nor can it be the case that an independent counsel is required to investigate because campaign contributors or those who donated to political parties believed their largesse would influence policy or achieve access. The Department of Justice routinely handles such allegations, and because of its experience in reviewing and investigating these sensitive matters, embracing, among other things, issues of national security, is particularly well-equipped to do so.

d. *Coordination of Campaign Fundraising and Expenditures*. You also suggest that the ''close coordination by the White House over the raising and spending of 'soft'—and purportedly independent—DNC funds violated Federal election laws, and/or had the legal effect of rendering those funds subject to campaign finance limitations they otherwise would not be subject to.'' We believe this statement misapprehends the law. The FECA does not prohibit the coordination of fundraising or expenditures between a party and its candidates for office. Indeed, the Federal Election Commission (FEC), the body charged by Congress with primary responsibility for interpreting and enforcing the FECA, has historically assumed coordination between a candidate and his or her political party.

Of course, coordinated expenditures may be unlawful under the FECA if they are made with funds from prohibited sources, if they were misreported, or if they exceeded applicable expenditure limits. However, we presently lack specific and credible evidence suggesting that any covered person participated in any such violations, if they occurred.

With respect to coordinated media advertisements by political parties (an area that has received much attention of late, the proper characterization of a particular expenditure depends not on the degree of coordination, but rather on the content of the message. Indeed, just last year the FEC and the content of the message. Indeed, just last year the FEC and the Department of Justice took this position in a brief filed before the Supreme Court, in a case decided on other grounds. See generally, Brief for the Respondent, *Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee* v. *FEC* (S. Ct. No. 95–489), at 2–3, 18 n. 15, 23–24. In this connection, the FEC has concluded that party media advertisements that focus on ''national legislative activity'' and that do not contain an ''electioneering message'' may be financed, in part, using ''soft'' money, i.e., money that does not comply with FECA's contribution limits. FEC Advisory Op. 1995–25, 2 Fed. Elec. Camp. Fin. Guide (CCH) ¶ 6162, at 12,109–12,110 (August 24, 1995); FEC Advisory Op. 1985–14, 2 Fed. Elec. Camp. Fin. Guide (CCH) ¶ 5819, at 11,185–11,186 (May 30, 1985). Moreover, such advertisements are not subject to any applicable limitations on coordinated expenditures by the party on behalf of its candidates. AO 1985–14 at 11–185–11,186.

We recognize that there are allegations that both presidential candidates and both national political parties engaged in a concerted effort to take full advantage of every funding option available to them under the law, to craft advertisements that took advantage of the lesser regulation applicable to legislative issue advertising, and to raise large quantities of soft political funding to finance these ventures. However, at the present time, we lack specific and credible evidence suggesting that these activities violated the FECA. Moreover, even assuming that, after a thorough investigation, the FEC were to conclude that regulatory violations occurred, we presently lack specific and credible evidence suggesting that any covered person participated in any such violations.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST—THE DISCRETIONARY PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

In urging me to conclude that the investigation poses the type of potential conflict of interest contemplated by the Act, you rely heavily on my testimony before the Senate Committee on Government Affairs in 1993 in support of reauthorization of the Independent Counsel Act. I stand by those views and continue to support the overall concept underlying the Act. My decisions pursuant to the Act have been, I believe, fully consistent with those views.

The remarks you quote from my testimony should be interpreted within the context of the statutory language I was discussing. When, for example, I referred to the need for the Act to deal with the inherent conflict of interest when the Department of Justice investigates ''high-level Executive Branch officials,'' I was referring to persons covered under the mandatory provisions of the Act. With respect to the conflict of interest provision, my testimony expressed the conviction that the Act ''would in no way preempt this Department's authority to investigate public corruption,'' and that the Department was clearly capable of ''vigorous investigations of wrongdoing by public officials, whatever allegiance or stripes they may wear. I will vigorously defend and continue this tradition.'' While I endorsed the concept of the discretionary clause to deal with unforeseeable situations, I strongly emphasized that ''it is part of the Attorney General's job to make difficult decisions in tough cases. I have no intention of abdicating that responsibility[.]'' These principles continue to guide my decisionmaking today.

There are times when reliance on the discretionary clause is appropriate, and indeed, as you point out, I have done so myself on a few occasions. However, in each of those cases, I considered the particular factual context in which the allegations against those persons arose and the history of the matter. Moreover, even after finding the existence of a potential conflict, I must consider whether under all the circumstances discretionary appointment of an independent counsel is appropriate. In each case, therefore, the final decision has been an exercise of my discretion, as provided for under the Act.

I have undertaken the same examination here. Based on the facts as we know them now, I have not concluded that any conflict of interest would ensue from our vigorous and thorough investigation of the allegations contained in your letter.

Your letter relies upon press reports, certain documents and various public statements which you assert demonstrate that ''officials at the highest level of the White House were involved in formulating, coordinating and implementing the [Democratic National Committee's (DNC's)] fundraising efforts for the 1996 presidential campaign.'' You suggest that a thorough investigation of ''fundraising improprieties'' will therefore necessarily include an inquiry into the ''knowledge and/or complicity of very senior White House officials,'' and that the Department of Justice would therefore have a conflict of interest investigating these allegations.

To the extent that ''improprieties'' comprise crimes, they are being thoroughly investigated by the agents and prosecutors assigned to the task force. Should that investigation develop at any time specific and credible evidence that any covered person may have committed a crime, the Act will be triggered, and I will fulfill my responsibilities under the Act. In addition, should that investigation develop specific and credible evidence that a crime may have been committed by a ''very senior'' White House official who is not covered by the Act, I will decide whether investigation of that person by the Department might result in a conflict of interest, and, if so, whether the discretionary clause should be invoked. Until then, however, the mere fact that employees of the White House and the DNC worked closely together in the course of President Clinton's reelection campaign does not warrant appointment of an independent counsel. As I have stated above, the Department has a long history of investigating allegations of criminal activity by high-ranking Government officials without fear or favor, and will do so in this case.

I also do not accept the suggestion that there will be widespread public distrust of the actions and conclusions of the Department if it continues to investigate this matter, creating a conflict of interest warranting the appointment of an independent counsel. First, unless I find that the investigation of a particular person against whom specific and credible allegations have been made would pose a conflict, I have no authority to utilize the procedures of the Act. Moreover, I have confidence that the career professionals in the Department will investigate this matter in a fashion that will satisfy the American people that justice has been done.

Finally, even were I to determine that a conflict of interest of the sort contemplated by the statute exists in this case—and as noted above I do not find such a conflict at this time—there would be a number of weighty considerations that I would have to consider in determining whether to exercise my discretion to seek an independent counsel at this time. Because invocation of the conflict of interest provision is discretionary, it would still be my responsibility in that circumstance to weigh all the factors and determine whether appointment of an independent counsel would best serve the national interest. If in the future this investigation reveals evidence indicating that a conflict of interest exists, these factors will continue to weigh heavily in my evaluation of whether or not to invoke the discretionary provisions of the Act.

I assure you, once again, that allegations of violations of Federal criminal law with respect to campaign financing in the course of the 1996 Federal elections will be thoroughly investigated and, if appropriate, prosecuted. At this point it appears to me that that task should be performed by the Department of Justice and its career investigators and prosecutors. I want to emphasize, however, that the task force continues to receive new information (much has been discovered even since I received your letter), and I will continue to monitor the investigation closely in light of my responsibilities under the Independent Counsel Act. Should future developments make it appropriate to invoke the procedures of the Act, I will do so without hesitation.

Sincerely,

JANET RENO.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have circularized my intent to pursue this amendment, and there is no other Senator on the floor now who seeks recognition. Before suggesting the absence of a quorum, let me say that we had talked earlier about having a vote on the Kyl mendment at 5 o'clock this afternoon. We have not yet locked in that amendment, but it is now being hot lined. It is my expectation that we will vote at 5 o'clock this afternoon on the Kyl amendment.

I now ask, Madam President, that anybody who opposes the sense-of-the-Senate resolution for independent counsel come to speak, anybody who favors it come to speak, or if somebody has another amendment, come to speak. We will be glad to set this aside and proceed with the business.

We also ask there be a hot line looking for a unanimous consent agreement later this afternoon, perhaps early evening, 6 o'clock, 6:30, to limit any further amendments which may be offered so that we may get a calendar as to what we are going to do on this bill to proceed to third reading and final disposition, because it is the intention of the managers to move for third reading if no other amendments are pending.

I thank the Chair, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ann McKinley, a fellow on my staff, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of the fiscal year 1998 Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1056

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I actually will be brief. I had a chance yesterday to speak in opposition to the amendment of my colleague from Arizona, Senator KYL. I know that other Senators have spoken about this as well.

I was on the floor early this morning when both Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN spoke about it. Mr. President, the part of the Kyl amendment which I am sympathetic to, and my guess is that a good many other Senators are sympathetic to it as well, would be the effort to try to expand funding for the Pell Grant Program. And, Mr. President, as my colleague, Senator HARKIN from Iowa, said earlier this morning, interestingly enough, the Pell Grant Program, named after Claiborne Pell, our Senator—I think all of us really came to admire and believe in Claiborne Pell—really does represent a kind of positive role for the public sector, for Government, because what we as a country have decided is that there are certain decisive areas of life in a

nation where you do not just leave it up to a market verdict.

If, in fact, you have a family, a young person or not such a young person who cannot afford higher education, there is a role to make sure that man or that woman can afford to go on to college, especially since this is becoming more and more important in determining how they will do economically or how their families will do.

Indeed, there is a statistic that is a shameful statistic that we have had since the late 1970's, about an 8-percent graduation rate from colleges and universities of those men and women from families with incomes under $20,000 a year, the main reason being that they have not been able to afford to go on and get their higher education.

I said this yesterday—and I will have an amendment that will try to speak to this today or tomorrow—it is also true that with all the discussion about HOPE scholarships and tax credits, since they are not refundable, all families with incomes below $28,000 a year are not going to become eligible. So we still have a huge hole, especially for those students from moderate- and low-income families. So it seems to me, if we are going to be talking about providing support for higher education and for families and for young men and women and older men and women—many of our students are older now in our community colleges—we ought to make sure that low-income are included.

The problem with the Kyl amendment is that he takes the funding from the LIHEAP, the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program, which is a lifeline program for very vulnerable families, especially for those of us who represent cold weather States, although part of low-income energy assistance is also, I say to the Chair, since he is from the great State of North Carolina, some of it also is for cooling assistance. I think it was two summers ago that we had a number of people in Chicago, poor people, who died, elderly people, from exposure to heat. They just could not afford air conditioning.

So, Mr. President, what the Kyl amendment does is it rescinds about $500 million, takes about half of what is in a $1 billion program—it has already been cut way down—and it essentially ends the program.

Mr. President, I just want people to know, my colleagues to know—I think they do—I think we are going to have a strong vote in opposition to the amendment, and that the vast majority of the recipients of an energy grant is maybe $300 a year, or thereabouts. It is a lifeline program. It just enables an elderly person to be able to afford heat and not have to then spend more than she can afford and, therefore, not be able to get ahold of a prescription drug she needs or maybe have to cut back on food on the table.

It is not much. It is extremely important. The vast majority of the citizens—there are about 110,000 households in Minnesota that have participated, have incomes under $8,000 a year. These are not wealthy people or middle-income people. These are people who are hard pressed. This is a lifeline program. It represents the goodness in us. And we cannot be gutting this program.

I have been involved in this fight to kind of maintain or protect the LIHEAP program for the last 3 or 4 years. I do not know why we have to go through this every time.

Mr. President, let me just make it clear that if you wanted to expand the Pell Grant Program, I can think of other ways to do it. I mean, now we know that with the B–2, the stealth bomber program, we have planes that cannot fly in the rain or the snow. I mean, I will have an amendment later on that will say, let us not build any more of these turkeys. And you can just transfer that funding for the Pell Grant Program. But do not take it out of low-income energy assistance.

I see my colleague from Pennsylvania here. I thank him for his graciousness in allowing me to have some time to speak about this. But again, colleagues have heard it from the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER, Senator HARKIN, any number of Senators who have come to the floor on this. And, again, I hope there will be a strong vote against the amendment.

It is extremely important. It is a matter of elementary decency, if you will, to provide people with some support that they need. It is a lifeline support program. And I tell you, to a cold weather State like Minnesota, it is very important. We already know in Minnesota right now that we are going to have to ask for some additional emergency energy assistance. We did last winter. That is what happens. This is an underfunded program, not overfunded. The only reason I do not have an amendment calling for more funding is I know the White House, the administration, has been good about providing that emergency funding for States that need it.

So, Mr. President, the last thing in the world that makes any sense is to essentially gut this program by rescinding $500 million. To all my colleagues, I hope you will vote against this amendment. To Senator KYL, who is a Senator that I like and respect, I think you are profoundly mistaken with this amendment, as much as I appreciate your good work here. I hope that we will have a very strong bipartisan vote against this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by Senator KYL. I am reluctant to do so because I strongly support changes in the eligibility rules for independent and dependent students for Pell grants.

Congress needs to make changes in the eligibility rules for these students. Both independent students and dependent students are unfairly disadvantaged by the rules now in effect. Today, single independent students at public 4-year institutions are not eligible for a Pell grant if their income is over $10,000. Many of these students will not benefit from the HOPE tax credit and the tax credit for lifelong learning. Federal funds should be available to help them meet their most basic college expenses.

A similar problem faces dependent students. The income protection allowance is so low for them that it has become a disincentive for college students to work part-time to help them contribute to college costs. Over three-quarters of undergraduates work part-time while enrolled in college. The current system penalizes students who work during the summer and part-time through the school year by reducing their Pell grant eligibility. We should be encouraging students to take part-time jobs, rather than take out additional loans.

The budget agreement contains a commitment to allocate $700 million for changes to the needs analysis formula under the Pell grants. The House appropriations subcommittee provided over $500 million toward this commitment, but the Senate bill contains no funds for this needed change.

I am working with others in Congress and with the Department of Education to ensure that a satisfactory appropriation level is contained in the final bill.

Senator KYL supports making funds available to reform the needs analysis. But unfortunately, to pay for the reform, he makes a deep cut in the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

For the 5 million beneficiaries of LIHEAP across the Nation, including 120,000 in Massachusetts, it will be an unnecessarily harsh winter if this important program is slashed.

Some 95 percent of the households receiving LIHEAP assistance have annual incomes below $18,000. They spend an extremely burdensome 18 percent of their income on energy, compared to the average middle-class family, which spends only 4 percent.

Researchers at Boston City Hospital have documented a ''heat or eat effect.'' Higher utility bills during the coldest months force low-income families to spend less money on food. The result is increased malnutrition among children.

Almost twice as many low-weight and undernourished children were admitted to Boston City Hospital's emergency room immediately following the coldest month of the winter. No family should have to choose between heating and eating.

Low-income elderly will be at the greatest risk if LIHEAP funds are slashed, because they are the most vulnerable to hypothermia. In fact, older Americans accounted for more than half of all hypothermia deaths in 1991.

In addition, the elderly are much more likely to live in homes built before 1940, which are less energy efficient and put them at greater risk.

Low-income elderly who have trouble paying their fuel bills are often driven

to rely on room heaters, fireplaces, ovens, and wood-burning stoves to save money. Between 1986 and 1990, these higher-risk heating sources were the second leading cause of fire deaths among the elderly. In fact, elderly citizens are up to 12 times more likely to die in heating-related fires than adults under 65.

LIHEAP is a lifeline for Massachusetts and many other cold weather States. I hope we can work together to make the needs analysis changes in the Pell grants, without denying this lifeline to a very vulnerable group. I urge that the Kyl amendment be defeated.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to join with the distinguished chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator SPECTER and the subcommittee's ranking member Senator HARKIN, in opposition to Senator KYL's amendment to cut funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP]. While I applaud the Senator from Arizona's goal to increase funding for Pell grants, I can not sanction a move that would essentially gut the LIHEAP program, effectively depriving millions of the disadvantaged, elderly, and disabled of critical assistance.

Mr. President, the appropriation for LIHEAP has declined more than 50 percent over the past decade, down from $2.1 billion in fiscal 1985. During that time, the eligible population has grown from 23 to 30 million. In Vermont, Federal cutbacks have forced the State to push back the deadline for applying for fuel aid to September 2. Mr. President, I strongly disagree with the contention that the need for fuel assistance has declined since the program's founding. Last winter, two-thirds of the 1,400 Vermonters who missed the State's benefits deadline were denied assistance; and the number of people who ran out of fuel and requested emergency aid doubled.

Mr. President, Federal cutbacks since 1995 have reduced the number of families in Vermont that receive assistance from over 24,000 to around 12,000 this year. These families should not face the prospect of further cutbacks.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize to the program's critics that LIHEAP helps the neediest of the needy. As others have already stated, almost 70 percent of recipient families have an annual income of less than $8,000, and 44 percent have at least one member who is elderly and 20 percent have one member who is disabled. Currently, only 5 million families are being served nationally, a million less than 2 years ago.

Mr. President, this is a time to increase funding for LIHEAP not decrease it. Last month, as cochair of the Northeast-Midwest Senate Coalition, I spearheaded a letter to Senators SPECTER and HARKIN that asked for an increase in regular funding for LIHEAP so that the program is not forced to rely on releases of emergency funds to meet basic needs. Fifty-five Senators signed on to this letter.

Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee should be commended for recognizing that the need for LIHEAP is greater than current resources. The committee has included $1.2 billion in so-called advance funds for fiscal 1999. I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly reject this amendment to cut LIHEAP and support Senators SPECTER and HARKIN in their effort to increase LIHEAP funding in fiscal 1999.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and 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. SPECTER. 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. SPECTER. Mr. President, there has been a hotline run, that is to say, Senators on both sides of the aisle have been notified, and I now ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on or in relation to the pending Kyl amendment at 5 p.m. today.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I again renew the request that any Senator who has an amendment to offer should come to the floor. And again I say that we are going to be seeking a unanimous-consent agreement to limit amendments which were filed, trying to get that accomplished by late afternoon or early evening.

Again, in the absence of any Senator on the floor seeking recognition, 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. 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 rise to discuss the pending amendment. I understand we will soon vote on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, Senator KYL. I wanted to take just a moment to address that amendment that is before the body.

Mr. President, Senator KYL has suggested that we increase Pell grant funding by $528 million. That is a worthy goal. That is something that I would like to see done. But he suggests paying for it by taking that money out of the low-income heating assistance program.

The Senator from Arizona experiences a different reality than the one I experience. The Senator from Arizona says the energy crisis is over; the need for low-income heating assistance has ended. I could not disagree more. We have just had in my State the worst winter in our history. In fact, we saw heating oil prices spike significantly, with natural gas hitting an all-time high. Propane spiked dramatically, hitting an all-time high.

Mr. President, this is not the time to end the low-income heating assistance program. We just went through a winter in which not only did we have the worst winter in terms of snowfall in our history, but we had, if I am not mistaken, eight blizzards and nine major winter storms. We also had the most powerful winter storm in 50 years in the first week of April.

Mr. President, that was devastating in my State. In fact, this collection of storms was devastating in my State. Low-income heating assistance played a key role in helping people who are faced with the choice between heating and eating. That is not a choice anybody should have to make in this country.

So, while I certainly support the underlying intention of the Senator from Arizona to increase assistance for Pell grants, I would simply point to the record of what we have already done.

We have a $1 billion increase for Pell grants in this legislation; funding of $6.9 billion for Pell grants. Again, I would like to see that increased further. But I don't think the way to fund it is to dramatically reduce what is available for low-income heating assistance. This bill has $1 billion for fiscal year 1998 in low-income heating assistance and $300 million in an emergency contingency fund. To cut back by $528 million to add to Pell grants I don't think can be justified.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing the Kyl amendment, not because I am opposed to an increase in Pell grants but because I am opposed to taking it out of low-income heating assistance at a time when we have just experienced in the northern plains the worst winter in our history, and, if the almanac is to be believed, we may be faced with another tough winter this year. I hope that is not the case, but if it is, low-income heating assistance may make the difference between people making a decision of heating versus eating. Again, that is not a decision anybody should have to make.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. 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. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we be given an extra 5 minutes past 5 o'clock to make statements.

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

NATIONAL DAY OF RECOGNITION FOR THE HUMANITARIAN EFFORTS OF DIANA, PRINCESS OF WALES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am offering for myself, Senator LEAHY, Senator SPECTER, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator MIKULSKI, and I am sure others, a resolution that designates Saturday, September 6, 1997, as a National Day of Recognition for the Humanitarian Efforts of Diana, Princess of Wales.

Death is always difficult to accept. It is, however, more difficult when it captures someone in the prime of her life as it has Princess Diana. It is safe to say that events surrounding her death will make us all take a closer look at the handling of this event by the press, its responsibilities, and the role it should play in the future.

As a mother, humanitarian, and a goodwill ambassador, Princess Diana was an inspiration to many people throughout the world who admired her strength in adversity, her dedication to those less fortunate, and her devoted love to her children.

The extraordinary outpouring of grief and affection is a true testament to the legacy that she leaves. The stunning array of flowers, candles, and notes in front of the British Embassy is just one indication of the high esteem in which the Princess was held here in the United States. Our country rejected a monarchy a long time ago, but we know a true friend when we see one.

In a town accustomed to the art of issue advocacy, the Princess of Wales was clearly one of the most persuasive and compelling advocates to have graced our Nation's Capital. Much has already been said about her efforts to raise awareness and attention to breast cancer and AIDS. She recently took up the cause of banning the deployment of antipersonnel landmines. She was informed and articulate and committed to these causes.

Many people can make speeches, and many people can throw gala benefits. What set Diana apart from others working for these same causes was the gentleness of her spirit. To break the back of intolerance and to help to dispel unfounded notions about AIDS, Diana broke tradition, and held babies afflicted with AIDS in her arms and to offer her hands to comfort AIDS patients.

We understood that she participated in these activities not just out of a sense of duty but because she genuinely cared. She delighted in children, commiserated with the rank and file, and listened to the elderly or less fortunate. Her vulnerability was also her strength. She could connect with people like few people ever could. She was indeed the people's Princess.

Although she was a symbol of glamour and celebrity, she taught us all that the quality of life is measured by what you do for others and how you treat others. By that measure, Diana's all too short life was very rich indeed. Her warmth and joie de vivre transcended wealth and power.

Along with my fellow Utahns and millions of people around the world, Elaine and I were shocked and saddened to hear the tragic news of her untimely and tragic death. We want to extend our sincere and heartfelt condolences and sympathy to her family, and especially to her two sons, Prince William and Prince Harry.

In offering this resolution, Mr. President, Senator LEAHY and I believe it is appropriate to extend the sympathy of all Americans to the people of the United Kingdom on the death of such an extraordinary lady.

Mr. President, we expect to pass this today and I urge the support of all of our colleagues.

This is a sad event. This was a sad day. This is a tremendous loss for the world. And this is the least we can do.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am proud to cosponsor with the senior Senator from Utah this resolution that designates September 6, 1997, as a National Day of Recognition for the Humanitarian Efforts of Diana, Princess of Wales.

What we try to do with this resolution is to convey a sense of the tremendous sorrow that Americans—indeed, people around the world—felt at the shocking news of her death in Paris.

I was with my wife in Vermont, and was called out of a gathering to be given the preliminary news of the accident. The two of us went back to our home that evening praying that the injuries were not life threatening. Of course, within a matter of hours we learned that she had died.

We have all been moved by the outpouring of affection by people everywhere, who remember the Princess of Wales as an extraordinary humanitarian who gave voice to the most vulnerable people. I remember the conversations I had with her about the scourge of landmines. This was an issue that I was honored to work with her on. She and Elizabeth Dole, the wife of our former distinguished majority leader and President of the American Red Cross, and myself and others, held a fundraiser for the victims of landmines earlier this year, and raised over half a million dollars for people who had lost arms and legs or their eyesight from landmines. She could do that, by simply spending an evening talking about the plight of landmine victims. She said about her trip to Angola, ''Before I went to Angola, I knew the facts but the reality was a shock.'' I wish more people would go see what she saw, and walk where she walked. Landmines would be banned tomorrow.

A lot of us can give speeches about landmines. Many people around the world have worked to stop the scourge of landmines, but Diana brought a human face to the crusade to ban them. She gave a voice to landmine victims. When she visited them, in Angola, or Bosnia, the whole world saw those victims. When she held in her arms a child maimed by a landmine, the whole world saw that child. And when they saw her walk into a minefield, the whole world saw the danger so many people face every day.

There was never a question in my mind, in my conversations with her, about the sincerity of her compassion. She saw the victims of landmines through the eyes of a mother, a mother who cared not only for her own two sons, but for the sons and daughters of those dying worldwide.

This week and next week nations of the world meet in Oslo to take the final steps toward an international treaty banning landmines. I hope each of them will think of what this woman did, in calling attention to the victims of landmines. There would be no more fitting memorial to this great woman than a treaty that bans anti-personnel landmines from this Earth forever.

I thank my distinguished colleague. I have appreciated working with him on this. He spoke about the many other humanitarian causes the Princess was involved in. I mentioned landmines, of course, because I saw first-hand how she became involved not as a Princess but as a mother, a mother who knew how other mothers suffered when their children suffered. She spoke for all of us.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1056

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Under the previous order, the Senate will now vote on amendment No. 1056 offered by the Senator from Arizona. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MURKOWSKI] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 74, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 213 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Allard	Gramm	McCain
Ashcroft	Hatch	McConnell
Breaux	Helms	Nickles
Brownback	Hutchinson	Roberts
Cochran	Hutchison	Sessions
Coverdell	Inhofe	Shelby
Faircloth	Kyl	Thurmond
Feinstein	Lott	
Gorton	Mack	

NAYS—74

Abraham	Durbin	Lieberman
Akaka	Enzi	Lugar
Baucus	Feingold	Mikulski
Bennett	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Frist	Moynihan
Bingaman	Glenn	Murray
Bond	Graham	Reed
Boxer	Grams	Reid
Bryan	Grassley	Robb
Bumpers	Gregg	Rockefeller
Burns	Hagel	Roth
Byrd	Harkin	Santorum
Campbell	Hollings	Sarbanes
Chafee	Inouye	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Coats	Johnson	Snowe
Collins	Kempthorne	Specter
Conrad	Kennedy	Stevens
Craig	Kerrey	Thomas
D'Amato	Kerry	Thompson
Daschle	Kohl	Torricelli
DeWine	Landrieu	Warner
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Domenici	Leahy	Wyden
Dorgan	Levin	

NOT VOTING—1

Murkowski

The amendment (No. 1056) was rejected.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HARKIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order so the Senator from Pennsylvania may be recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, after consulting with the majority leader, it is our intention to proceed with a series of amendments and to have perhaps two stacked votes at about 7 o'clock. We have next up an amendment that will just take a moment or two, a very brief amendment by Senator MCCAIN. Then we are going to follow that with a brief amendment by Senator NICKLES.

Will that require a rollcall vote, Senator NICKLES? It will.

Then we have an amendment by Senator LIEBERMAN, and then we will be in a position to, we hope, have a list of amendments which will be limited so we can proceed to see precisely how we will finish the bill.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, will the Senator entertain a unanimous-consent request, a brief one?

Mr. SPECTER. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the manager.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE—VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1057

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I was absent this morning during the vote on the Harkin amendment. Had I been here, I would have voted with the distinguished Senator from Iowa. I was at the funeral of a friend, an employee of 35 years, who passed on, and I was privileged to give the eulogy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I have an amendment I would send to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1074

(Purpose: To provide for the establishment of a program for research and training with respect to Parkinson's disease)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FORD, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. BREAUX, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. REID, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. BRYAN, proposes an amendment numbered 1074.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . PARKINSON'S DISEASE RESEARCH.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act of 1997''.

(b) FINDING AND PURPOSE.—

(1) FINDING.—Congress finds that to take full advantage of the tremendous potential for finding a cure or effective treatment, the Federal investment in Parkinson's must be expanded, as well as the coordination strengthened among the National Institutes of Health research institutes.

(2) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to provide for the expansion and coordination of research regarding Parkinson's, and to improve care and assistance for afflicted individuals and their family caregivers.

(c) PARKINSON'S RESEARCH.—Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PARKINSON'S DISEASE

''SEC. 409B. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall establish a program for the conduct and support of research and training with respect to Parkinson's disease (subject to the extent of amounts appropriated under subsection (e)).

''(b) INTER-INSTITUTE COORDINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall provide for the coordination of the program established under subsection (a) among all of the national research institutes conducting Parkinson's research.

''(2) CONFERENCE.—Coordination under paragraph (1) shall include the convening of a research planning conference not less frequently than once every 2 years. Each such conference shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives a report concerning the conference.

''(c) MORRIS K. UDALL RESEARCH CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall award Core Center Grants to encourage the development of innovative multidisciplinary research and provide training concerning Parkinson's. The Director shall award not more than 10 Core Center Grants and designate each center funded under such grants as a Morris K. Udall Center for Research on Parkinson's Disease.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to Parkinson's, each center assisted under this subsection shall—

''(i) use the facilities of a single institution or a consortium of cooperating institutions, and meet such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Director of the NIH; and

''(ii) conduct basic and clinical research.

''(B) DISCRETIONARY REQUIREMENTS—With respect to Parkinson's, each center assisted under this subsection may—

''(i) conduct training programs for scientists and health professionals;

''(ii) conduct programs to provide information and continuing education to health professionals;

''(iii) conduct programs for the dissemination of information to the public;

''(iv) separately or in collaboration with other centers, establish a nationwide data system derived from patient populations with Parkinson's, and where possible, comparing relevant data involving general populations;

''(v) separately or in collaboration with other centers, establish a Parkinson's Disease Information Clearinghouse to facilitate and enhance knowledge and understanding of Parkinson's disease; and

''(vi) separately or in collaboration with other centers, establish a national education program that fosters a national focus on Parkinson's and the care of those with Parkinson's.

''(3) STIPENDS REGARDING TRAINING PROGRAMS.—A center may use funds provided under paragraph (1) to provide stipends for scientists and health professionals enrolled in training programs under paragraph (2)(B).

''(4) DURATION OF SUPPORT.—Support of a center under this subsection may be for a period not exceeding five years. Such period may be extended by the Director of NIH for one or more additional periods of not more than five years if the operations of such center have been reviewed by an appropriate technical and scientific peer review group established by the Director and if such group has recommended to the Director that such period should be extended.

''(d) MORRIS K. UDALL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN PARKINSON'S DISEASE RESEARCH.—The Director of NIH shall establish a grant program to support investigators with a proven record of excellence and innovation in Parkinson's research and who demonstrate potential for significant future breakthroughs in the understanding of the pathogensis, diagnosis, and treatment of Parkinson's. Grants under this subsection shall be available for a period of not to exceed 5 years.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 and 2000.''.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I could talk at some length about this amendment, and I will not. I will just make a few introductory comments, and then my colleague, Senator MCCAIN, will speak on this.

We have, I believe, close to 66, or thereabouts, cosponsors. This amendment, which I am very proud to offer today, is really an amendment that is

named after Mo Udall, who was a very distinguished Representative in the House of Representatives and somebody that many people here have a great deal of love and respect for.

This amendment would call for 10 Parkinson's research centers. This would be $100 million a year. The reason for this amendment is that Parkinson's disease is a devastating neurological disease. Probably my colleagues are very familiar with it. They may have had a loved one who suffered from it. I had two parents who suffered from Parkinson's disease.

Mr. President, what happens with people with Parkinson's is that there is a tremendous problem with shaking, people have difficulty walking, and many people have really found it difficult to be, if you will, their own lobbyist. People have found it difficult to speak for themselves.

But what has happened in the last several years is that there has been a wonderful group of people who have come here. The Udall family has been very, very important in this whole struggle. In addition, Joan Samuelson, with the Parkinson's Action Network, has been really critical to this. They have come here and I think have met with Senators, Democrats and Republicans alike. This is a bipartisan effort we have on the floor of the Senate. They have essentially said to all of us, ''Time is not on our side. We have the research that we can point to. It is such promising research. We are on the cuspis of major breakthroughs, but if we do not at least increase this funding for research for many of us, we really will not have that much of a future.''

Mr. President, there are a million people in our country, men and women who struggle with Parkinson's disease. Up to now, we have been spending about $30 per person. It is a really shamefully low amount of money that we have spent. Very little has been invested.

But now these men and women, this community, has come to the Nation's Capital. They have met with all of us, and they have made their case. I am very honored to offer this amendment with Senator MCCAIN. I hope we will get very, very strong support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add as original cosponsors to this amendment Senator CRAIG, Senator BURNS, Senator DURBIN, Senator FORD, Senator D'AMATO, Senator BREAUX, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, Senator SANTORUM, Senator JOHNSON, Senator SNOWE, Senator HARRY REID, Senator HOLLINGS, Senator TORRICELLI, Senator FAIRCLOTH, Senator LEVIN, and Senator LAUTENBERG.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1074, AS MODIFIED

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send a modification to the desk, along with the cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment, the yeas and nays not having been ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . PARKINSON'S DISEASE RESEARCH.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act of 1997''.

(b) FINDING AND PURPOSE.—

(1) FINDING.—Congress finds that to take full advantage of the tremendous potential for finding a cure or effective treatment, the Federal investment in Parkinson's must be expanded, as well as the coordination strengthened among the National Institutes of Health research institutes.

(2) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to provide for the expansion and coordination of research regarding Parkinson's, and to improve care and assistance for afflicted individuals and their family caregivers.

(c) PARKINSON'S RESEARCH.—Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PARKINSON'S DISEASE

''SEC. 409B. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall establish a program for the conduct and support of research and training with respect to Parkinson's disease (subject to the extent of amounts appropriated under subsection (e)).

''(b) INTER-INSTITUTE COORDINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall provide for the coordination of the program established under subsection (a) among all of the national research institutes conducting Parkinson's research.

''(2) CONFERENCE.—Coordination under paragraph (1) shall include the convening of a research planning conference not less frequently than once every 2 years. Each such conference shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives a report concerning the conference.

''(c) MORRIS K. UDALL RESEARCH CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall award Core Center Grants to encourage the development of innovative multidisciplinary research and provide training concerning Parkinson's. The Director shall award not more than 10 Core Center Grants and designate each center funded under such grants as a Morris K. Udall Center for Research on Parkinson's Disease.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to Parkinson's, each center assisted under this subsection shall—

''(i) use the facilities of a single institution or a consortium of cooperating institutions, and meet such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Director of the NIH; and

''(ii) conduct basic and clinical research.

''(B) DISCRETIONARY REQUIREMENTS.—With respect to Parkinson's, each center assisted under this subsection may—

''(i) conduct training programs for scientists and health professionals;

''(ii) conduct programs to provide information and continuing education to health professionals;

''(iii) conduct programs for the dissemination of information to the public;

''(iv) separately or in collaboration with other centers, establish a nationwide data system derived from patient populations with Parkinson's, and where possible, comparing relevant data involving general populations;

''(v) separately or in collaboration with other centers, establish a Parkinson's Disease Information Clearinghouse to facilitate and enhance knowledge and understanding of Parkinson's disease; and

''(vi) separately or in collaboration with other centers, establish a national education program that fosters a national focus on Parkinson's and the care of those with Parkinson's.

''(3) STIPENDS REGARDING TRAINING PROGRAMS.—A center may use funds provided under paragraph (1) to provide stipends for scientists and health professionals enrolled in training programs under paragraph (2)(B).

''(4) DURATION OF SUPPORT.—Support of a center under this subsection may be for a period not exceeding five years. Such period may be extended by the Director of NIH for one or more additional periods of not more than five years if the operations of such center have been reviewed by an appropriate technical and scientific peer review group established by the Director and if such group has recommended to the Director that such period should be extended.

''(d) MORRIS K. UDALL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN PARKINSON'S DISEASE RESEARCH.—The Director of NIH shall establish a grant program to support investigators with a proven record of excellence and innovation in Parkinson's research and who demonstrate potential for significant future breakthroughs in the understanding of the pathogenesis, diagnosis, and treatment of Parkinson's. Grants under this subsection shall be available for a period of not to exceed 5 years.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section and section 301 and title IV of The Public Health Service Act with respect to direct Parkinson's disease research, there are authorized to be appropriated a total of $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I defer to my colleague from Arizona, and I thank him for his—I am not going to use the word ''leadership'' because many people always talk about Senator MCCAIN's leadership—but for his emotional and personal involvement. He is a Senator who is very connected to people. I thank him for all of his work. I hope we will get a good, strong vote.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Minnesota. He is a man of great spirit, a man of great commitment. When the Senator from Minnesota gets involved in an issue, he is heard from. I believe his involvement in this issue is important and, indeed, critical. I don't think it is inappropriate to mention that the life of the Senator from Minnesota has been touched in the most graphic and dramatic fashion by this disease we are discussing today. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I support Senator WELLSTONE's amendment. Scientists have made tremendous new discoveries and progress in regard to Parkinson's disease, which clearly illustrates how close we are to finding a cure and treatment for this deadly disease. According to a wide array of experts, we

are on the verge of substantial, groundbreaking scientific discoveries in the next few years regarding the cause and potential cure of Parkinson's disease.

The most recent scientific discovery of a gene abnormality that causes some cases of Parkinson's disease has provided researchers with a powerful new tool for understanding Parkinson's disease. This is the kind of breakthrough that makes a strong case for ensuring adequate funding for Parkinson's research.

I don't come to the floor very often on a situation like this, but there is a gross inequity here and one that needs rectification. I find it gravely disturbing that despite the significant progress scientists are making in the field of Parkinson's, the National Institutes of Health continuously fail to provide an appropriate amount of funding for Parkinson's research, which is why the Senator from Minnesota and I are here.

During fiscal year 1996, the National Institutes of Health spent $32 million for direct Parkinson's research. That is about $32 for each of the approximately 1 million Parkinson's patients—$32 for each of the approximately 1 million Parkinson's patients. Compare this to the $2,143 per AIDS victim; $338 per cancer victim; or $200 per breast cancer victim; or $81 per Alzheimer's victim; $74 per heart disease victim, not including the additional funding just adopted as an amendment to this bill.

Obviously, funding for Parkinson's research is grossly inadequate compared to support which other diseases receive at NIH. By failing to provide scientists with adequate funding, we are potentially letting a cure for this dreadful disease slip further and further into the future. This amendment will ensure that our scientific researchers have available the necessary funding and support to proceed as quickly as possible to combat Parkinson's.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has described what this legislation would do, including the establishment of 10 Morris K. Udall Centers for Research on Parkinson's Disease throughout the Nation, create a national Parkinson's disease clearinghouse and other things.

Approximately 1 million Americans are afflicted with Parkinson's disease. Parkinson's is a debilitating, degenerative disease which is caused when nerve centers in an individual's brain lose their ability to regulate body movements. People afflicted by this disease experience tremors, loss of balance and repeated falls, loss of memory, confusion and depression. Ultimately, this disease results in total incapacity of an individual, including the inability to speak. This disease knows no boundaries, does not discriminate and strikes without warning.

This amendment is supported by the National Parkinson's Foundation, the American Parkinson's Disease Association and Parkinson's Action Network. These organizations, as well as many other individuals involved in grassroots support activities, have worked long and hard to achieve widespread support for this authorization bill in both the House and Senate.

The Mo Udall Parkinson's Research and Education Act, which is the basis for this amendment, has 64 cosponsors in the Senate and approximately 240 cosponsors in the House. Mr. President, we cannot afford to lose this opportunity to continue the momentous progress in finding the cause for a cure for this terrible illness. On behalf of the millions of Americans afflicted with Parkinson's and their families and friends, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HATCH be added as an original cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, finally, I would like to thank the people that I mentioned earlier—the National Parkinson's Foundation, the American Parkinson's Disease Association, and Parkinson's Action Network. Without the help of these organizations, we would not be here today.

Finally, I know sometimes amendments have a tendency to be dropped in conference. The Senator from Minnesota and I feel very strongly about this amendment, and that is why we feel it is necessary that we have a rollcall vote on this issue. I hope that the managers of the bill will see the way clear to preserve this amendment in conference, as it is supported by, as I mentioned, now 65 of our colleagues in the Senate and over 240 Members of the House.

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. MCCAIN. I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to add one final word to what my colleague, Senator MCCAIN, has had to say. Above and beyond the organizations that Senator MCCAIN recognized for their fine work, and above and beyond Mo Udall, this amendment comes from legislation which, as I said, is really named after Mo Udall, for reasons I don't need to explain to any colleague. I also would like to thank, but I want to do this carefully, Muhammad Ali, who has been very courageous, and I use that word carefully. Muhammad Ali struggles with Parkinson's, and he could have chosen to have had the world or the country have only seen him as he was when he was in his prime as a boxer. Instead, he has been very public, very visible and a very, very strong advocate, not just for himself but for many, many other people.

Mr. President, I say to my colleagues, and I know that my colleague from Indiana is going to have a second-degree amendment which I think really adds strength to this and he has some very thoughtful and important questions to raise or comments to make, but I am going to end on a personal note. I want to say to everybody here that we really do need to have a strong vote, and we need to keep this in conference.

When Senator MCCAIN was talking about this disorder and what it does to people, I remember when L-Dopa, the first drug, came out. My father was in the original pilot group. For a while, L-Dopa helped, but then it reached the point where it did not. With my father, Leon Wellstone, at the very end, he not only could not walk, and he was a writer and his hand would shake and he could not type, but, in addition, he could not even speak.

It can be so ravaging to people. It can be so devastating. The reason we have brought this amendment to the floor is that it is an equity question. So precious little has been invested in Parkinson's research at the very time when there is such potential for big breakthroughs.

I want to make it clear to everybody that we have had the Parkinson's community come here to Washington, and they have come year after year for the last 3 or 4 years that they have been working on this. Each time, we make progress, and then at the very end, for some reason, they get shut out.

So I make a plea to people on the basis of please vote for this funding. It is just a matter of elementary fairness and justice. It is just a matter of equity. Please don't shut people out. I just don't want to see people who have been so courageous and who have come here and have struggled so hard not be successful in this Senate and in this House of Representatives. We have to pass this legislation. It really would be a wonderful vote, and it really would make a huge difference in the lives of many of our neighbors and many of our friends who are men and women of enormous worth and enormous dignity and enormous substance. Nothing I say is said out of pity, it is said out of respect for the dignity of people. I just would like to say one more time, I hope we will get a huge vote for this amendment. I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this amendment to provide a statutory program for research and training with respect to Parkinson's, I think, is well founded.

We have worked within the subcommittee to increase the funding for the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke which included language in the Senate report highlighting the importance of further activity on Parkinson's disease research. And the activities of the sponsors of

this amendment, whom I commend, will direct greater intensive effort on Parkinson's, which is a horrible disease. It has afflicted many, many people.

With the enactment of this amendment, I think we will be taking a firm stand to show the emphasis that the Senate, hopefully, ultimately the full Congress, will place on additional research and resources being directed against Parkinson's.

There is a great deal that could be said. We have a number of other amendments, so I will limit my comments to those brief remarks.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I want to concur with what the chairman just said about this amendment. Obviously, all of us are very concerned about the lack of, shall we say, appropriate funding levels for research into the causes and interventions and cures of Parkinson's disease. This is something that I have been very close to for the last several years. I know that both Senator MCCAIN and Senator WELLSTONE have been leaders on this issue in the Senate. And I congratulate them and commend them for their leadership on the issue of proper funding for Parkinson's research.

There have been some recent breakthroughs in the causes of Parkinson's, some recent breakthroughs in genetic tracing, some recent breakthroughs in possible interventions, early interventions for those who are detected early with the onset of Parkinson's disease.

This is a quantum increase. It is not out of bounds. Certainly the incidents of Parkinson's disease in this country and around the globe warrants the type of investment in research that the amendment anticipates. It remains to be seen whether or not we can accommodate this huge increase within the confines of the conference. I can assure the authors of the amendment that this Senator, and I am sure that Senator SPECTER, will do what we can to maintain this type of a level for Parkinson's research. What the disposition will be on the House side, obviously, we have no control over that. But I want to commend both Senator MCCAIN and Senator WELLSTONE for their leadership on this issue and hope that we can do what we can in conference to keep the funding level up for Parkinson's research.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I want to add my support to this. I have been a supporter of additional funds for Parkinson's. But in the process of all of this, and serving on the committee, I have raised, on a number of occasions, my concerns that we are making decisions about which diseases, which research centers at NIH receive the funds. We are making that decision, I think, in well-intended ways, in ways that we hope will direct funds to provide breakthroughs and better research and hopefully cures for some of these diseases, yet I have been concerned we are doing it on a piecemeal basis.

I am concerned that those organizations which have the greatest lobbying clout, who have been able to contact the most Senators or Congressmen, the ones who have generated the most support at home or who are best organized have become those that are rewarded by passage of legislation like this, and that those who do not have the lobbying expertise, the lobbying clout, do not have the same kind of friends in Congress that others have and end up being shorted. As a consequence, we are making decisions on the basis of anecdotal evidence—and some scientific evidence—but on the basis of political decisions as much as scientific decisions.

Medical research is a complicated field. NIH is a wonderful organization that attempts to direct funds in ways that will ensure that research dollars are going into those areas where the best results can be obtained. And yet, in my visits to NIH, and talking with a number of people out there, and my observation of the process here, it is clear that those funds are not always directed in the most expeditious manner, not always directed in ways that provide the most hope in terms of finding breakthroughs and in finding cures.

Having said that, there is no question that Parkinson's research over the years has been shorted. In 1994, it had a funding rate of $26 per patient, the lowest of all the major diseases, yet it affects one million or more Americans. Its direct funding in 1994 was only $26 million, the lowest dollar number of all the major diseases.

So I think it is important that we recognize that here is a debilitating disease that affects a million or more Americans, that has had a personal impact on many of us and our families, that has generated a very effective organization that supports research, increased funding for research, but at the same time I think we have to acknowledge or we should acknowledge and recognize that this is not the best way to go about allocating funds for research at NIH, that the lobby group that is the most effective or the Members who are in the best position to direct the funds because of their committee positions or whatever, that is not the way that we ought to be allocating research dollars.

We ought to be doing it on a meritorious basis, one that is supported by medical science, one that receives the recommendation of independent researchers or an independent body or medical experts that certainly have more expertise in this area than we do. I say that because if you look at the list of diseases and the centers and the way we fund those, there is clearly an imbalance. We clearly are directing funds to areas where research is unnecessary or is duplicated. We clearly are not directing funds to areas where we need research.

I have discussed this with NIH officials. I have been told—and will not quote any names—but I have been told by people who are in a position to know, they are duplicating and in some cases tripling the amount of funds going into the same research simply because they are directed by the Congress to fund that specific disease. And, of course, any duplication or triplication or every excess dollar that has to be spent because it is politically directed to be spent and not medically necessary or scientifically required and going to meritorious studies is a dollar that does not go into some other research, whether it is direct research or indirect research, that could offer potentially life-saving breakthroughs in other diseases.

Just an example or two. All of us have heard about Parkinson's, and we are going to increase Parkinson's here. And I am going to support that increase. I will say this. This is the last specific research dollar increase that I am going to support until we have an outside organization that can give us some recommendations as to how to allocate our money. This ''disease of the month'' or who has the best lobby or who has the most influential friends in Congress is not the way that we ought to be directing research funds. But I have been a long-time supporter of Parkinson's.

They have made their case. But I have told them I am not going to continue on this basis. I will support the bill this year, but I am going to be adding shortly an amendment that Senator FRIST will speak to, of which I would like to add him as a cosponsor, which will initiate this study so that we would have a report so that in next year's appropriations process we have before us the information we need in order to make rational decisions, meritorious decisions rather than just simply political decisions. I don't mean just simply political decisions, but decisions that are not wholly supported by medical science.

Very few people have heard of polycystic kidney disease, PKD. I had not heard of it until I was visited by a friend of mine who introduced me to the disease. PKD receives a ridiculously low appropriation, and yet PKD is a disease that affects 500,000 Americans. It affects their kidneys in a way that they do not function. And yet, as a Government, because kidney dialysis is covered under Medicaid and Medicare, we spend untold millions of dollars in paying the bills for kidney dialysis when we provide virtually nothing for research in an area where some amazing advances are possible, according to the medical researchers, that can eliminate this disease and save the taxpayer literally billions of dollars.

But because PKD is something that has not generated a huge lobbying effort, does not have influential friends in Congress in key positions, PKD continues to get the short end of the stick

in terms of research dollars. And yet, if there was ever an area where we ought to be directing research funds, if the medical science says we have an opportunity here to utilize these effectively and provide research, if there is ever an area that can free up funds that we can use for more research, in Parkinson's and other areas, or to help with the Medicare funding or Medicaid funding or Medicare funding, it ought to be in polycystic kidney disease, because the Government, we have agreed we are going to pay for transfusions on dialysis, we are going to pay for those out of Federal funds. And so year after year after year we pay billions of dollars to provide very costly and very difficult relief for people suffering from this disease, and yet we give them virtually nothing in terms of their research.

As a consequence of all that, and through discussions we have had in committee with some NIH scientists and researchers, I think we are coming to a consensus here that we ought to initiate a process by which we can coordinate our research dollars in a way that it gives us an effective use of those dollars and gives us the best chance to provide the best research in the best ways.

This amendment that I am going to offer shortly would require a comprehensive review of NIH and congressional policies and procedures for establishing priorities for research dollars. And that review has to be independent of the agency. The amendment requires that the agency contract with the Institute of Medicine, which I think is a highly respected and reputable institution, to conduct the study according to the statutory specifications, and requires a report to Congress within 6 months so that the authorizing and the appropriating committees for next year's cycle will have that information before them before they make their decisions.

It raises critical questions about how we ought to direct research dollars, talks about how much funding that would be appropriate, and the statutory changes that will be needed to change NIH policies and procedures.

The Institute of Medicine is particularly directed to focus on the factors and criteria used by NIH to make disease funding allocations, to focus on the process by which the funding decisions are made, the mechanisms for public input and the impact of congressional statutory directives.

Again, as I said, Dr. Olonow, from NIH, who testified before our committee, thought that this was an appropriate way to proceed. The funding is drawn from NIH's general administrative funds. None of these funds will come from existing research dollars. This amendment is not opposed by NIH. I think it will give us a means of making wiser decisions about how we appropriate dollars in the future.

AMENDMENT NO. 1075

(Purpose: To provide for the conduct of a comprehensive, independent study of National Institutes of Health research priority setting)

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I now offer this amendment by sending it to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that Senator FRIST be added as an original cosponsor.

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

Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendments so the Coats amendment would be considered as a first-degree amendment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. We have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], for himself and Mr. FRIST, proposes an amendment numbered 1075.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 49, after line 26, add the following:

COMPREHENSIVE INDEPENDENT STUDY OF NIH RESEARCH PRIORITY SETTING

SEC. . (a) STUDY BY THE INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine to conduct a comprehensive study of the policies and process used by the National Institutes of Health to determine funding allocations for biomedical research.

(b) MATTERS TO BE ASSESSED.—The study under subsection (a) shall assess—

(1) the factors or criteria used by the National Institutes of Health to determine funding allocations for disease research;

(2) the process by which research funding decisions are made;

(3) the mechanisms for public input into the priority setting process; and

(4) the impact of statutory directives on research funding decisions.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the Secretary of Health and Human Services enters into the contract under subsection (a), the Institute of Medicine shall submit a report concerning the study to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—The report under paragraph (1) shall set forth the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Institute of Medicine for improvements in the National Institutes of Health research funding policies and processes and for any necessary congressional action.

(d) FUNDING.—Of the amount appropriated in this title for the National Institutes of Health, $300,000 shall be made available for the study and report under this section.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I appreciate the support and the efforts that Senator WELLSTONE has provided. We have discussed this matter on a number of occasions. He is, I believe, willing to accept the amendment and supports what we are trying to do.

I know Senator FRIST and maybe others would like to speak on the Coats amendment. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, could I add Senator BRYAN as an original cosponsor of the Wellstone-McCain amendment.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague from Indiana and also my colleague from Tennessee for their thoughtful and important amendment, and I thank them for their support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. FRIST. I rise to commend my colleagues, Senators WELLSTONE and MCCAIN, for their excellent leadership on this issue and their commitment to improving the lives of patients suffering from Parkinson's disease.

I would like to recognize at this time the important efforts of all of the advocacy groups who have done such a wonderful job in educating people broadly, increasing the awareness about the devastation of this disease, and the continued need for research, and to the causes and to the treatments and to the eventual cure of Parkinson's disease. It is in large part due to these efforts, this broad effort at the grassroots level across this country that there has been increased focus on Parkinson's disease and Parkinson's research at the National Institutes of Health.

I want to reiterate and support the words of my colleague from Indiana who has expressed some concern with regard to the process of how these decisions are made and are brought forward, and thus our amendment which he has put forward. As chair of the subcommittee on public health and safety that has jurisdiction over the majority of the public health agencies, including the National Institutes of Health, I must state today, because I believe we should not be placing authorizing legislation on an appropriations bill but should rather be considering this particular bill within the overall NIH reauthorization process.

I, along with my fellow committee members, Senators JEFFORDS and COATS, have discussed at length the critical role our public health agencies play in improving the health and well being of American citizens. We have a strong commitment to push forward authorization legislation for each of the National Institutes of Health's vital programs, but we have to do this in a systematic way through a coherent process, one in which we would be able to give thoughtful review and comparative review to the programs that we establish.

Thus, although I am very supportive of increasing funding in support for Parkinson's research, my preference very clearly would have been to work

with my colleague and to include this bill within our overall NIH reauthorization bill that would address the various concerns.

I also want to reiterate what my colleague from Indiana has said, that we have to be very careful because once again we are falling into this risky area of establishing a precedent that once again we take a disease either of the week or of the month or of the year or in reflection or in response to a very strong advocacy group and react to that individual disease without consideration of this larger process.

Every week people come to my office with multiple voices requesting more funds to be allocated to research in a variety of diseases. It might be heart disease, lung disease, kidney disease or pancreatic disease or neurological research. Again, each comes forward making a very strong case. As a physician, and as one who is empathetic and who has treated many of these diseases, my initial response is to say we should increase funding, and if we do increase funding we will find a cure, better treatment or relieve suffering.

The problem is that is exactly the way the system works today. I am concerned that if we continue to appropriate as we are today, disease by disease, we are sending an inaccurate or wrong message to our patient groups. Therefore, we come in today with this amendment, to have a comprehensive study of talking, of discussing exactly how these decisions of prioritization, of research, should be made.

As a physician and as a researcher, I understand the many, many complex factors that must be considered in determining the priorities for research and the enormous difficulty that exists in making decisions of heart disease versus lung disease versus renal disease versus pancreatic disease versus Parkinson's disease. Indeed, each of us in this Chamber, if you came and asked us, would have different priorities based on our own personal circumstances, who we know who has come to see us, who in our family has suffered from a particular disease, and then we are asked to turn around and vote on particular pieces of legislation to be supported by the available research dollars.

My fellow members of the Senate Labor Committee and I have discussed the issue of the priority-setting process within the NIH in two hearings, one on May 1 and the other on July 24. In those hearings we engaged the various committee members in the dialog about the process at the National Institutes of Health regarding funding allocation decisions and what should be the appropriate congressional role in directing Federal biomedical research dollars. Our committee members have expressed concern, as again so well articulated by the Senator from Indiana, that Congress should take caution in micromanaging biomedical research by establishing legislative mandates for specific areas of research without a thorough comparative review of other diseases, of other interests.

We have to be honest with ourselves that there is genuine disagreement among various constituencies about how NIH funds should be distributed among the various institutes and agencies at the NIH. Indeed, there has been much discussion over the need for increased Parkinson's research, and I recognize that disputes have taken place regarding over what the exact amount of research dollars currently spent on Parkinson's disease should be.

As legislators, we have a responsibility, an obligation to the American people to assess the overall strategy, the overall system, the overall process of prioritizing our research dollars. We must do that to ensure the public trust in the decisionmaking process as the NIH addresses the health needs of the Nation.

However, we must ensure that we are funding the best scientific opportunities through the appropriate process. I believe we all have the same goal, to use our resources in the very best way possible to reduce the burden of illness and human suffering. Our challenge is to figure out the system, the process, the path for best achieving that goal. I believe the best way to answer these questions is to ensure that the process at the NIH is working, that the public has a vote in that process.

The amendment we are offering today supports a study to be undertaken by the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Science to conduct a comprehensive independent study of the policies and the processes used by the NIH to determine how they allocate funds for biomedical research. The study will look at those factors or criteria that are used to determine funding allocations for disease research, the process by which these research funding decisions are made, the mechanisms for public input into the priority-setting process, to make sure we hear from the public, and lastly, the impact of the statutory directives on research funding decisions.

The report of the study will set forth the findings and the recommendations and the conclusions of the Institute of Medicine for improvements in this process, and the Institute of Medicine will submit the report to both the Senate and the House authorizing committee and Appropriations Committees within 6 months.

I believe this is the best way to address this challenge of prioritizing research. It is my goal that we ensure that the process and the policies at the NIH appropriately address funding allocation and research decisions. The scientific community is equipped to help set the Nation's research priorities.

In conclusion, I again want to state my preference on the underlying amendment would have been to work with my colleagues in the Senate within the overall NIH reauthorization process to resolve the various issues rather than legislating on the appropriations bill today. However, I do support the underlying bill to support the increase in Parkinson's research, and I urge my colleagues to support our amendment to initiate this comprehensive independent study of NIH policies and processes for making funding decisions in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I speak in favor of the Coats amendment and I urge its adoption. I do have problems with the underlying amendment. On the other hand, I recognize that the large majority of Members desire to tell NIH what they should be doing with respect to Parkinson's disease. I also recognize it is a serious problem for those that have Parkinson's disease, and many of my friends across the country do so.

I think the Coats amendment is an important addition to let NIH know that they have to at least be more forthcoming with respect to the processes they use in determining how they should expend the money in research. I, therefore, commend Senator COATS for bringing this to our attention, and as a way to prevent the need for amendments such as the underlying amendment as we move toward the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Parliamentary inquiry. What is the status of the pending issue before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the Coats amendment numbered 1075.

Mr. SPECTER. Further inquiry, Madam President. Has the amendment offered by Senator MCCAIN and Senator WELLSTONE been set aside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been set aside.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana is acceptable to this side of the aisle. It calls for a study which I think is well-founded, and we are prepared to accept it.

I commend my colleague from Indiana for offering the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment numbered 1075, offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment (No. 1075) was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, if we can proceed with sequencing, I have just discussed with the Senator from Indiana a subsequent amendment which he intends to offer and he is prepared to accept a 20-minute time limit, equally divided, so we can proceed to a vote on that amendment in relatively short order.

I believe we will have to get concurrence from my colleague, Senator HARKIN.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SPECTER. I think we will be able to work out a time agreement, 20 minutes equally divided, but we have to check on the other side of the aisle.

Why do we not proceed at this time, and then we will work on that time agreement. I suggest my colleague from Indiana proceed with his 10 minutes at this time.

Mr. COATS. If I could state to the Senator, before we have an agreement, why do I not just, while we are working on the agreement, why do I not begin? I could probably pretty much make my statement, and I might not need the full 10 minutes in the agreement. I will be glad to yield back. There are a certain amount of things I want to say. Until we hear from the other side——

Mr. HARKIN. I think if we might, the Senator from Indiana would go ahead and make some remarks and at least at the beginning outline what his amendment is about. That will certainly alert offices. If we do not hear, in a decent amount of time, that some people are objecting to a time limit, we will go ahead with an agreement.

Mr. SPECTER. I think that arrangement is acceptable.

Why do we not proceed on that basis, with the Senator from Indiana proceeding with his argument, and we will try to solidify that time agreement as we hotline it or allow Members to know what we are doing generally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. COATS. The amendment I will offer, and I will hold offering it until such time as an agreement can be at least reached on the other side, this amendment is something that we have debated before. I think it is an important debate. I think it does not require that we make a lengthy debate because it has been discussed and debated.

I want to make sure that each Senator is aware of a certain practice and the implications of that practice before they cast their final vote on the Parkinson's research or any other research that might involve the use of fetal tissue. The amendment says, briefly, notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the amounts subject to the provisions of subsection (e) of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act of 1997 may be expended for any research which utilizes human fetal tissues, cells, or organs obtained from a living or dead embryo or dead fetus during or after an induced abortion. The subsection does not apply to human fetal tissues, cells, or organs obtained from a spontaneous abortion or an ectopic pregnancy.

We just debated, and I believe will vote tonight or tomorrow, and certainly it will pass and I will vote for it, the provision offered by the Senator from Minnesota to increase funding for Parkinson's research. I was pleased the Senate accepted the amendment I just offered to provide a study which will give us guidance in terms of how we can direct research funds in the future.

But on the question of Parkinson's research, it is important that we address an issue that a lot of people do not like to talk about but it is an issue that I think is relevant and one that is important, and that is that in certain research—and I believe it is very limited research, and fortunately it is research that is much more limited than it was in the past because it has not shown that much promise—the implantation of human fetal tissue has been one of the means by which researchers have attempted to address the symptoms of Parkinson's disease.

Now, from a practical standpoint it is important to understand that the amendment here only affects use of fetal tissue, the use of funds to provide fetal tissue research for Parkinson's disease. There are a number of other diseases, diabetes and others, that use fetal tissue research, and that is a subject for a separate time. This only applies to that particular section of the Udall bill and it simply says that funds that we will appropriate cannot be used for fetal tissue research. It does not affect research in other areas. It does not affect indirect research that affects Parkinson's.

Frankly, I do not know that this should even be an issue in Parkinson's, and I cannot speak with scientific authority, but to the best of my knowledge fetal tissue research has held very little and is diminishing in importance in terms of Parkinson's research.

The Parkinson's Action Network has issued a statement, and I will quote from that statement that says:

> Even those involved with fetal tissue research readily acknowledge that the result of their research will not use human fetal tissues. Current work is intended only to demonstrate the capability. Ultimately, another source of fetal material must be found.

That is the statement from the Parkinson's Action Network.

So we are not even talking about direct use here as a potential cure or alleviation of circumstances of Parkinson's. One of the reasons for that is that human tissue has consistently been found to be unsanitary or not fit for clinical use.

Now, the good news is that there are other sources of tissue that have shown some promise that are not from induced abortions. There are xenografts, fetal pig tissue, that at this time and to my understanding are believed to be more useful than human tissue.

There are human cell lines that are more promising sources of tissue than tissue derived from abortions. Genetically engineered cell research has shown significant promise. And tissue that is derived from miscarried pregnancies is now being utilized as a substitute for utilizing fetal tissue from induced abortions.

So I want my colleagues to understand, we are not trying to impede significant research on Parkinson's from the limited amount of research that does come from fetal tissue. There are alternative means of obtaining tissue, whether it is animal tissue, whether it is human cell lines, whether genetically engineered, or whether it is actual fetal tissue, but fetal tissue obtained from miscarriages, from spontaneous abortions, which are miscarriages, but also from ectopic pregnancies.

So there are alternatives to obtain the material necessary for this research.

In addition, the research seems to be moving away from fetal tissue and even new tissue toward more promising areas of research in Parkinson's disease. Implanted brain stimulators work for some but obviously do not work for all. Surgical pallidotomies, proton therapy, genetic-based therapy—these are all alternatives to the fetal tissue research.

So, therefore, just from a practical standpoint, regardless of how you feel about the ethical question, I think there is a real basis to avoid the controversy and to avoid the profound ethical questions and concerns that arise from the utilization of human fetal tissue through induced abortions.

What are those ethical questions that we ought to be asking ourselves? Many of us in the Senate—I am included in this—either have parents, children, spouses, relatives, friends, or colleagues who have, unfortunately, incurred a neurological disease in which fetal tissue transplantation has offered some hope of treatment. So it is not a subject that we ought to lightly dismiss.

I just outlined why I think in the area of Parkinson's research that it is really not even a major issue any more. But I think we have to address the question of the wrenching dilemma that it ought to pose—that is posed—by the issue of human tissue research. Therefore, I think we ought to be searching for a path that serves both public health needs and concerns and the questions of moral principle, a path that offers hope for breakthroughs in research, for cures, for alleviating symptoms, but a path which also shows ethical insight.

Scientific research does not occur in a moral vacuum. I think it has to be guided by something that is more than just practically possible or feasible research. It has to be guided by some ethical considerations that I think each of us need to ask ourselves.

In this regard, the ethical questions, I believe, are the following:

Question No. 1: Will the use of tissue from elective abortions create an irreversible economic and an institutional bond between abortion centers and biomedical science?

Just think for a minute. If medical research becomes dependent on widespread abortion, a vested interest would clearly be created in a substantial uninterrupted flow of human fetal

tissue. Medical science would be dependent on continued legal abortion on demand. Does that create an ethical dilemma? I would argue that it does. The reason that it does is that there is no way that we could provide sufficient tissue from spontaneous abortions, miscarriages, or ectopic pregnancies because we know that if tissue transplants are the cure for diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, and other neurological trauma, then we are talking about between 34 million and 20 million fetuses a year necessary to supply the need for the fetal tissue to address the problem.

So just on this basis alone, it seems that we need to look at alternative ways to generate fetal tissue without elective abortions—to look at cell cultures, use of animal tissue, and other research that I have just mentioned. We have an ethical nightmare, a potential ethical nightmare that we will face if we can't address ourselves to alternatives.

Another question is: By what right is this fetal tissue obtained? Certainly the remains of the fetus in elective abortions are not donated in the traditional sense of the word. The fetus can't give consent. It is instead provided by the very people who have made the decision to end the life of the fetus. Can the person who ends the life be morally permitted to determine the use of the organs in the life that that person just ended?

Mr. SPECTER. If the distinguished Senator will yield for a moment.

Mr. COATS. I would be happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, we have been checking with various Senators to see if we could reach a unanimous-consent agreement, and it now appears that we will not be able to make that determination very fast. Senators are waiting to find out what is going to happen with respect to the vote and we had earlier talked about stacked votes at 7. It now appears we cannot have stacked votes. So we will set the vote at 7 o'clock by agreement with the other side of the aisle on the Wellstone-McCain, McCain-Wellstone amendment so we will at least proceed with that vote at that time, and by 7 we should be in a position to know what we will be able to do about a unanimous-consent agreement here and further scheduling.

I thank my colleague from Indiana for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make a request that the vote occur at 7 p.m?

Mr. COATS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam Chair, I will not object, but might I inquire, the amendment that we have introduced, Wellstone-McCain, McCain-Wellstone, this precludes a second-degree amendment, I gather. Is that correct?

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry as to whether it precludes a second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present agreement would not preclude a second-degree amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that this vote at 7 preclude a second-degree amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. I agree with that modification, Madam President.

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

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I regret that we were not able to obtain an agreement. I will finish my statement very shortly here and then offer the amendment. I certainly would agree to set it aside so that the Senator from Pennsylvania can continue with what other business he has. We obviously will have to address this issue in greater detail at another time, either later this evening or tomorrow.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I think it may still be possible to have a time agreement, but we could not get that determination. Rather than await that determination to get back-to-back votes, I decided we ought to get the vote set at 7 and perhaps we could have a time agreement entered into after that. We will decide when to have the vote, but perhaps we can have a time agreement. We have a great many amendments pending, and to the extent we can have limited time agreements, we ought to try to do that.

I thank my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. COATS. Let me return to the question of the ethical dilemma that is posed with utilization of fetal tissue in research. There is a broad ethical question that affects all neurological research or any research that utilizes human fetal tissue. I have tried to raise some of the questions that I think ought to give all of us pause before we sign off on the use of human fetal tissue in medical research.

Does it create an irreversible economic and institutional bond been abortion centers and biomedical science? That is a legitimate question. Because if the cure or alleviation of symptoms for neurological diseases, diseases including Alzheimer's and Parkinson's and diabetes and other neurological trauma, is dependent on utilization of human fetal tissue, then we are talking about the need to supply fetal tissue patches or pieces from up to 20 million abortions, induced abortions a year. That poses a profound ethical question.

Second, the question is, by what right will we obtain this fetal tissue? We obtain it with the consent of the very person who has made the decision to end the life of the fetus from which the fetal tissue will be derived. So there is no such thing as consent of the human species, the human being, the human person whose life is ended to provide the fetal tissue in the name of medical science.

And is it really possible to separate the practice of abortion from its use in biomedical research? Are researchers merely using the results of abortion, or are they dictating its practice?

There are real concerns about how fetal tissue is derived, how it is procured. A report issued by the University of Minnesota Center for Bioethics has stated that in Sweden, ''Doctors say they have obtained brain tissues with a forceps before the fetus was suctioned out of the mother. That raises the question of whether the fetus was killed by the harvesting of brain tissue or by abortion.''

Janice Raymond, professor of women's studies and medical ethics at the University of Massachusetts, has testified that doctors are already altering the methods of abortion in order to get the tissue that they desire, and I quote from her.

> Doctors who are eager to get good tissue samples must put women at additional risk of complication by altering the methods of performing abortions and by extending the time it takes to perform the conventional abortion procedure.

Dorie Vawter of the Center for Bioethics at the University of Minnesota has reaffirmed this observation, noting that some clinics currently alter abortion methods for tissue harvesting—slowing down the abortion procedure, reducing the pressure of the suction machine, and increasing the size of dilation instruments, all practices which place women at additional risk.

And so in the harvesting of human tissue, the human tissue has to be at a certain condition. I talked a few moments ago about how much of this tissue is unfit for effective use in Parkinson's research or other neurological research. And now we have testimony of people who are altering the procedures of obtaining the human fetal tissue so that the human fetal tissue is in a better condition for this research. But in doing so they place the health of the woman who is carrying the child, from whom the fetal tissue is derived, at greater health risk.

And then I think we have to ask probably the most difficult of questions, and that is, are we encouraging abortion by covering it with a veneer of compassion?

Dr. Kathleen Nolan, formerly of the Hastings Center, writes,

> Lifesaving cures resulting from the use of cadaveric material might make abortion, and fetal death, seem less tragic. Enhancing abortion's image could thus be expected to undermine efforts to make it as little needed and little done procedure as possible.

This is a very real concern because often people come up to me and say: Why do you offer amendments? Why do you think that utilization of fetal tissue should be restricted to noninduced abortions, because it does so much good, it holds so much potential.

Look at the ethical question involved. Is taking a life, is killing a

fetus in order to obtain material that is useful in providing research which offers promising health benefits to individuals, is that not one of the most profound ethical and moral questions that we have to face?

And so I think when we look at a question like this, we clearly have to understand, as Stephen Post said,

> Ultimately, it is the specter of a society whose medical institutions are inextricably bound up with elective abortion and whose people come to believe that for their own health they have every right to feed off the unborn, that gives pause.

Arthur Caplan of the University of Minnesota expresses these concerns in another way.

> This is the ultimate issue of generational justice. You're not just asking for the pocketbooks of the young—you're asking for their body parts.

Now, fortunately, Madam President, we have alternatives available to us. I have listed those alternatives. In the case of Parkinson's, and that is the issue we are facing here—we will address the other issue at another time—but in the case of Parkinson's research, we are learning that fetal tissue research is of diminishing importance and of diminishing effectiveness.

We are learning that there are more viable alternatives that hold far greater benefit and hope for breakthroughs in treating Parkinson's than fetal tissue. And so while I think it is appropriate that we are focusing on increasing funds for research in Parkinson's, I believe it is also appropriate that we place this most limited of restrictions on this research, both for practical reasons because it offers very little hope of any research breakthroughs and because this tissue can be obtained by other alternatives without taking human life, without inducing abortions. Fetal tissue cells from human fetuses can be obtained through miscarriages, spontaneous abortions, ectopic pregnancies, but the other forms of research, the xenografts from animal tissue, which are now being found to be more useful than human tissue, human cell lines, genetically engineered cells, and then all the other more promising means of research in Parkinson's, I think allow us to say that at least in this area we will not pursue and we do not need to pursue the utilization of human fetal tissue.

AMENDMENT NO. 1077

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds for research that utilizes human fetal tissue, cells, or organs that are obtained from a living or dead embryo or fetus during or after an induced abortion)

Mr. COATS. So with that, Madam President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration with the understanding that it may be possible to enter into an agreement that would limit the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment? Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], for himself and Mr. NICKLES, proposes an amendment numbered 1077.

Mr. COATS. Madam 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, none of the amounts subject to the provision of subsection (e) of the ''Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act of 1997'' may be expended for any research that utilizes human fetal tissue, cells, or organs that are obtained from a living or dead embryo or fetus during or after an induced abortion. This subsection does not apply to human fetal tissue, cells, or organs that are obtained from a spontaneous abortion or an ectopic pregnancy.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator withhold.

Mr. HARKIN. I withdraw that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Susan Hammersten, a fellow in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor during the pending Labor, HHS appropriations bill.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I strongly support the amendment that Senator MCCAIN and Senator WELLSTONE have offered. More research is clearly needed if we are to conquer this debilitating disease that afflicts more than a million Americans.

I strongly disagree, however, that this is an appropriate place to revisit the issue of fetal tissue research, and I urge the Senate to defeat the Coats amendment.

The earlier ban on fetal research was lifted 4 years ago, and that action was deeply justified. The ban was lifted by the administration and Congress after careful consideration and exhaustive debate.

Research involving fetal tissue holds the potential to provide tremendous advances in treatments and cures for a long list of debilitating conditions such as Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, Huntington's disease, diabetes, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, blindness, leukemia, hemophilia, sickle cell anemia, spinal cord injuries, deficiencies of the immune system, birth defects, and certain conditions causing intractable pain. The list goes on and on.

It is no wonder, then, that opposition to a ban on fetal tissue research is supported by a wide range of organizations dedicated to improving the health of Americans, including the Alzheimer's Association, the Epilepsy Foundation of America, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the Parkinson's Disease Foundation, and the Society for Pediatric Research.

Four years ago, Congress decided that the benefits of this research far outweighed the unsubstantiated fears and concerns that the need for fetal tissue would lead to increases in abortions. The vote in the Senate to lift the ban was a resounding 93 to 4.

The bill enacted in 1993 established rigorous standards to safeguard against any possibility that fetal tissue research would influence individual decisions about abortion. Those safeguards are in place and they are working—and working well.

A 1997 GAO study of the safeguards reports that ''the act's documentation requirements were met'' and that ''there have been no reported violations in the acquisition of human fetal tissue for use in transplantation.''

The safeguards are working not just in research on Parkinson's disease, but in all research involving fetal tissue. It is irrational and inappropriate to revisit this debate by singling out research on Parkinson's disease for excessive restrictions.

Since 1993, the NIH has awarded more than $23 million in grants for research involving the study, analysis, and use of human fetal tissue. The research that is being carried out today is producing effective solutions that can end the suffering associated with a wide variety of illnesses, and it makes no sense, no sense at all, to restrict it.

One other point should be made. The research being conducted today with fetal tissue is also providing new techniques such as specialized cell lines and genetically engineered cells. In fact, the development of these new technologies may well eliminate the need for using fetal tissue for research purposes. Ironically, the best way to achieve the goal of the Coats amendment is to defeat the Coats amendment, and I urge the Senate to do so.

My Republican colleagues have argued that women will decide to have an abortions in order to donate tissue for research.

These claims are unfounded and uncorroborated. The substantial history of fetal tissue research—extending back at least 30 years to the development of the polio vaccine—shows no evidence—and no evidence has been presented here to the Senate this evening—that the results have encouraged abortion.

American women for various personal and entirely unrelated reasons choose to have over 1 million legal abortions each year. These legal abortions will continue to be performed in the future, regardless of the extent of fetal tissue research.

Congress enacted stringent safeguards to address this claim. No woman can know in advance if the remains from her abortion would or even

could be used for research purposes. A woman may not be approached for consent to donate the aborted tissue until after she has made the decision to have an abortion.

Safeguards established by the NIH have eliminated any potential incentives for abuse. No profit can be derived from providing the tissue for research. No family member or friend can benefit from a woman's abortion. A woman may not designate who will be the recipient of the tissue.

This issue has been reviewed and studied as to the effectiveness of the rules and regulations which have been established. It is effectively working and working well. This amendment would have an adverse impact in terms of the real potential for making significant progress in areas of research, and it would not be justified in terms of providing the kind of restrictions that are included in the Coats amendment. For that reason, I hope the Coats amendment will not be accepted.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1074, AS MODIFIED

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, on the Wellstone-McCain/McCain-Wellstone amendment, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BOXER be added as a cosponsor.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ROBB be listed as a cosponsor of the Wellstone-McCain / McCain-Wellstone amendment.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. 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 question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1074, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 214 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Abraham	Feingold	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Allard	Ford	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Glenn	Mikulski
Biden	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Bond	Gramm	Murray
Boxer	Grams	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Reed
Brownback	Gregg	Reid
Bryan	Hagel	Robb
Bumpers	Harkin	Roberts
Burns	Hatch	Rockefeller
Byrd	Helms	Roth
Campbell	Hollings	Santorum
Chafee	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Cleland	Hutchison	Sessions
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kennedy	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerrey	Specter
Craig	Kerry	Stevens
D'Amato	Kohl	Thomas
Daschle	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Landrieu	Thurmond
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Faircloth	Lott	

NAYS—3

Ashcroft	Enzi	Jeffords

NOT VOTING—2

Inouye	Murkowski

The amendment (No. 1074), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, each year a small portion of the Medicare budget is devoted to HCFA's Office of Research and Demonstrations for Activities that help guide Medicare policymaking on coverage, financing and other operational issues. This year the Appropriations Committee has approved $47 million for this purpose, an increase, of $3 million over the last year.

The Appropriations Committee has urged the Secretary of Health and Human Services to use a portion of this research budget to conduct a 2-year demonstration project on coverage of medical nutrition therapy by registered dietitians under Medicare part B. I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate my support for this project and to urge the Secretary to move expeditiously to initiate this program.

Research has shown that medical nutrition therapy is an effective way to save health care dollars and improve patient outcomes. By reducing and shortening hospital admission, preventing and controlling medical complications and limiting the need for physician follow-up visits, medical nutrition therapy can lower the cost of treating a variety of diseases. Of particular note are the savings that have been documented for patients with diabetes and cardiovascular disease, two ailments that account for a staggering 60 percent of all Medicare expenditures.

As we continue efforts to modernize and improve the Medicare Program, we should not overlook medical nutrition therapy as an important way to save program dollars and improve patient treatment options. A demonstration project in this area will help us understand how we can best integrate this important service into any future Medicare improvements.

AMENDMENT NO. 1057

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, earlier today I voted to support Senator HARKIN's amendment to fund the Food and Drug Administration's ''Youth Tobacco Initiative'' regulations. When this amendment was first offered on July 23, 1997, I voted to table it. I was concerned at that time that the offset was a tax; taxes fall under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means and Finance Committees. I am pleased that Senator HARKIN changed the offset so that I was able to vote for the amendment today. I am a strong supporter of the Food and Drug Administration's efforts to reduce the number of young people who begin smoking cigarettes each year. I believe that the money designated for that purpose today is crucial to the success of those efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

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

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

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION MODERNIZATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now turn to the consideration of S. 830, the FDA reform bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. On behalf of Senator KENNEDY, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. I move to proceed to S. 830, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 105, S. 830, the FDA reform bill.

Trent Lott; Jim Jeffords; Pat Roberts; Kay Bailey Hutchison; Tim Hutchinson; Conrad Burns; Chuck Hagel; Jon Kyl; Rod Grams; Pete Domenici; Ted Stevens; Christopher Bond; Strom Thurmond; Judd Gregg; Don Nickles; and Paul Coverdell.

Mr. LOTT. I withdraw the motion to proceed.

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

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, I regret that the cloture motion is necessary at this time. I understand all of the interested parties were in agreement just prior to the recess. In fact, I stayed very close to the members of the committee that reported this legislation and to those who have continued to work to try to work out remaining disagreements, including Senator JEFFORDS, Senator MACK, Senator FRIST, others on this side of the aisle, as well as Senator DODD and Senator MIKULSKI.

This is truly a bipartisan issue and one we certainly should take up and finish before we go out at the end of this year.

When you talk about quality of life for Americans, certainly having a reformed Food and Drug Administration would be in their interest. Too many procedures, pharmaceuticals, and medical devices are delayed, hung up by bureaucracy. What we need is an expedited process, the reforms that are necessary to make that happen, and safe procedures for the American people.

I hope we can get this done. The only objection I know of was one that has been lodged by Senator KENNEDY. We thought we had the agreement all worked out the last week we were in session. At the last minute, there seemed to be some further objection. As a matter of fact, I had hoped over the last 2 weeks before we went out the 1st of August for our State work period that we could get this agreed to. Now there is apparently some disagreement with regard to cosmetics. I would think this legislation is much more important than some remaining small disagreement in this area.

So as a result of filing this cloture motion, a cloture vote will occur on Friday, September 5 in the morning unless something is worked out in the meantime. I will consult with the Democratic leader and all the Senators involved on both sides of the aisle as to how we can proceed. We need to get this done.

By the way, this is on the motion to proceed. It looks like we will have a filibuster even on the motion to proceed. I am committed to this. If we have to have a cloture on the motion to proceed, if we have to have more than one, if we have to have cloture on the bill itself, whatever is necessary, I feel that we should force this to an action.

However, I do ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived at this time.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each, with the exception of Senators HUTCHISON of Texas and ROBERTS.

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

TRIBAL SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on October 25, 1994, Jered Gamache lost his life, and his brother, Andy, was seriously injured on their way home from school when a Yakama tribal police officer, driving at 68 miles per hour, ran through a red light and crashed into their truck. Jered was 18 and Andy was 16. Despite the loss of Jered's life and the injuries to Andrew, the Gamache family has been totally unable to seek damages against the Yakama tribal government for the actions of its police officer.

Now, let us compare this situation, Mr. President, to the case of Abner Louima, the Haitian immigrant who was brutalized a few weeks ago by New York City police officers. According to the New York Times, in addition to the ongoing criminal investigation, Mr. Louima's attorneys are planning to file a $465 million civil damage suit against New York City.

Now, Mr. President, what makes the case of Jered and Andy Gamache different from the case of Abner Louima? The answer is simple: Tribal sovereign immunity. Unlike New York City, the Yakama tribal government can claim immunity from any civil lawsuit, including suits involving public safety and bodily harm, in both State and Federal courts. As a consequence, the lawyers retained by the Gamache family have told them it is pointless to bring any kind of lawsuit. They have no recourse.

New York City does not have sovereign immunity, and thus, of course, is subject to a lawsuit in any amount of money on the part of victims of malfeasance, on the part of members of its police department.

A few weeks ago, up until the present time, the New York Times has run articles and editorials showcasing the Louima case as an example of police brutality and the need for permanent reform. While that case has sparked outrage from editorialists in New York and elsewhere, last Sunday the New York Times vilified my efforts to provide exactly the same avenue for relief to the Gamache family as the New York Times eloquently advocates for Mr. Louima. The New York Times has decided that while it is unacceptable for New York City to brutalize a person, it rejects non-Indians' right to bring similar claims against tribal police agencies in the U.S. courts. So we have 18- and 16-year-old victims who have no recourse.

Enormous injustices can be done whenever a technical claim can prevent the adjudication of a just claim on the part of an individual against a government. It is for exactly that reason that the doctrine of sovereign immunity was long ago dropped by the Federal Government and the State government in cases of this nature.

Let us consider another case, Mr. President, the case of Sally Matsch. When she was fired from an American Indian casino in Minnesota she felt that she was a victim of age discrimination, so she sued the Prairie Island Indian Tribe. The tribe, however, invoked its sovereign immunity against lawsuits in State or Federal courts, and her case was heard by an Indian court on the second floor of the casino and was dismissed amid the sounds of slot machines by a judge who served at the pleasure of the tribal council that ran the casino.

Seventeen years ago I was attorney general of the State of Washington. I brought a lawsuit that asserted the right of the State of Washington to tax the sale of cigarettes in Indian smoke shops to non-Indians. The Supreme Court of the United States upheld our position that those sales were taxable. For all practical purposes, however, in the 17 years since that time, States have been unable to enforce a right that the Supreme Court of the United States said they had because they cannot sue the tribe or the tribal business entities in order to collect those taxes or to enforce their collection. Why? Tribal sovereign immunity.

Barbara Lindsey, Mr. President, is president of an organization of Puget Sound beach property owners in Washington State. In 1989, 16 Indian tribes sued those property owners in the State of Washington claiming that ''treaty rights'' gave them the right to enter private property to remove clams and oysters. A Federal district court in large measure has accepted that claim, but Barbara Lindsey and the thousands of property owners she represents, Mr. President, cannot sue the Indian tribes for violations of their property rights, even in cases when those violations are obvious and open. The problem? Tribal sovereign immunity.

So, Mr. President, this body will debate next week when it debates the Interior appropriations bill a provision that for a period of 1 year, as a rider on the appropriations bill, requires the waiver of tribal sovereign immunity on the part of those tribes—and I believe

it is all of them—whose governmental entities, whose police forces, are being funded by money appropriated by the Congress out of the taxes collected from all of the American people. The proposal does not change any substantive laws. It simply says if, in fact, the law has been violated, there should be a remedy in a neutral Federal court—we have not extended it to State courts—but in a neutral Federal court.

Is it fair to prevent a family from seeking justice for the wrongful death of their son? Is it fair that a claim of age discrimination cannot be made or decided in a neutral court? Is it fair that a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on taxes cannot effectively be enforced? It is not, Mr. President, and claims that sovereignty is somehow undercut by saying that the sovereign is subject to the laws is simply not the case.

The claim of those who believe we should make no change is a claim that an Indian tribe can act in a totally lawless fashion and not be held responsible in any court of the United States for those lawless actions.

It can be dressed up in whatever fancy language about sovereignty that one may propose, but it comes right down to that proposition: Is it fair that if you are injured by a New York City policeman you can sue New York City, but if you are injured by a Yakama tribal police officer, you may not sue its tribe. The doctrine is one that stems from the kings of England. It is an anachronism in today's world. Under constitutional guarantees of due process to every American citizen, every American citizen should be granted the opportunity to bring his or her case in a neutral court and get an answer as to whether or not crimes have, in fact, been committed. The only issue that will be involved in this case is, Should any government be permitted to act in an entirely lawless fashion and not be called to account for its acts? The answer to that question is ''no''. We should not be involved in that kind of action, and the only body with constitutional authority to make that decision across this United States is the Congress of the United States. The buck stops here.

SUBMITTING CHANGES TO THE BUDGET RESOLUTION DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS, APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY AGGREGATES, AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ALLOCATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Section 314(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, allows the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the discretionary spending limits, the appropriate budgetary aggregates and the Appropriations Committee's allocation contained in the most recently adopted budget resolution—in this case, House Concurrent Resolution 84—to reflect additional new budget authority and outlays for continuing disability reviews subject to the limitations in section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.

I ask unanimous consent that revisions to the nondefense discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 1998 contained in sec. 201 of House Concurrent Resolution 84 in the following amounts be printed in the RECORD.

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

	1998
Budget Authority:	
Current nondefense discretionary spending limit	$261,698,000,000
Adjustment	245,000,000
Revised nondefense discretionary spending limit	261,943,000,000
Outlays:	
Current nondefense discretionary spending limit	286,556,000,000
Adjustment	230,000,000
Revised nondefense discretionary spending limit	286,786,000,000

I hereby submit revisions to the budget authority, outlays, and deficit aggregates for fiscal year 1998 contained in sec. 101 of H. Con. Res. 84 in the following amounts:

Budget Authority:	
Current aggregate	1,390,541,000,000
Adjustment	245,000,000
Revised aggregate	1,390,786,000,000
Outlays:	
Current aggregate	1,372,111,000,000
Adjustment	230,000,000
Revised aggregate	1,372,341,000,000
Deficit:	
Current aggregate	173,111,000,000
Adjustment	230,000,000
Revised aggregate	173,341,000,000

I hereby submit revisions to the 1998 Senate Appropriations Committee budget authority and outlay allocations, pursuant to sec. 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, in the following amounts:

Budget Authority:	
Current Appropriations Committee allocation	801,276,000,000
Adjustment	245,000,000
Revised Appropriations Committee allocation	801,521,000,000
Outlays:	
Current Appropriations Committee allocation	828,183,000,000
Adjustment	230,000,000
Revised Appropriations Committee allocation	828,413,000,000

SUBMITTING CHANGES TO THE BUDGET RESOLUTION ALLOCATION TO THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, to comply with the provisions of Public Law 105–33, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, that amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I hereby submit a revised allocation for the Appropriations Committee pursuant to section 302(a) of the Budget Act.

This revised allocation includes all previous adjustments made to section 201 of House Concurrent Resolution 84, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998, and to the Appropriations Committee budget authority and outlay allocations pursuant to section 302 of the Budget Act.

This revised allocation also includes an adjustment to the Appropriations Committee budget authority and outlay allocations pursuant to section 205 of House Concurrent Resolution 84 regarding priority Federal land acquisitions and exchanges.

I ask unanimous consent that the revised allocation be printed in the RECORD.

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

	Budget authority	Outlays
Defense discretionary	269,000,000,000	266,820,000,000
Nondefense discretionary	262,643,000,000	287,043,000,000
Violent crime reduction fund	5,500,000,000	3,592,000,000
Mandatory	277,312,000,000	278,725,000,000
Total allocation	807,721,000,000	832,262,000,000

JOB CORPS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise to express my sincere interest in establishing a Job Corps campus within my home State of Delaware. Today, the Senate considers legislation increasing our commitment to the Job Corps program—a program to educate and provide job training to youth at high risk of falling into government dependent or criminal lifestyles. Most of the young people who benefit from the Job Corps' services live at residential centers in their home States. In some cases, students enrolled in Job Corps can even commute from their homes. Currently, Delaware's young people do not have either of these options available to them. This situation potentially limits the number of my young constituents able to take advantage of the Job Corps, cutting off a path to self-reliance and a brighter future for many.

My office has worked in concert with a host of Delaware's other elected and appointed officials on this issue. It is my hope that a small portion of the funding this legislation dedicates to this program can be used to begin establishment of a Delaware Job Corps facility. I applaud Senators STEVENS and SPECTER for including an acknowledgement of our efforts to bring a Job Corps campus to Delaware in S. 1061's accompanying committee report. I look forward to working with the administration on this important matter.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, September 2, 1997, the Federal debt stood at $5,424,368,836,901.08. (Five trillion, four hundred twenty-four billion, three hundred sixty-eight million, eight hundred thirty-six thousand, nine hundred one dollars and eight cents)

Five years ago, September 2, 1992, the Federal debt stood at $4,044,021,000,000.

(Four trillion, forty-four billion, twenty-one million)

Ten years ago, September 2, 1987, the Federal debt stood at $2,358,780,000,000. (Two trillion, three hundred fifty-eight billion, seven hundred eighty million)

Fifteen years ago, September 2, 1982, the Federal debt stood at $1,109,939,000,000 (One trillion, one hundred nine billion, nine hundred thirty-nine million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $4 trillion—$4,314,429,836,901.08 (Four trillion, three hundred fourteen billion, four hundred twenty-nine million, eight hundred thirty-six thousand, nine hundred one dollars and eight cents) during the past 15 years.

TRIBUTE TO DR. RICHARD LESHER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to pay a word of tribute to Dr. Richard Lesher, outgoing president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. President, it has been my pleasure to know and work with Dick Lesher since I was a freshman Member of the Senate. We have served in the army of free enterprise in many important legislative battles. Dick was a dedicated fighter for small businesses.

Dick can also be justifiably proud of the growth and success of the U.S. Chamber over the last 22 years. During his tenure as president, the Chamber has grown to 215,000 strong.

The Chamber has also expanded its information services to include television. ''First Business'' is carried on 42 local stations, the USA Latin American channel, and USIA's WorldNet. ''It's Your Business'' is seen on USA Cable Network and 140 stations around the country.

Dick Lesher also took very seriously the Chamber's responsibility to help educate the next generation of business leaders and created the Center for Workforce Preparation.

These are just a few of Dick Lesher's many accomplishments as president of the flagship business organization in our country.

But, Dick is a man we can appreciate as much for who he is as for what he did. I have always known Dick Lesher to be straightforward and honest. He never pulled punches. You knew where you stood. And, even if Dick disagreed on a matter of policy, he admired his opponents' convictions. Such a fair-minded attitude sets the stage for alliances on other issues. And, I have always believed, having genuine respect for everyone on the playing field is not only good business, it is a hallmark of good character.

Dick is leaving the Chamber to return to his hometown in Chambersburg, PA. I wish him all the best in his new home and, hopefully, more relaxed lifestyle.

But, while he will be leaving the day-to-day battles on labor and tax policy to his successor, I do not believe for a minute that he is retiring. I know that he will remain informed and engaged in the myriad of issues that affect the health and growth prospects of American business. And, I look forward to his continued counsel and insights.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, 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 treaties and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill, previously received from the House of Representatives for the concurrence of the Senate, was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 765. An act to ensure maintenance of a herd of wild horses in Cape Lookout National Seashore; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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–2875. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sequestration update report for fiscal year 1998; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of August 1977, to the Committee on the Budget and to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–2876. A communication from the Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled ''End-Stage Renal Disease Payment Exception Requests and Organ Procurement Costs'' (RIN0938–AG20) received on August 26, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2877. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Services, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled ''Duty-Free Treatment of Articles Imported From U.S. Insular Possessions'' (RIN1515–AB14) received on August 28, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2878. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, the report of the texts of international agreements, other than treaties, and background statements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2879. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Presidential Determination 97–30; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. D'AMATO, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1142. A bill to repeal the provision in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 relating to the termination of certain exceptions from rules relating to exempt organizations which provide commercial-type insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 1143. A bill to prohibit commercial air tours over the Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. D'AMATO):

S. 1144. A bill disapproving the cancellation transmitted by the President on August 11, 1997, regarding Public Law 105–33; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRAMS:

S. 1145. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide simplified and accurate information on the social security trust funds, and personal earnings and benefit estimates to eligible individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 1146. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide limitations on copyright liability relating to material on-line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BIDEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S. Res. 118. A resolution expressing the condolences on the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, and designating September 6, 1997, as a ''National Day of Recognition for the Humanitarian Efforts of Diana Princess of Wales.''; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. D'AMATO and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1142. A bill to repeal the provision in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 relating to the termination of certain exceptions from rules relating to exempt organizations which provide commercial-type insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

LEGISLATION REPEALING CERTAIN PROVISION OF THE TAXPAYER RELIEF ACT

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would repeal an irrational provision of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997. I refer to section 1042 of that act, which took away the tax exempt status of TIAA–CREF, the Teacher's Insurance Annuity Association College Retirement Equities Fund. The legislation I am introducing today, with Senators D'AMATO

and GRAHAM of Florida as original cosponsors, would simply strike section 1042 and restore the tax exemption that TIAA–CREF has been afforded since its establishment by Andrew Carnegie in 1918. Repeal of section 1042 would also serve to restore the tax exemption for Mutual of America, which has served as a pension administrator for social welfare organizations for over 50 years and was similarly tax-exempt until August 5, 1997, when the President signed the tax bill.

TIAA–CREF is a 2-million member retirement system that serves 6,100 American colleges, universities, teaching hospitals, museums, libraries, and other nonprofit educational and research institutions. TIAA was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York in 1937 to ''forward the cause of education and promote the welfare of the teaching profession.'' Let me repeat—to ''forward the cause of education and promote the welfare of the teaching profession.'' The law further states that the purpose of TIAA—this is the New York Statute—is ''to aid and strengthen non-proprietary and non-profit-making colleges, universities, and other institutions engaged primarily in research.'' And it has done just that, in an exemplary manner. It has long been recognized as a model of such programs.

Mr. President, by charter and New York law, TIAA–CREF's pension assets are exclusively and irrevocably dedicated to providing retirement benefits to covered employees. Its funds are essentially equivalent to a multiple employer pension trust for colleges and universities. Like other pension trusts, TIAA–CREF should not be taxed.

As a somewhat unanticipated result of TIAA–CREF's creation, it brought to American higher education portability of pensions. You did not have to start out in one institution and after a certain point stay there the rest of your life because you had to have some retirement benefit. This is of great value to our educational system for the simple reason that it enables a young person at, say, a 2-year college or a local college, who shows great promise, does good work, to end up at Chicago or Stanford or Duke, because they can move. This is part of the agility of American higher education. There is no reason to tax this. Earlier in the summer, the Finance Committee had said don't tax it, and the full Senate agreed. But somehow or other, the conference agreement provided otherwise. This was a mistake, and it wants to be corrected.

The repeal of TIAA–CREF's 79-year-old tax exemption will cost the average retiree who receives a $12,000 annual pension about $600 in income, unless we act. Librarians are not highly paid. A $12,000 pension would be quite normal. A $600 reduction would be 5 percent right away. Future retirees currently accumulating benefits are likely to face reductions of 10 to 15 percent.

Why make the lives of librarians and assistant professors and teachers in community colleges harder? We have an opportunity to undo this before the law takes effect in 1998. Why don't we? The Finance Committee said no to it. During the conference deliberations on the tax bill, nearly half the Members of the Senate, and dozens of Members of the House, signed letters asking the conferees to stand against repealing this tax exemption.

Now it is September. Members of Congress have had a month-long opportunity to visit with and hear from the academic community. I am hopeful we can act on this legislation and restore TIAA–CREF and Mutual of America to their appropriate status as tax-exempt organizations before Congress adjourns for the year.

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. 1142

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

SECTION. 1. REPEAL OF PROVISION RELATING TO THE TERMINATION OF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1042 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–34) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–34).

By Mr. ALLARD: (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 1143. A bill to prohibit commercial air tours over the Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK LEGISLATION

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I am here today to introduce legislation banning commercial tour overflights at Rocky Mountain National Park.

Tour overflight disturbances are a growing problem at a number of parks. This is an issue that other Members of Congress have addressed in the past, and it will continue to be contentious as long as the natural calm treasured by park visitors is threatened.

I commend the Members of Congress who have been involved in creating legislation to control national park overflights in general or in a particular park. Details of problems are park specific, which is why I am addressing the issue of overflights at Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado. I hope that introduction of this legislation also serves to help Congress and the administration stay focused on creating a policy to address tour overflights at all national parks.

The National Park Service is directed by law to protect the natural quiet in our National Parks. The 1916 National Park Service Organic Act states that the Park Service shall conserve scenery and wildlife and leave the areas unimpaired for future generations. Two other public laws explicitly state the need to preserve national parks in their natural state, most recently the National Parks Overflights Act of 1987 that notes the adverse impact that overflights have on the natural quiet and experience. The law also insists that parks should be essentially free from aircraft sound intrusions. In 1996, President Clinton announced his commitment to the peace of our national parks by ordering that agencies protect them against noise intrusions from park overflights.

Furthermore, surveys have indicated that more than 90 percent of park visitors feel that tranquility is very important, but it is not only the quiet atmosphere that overflights threaten; overflights also have the potential to adversely impact wildlife and other natural resources.

In particular, I am concerned about proposals for helicopter sightseeing at Rocky Mountain National Park that could seriously detract from the enjoyment of other park visitors and also could have a negative impact on the resources and values of the park itself. I value the wildlife and solitude at Rocky Mountain National Park, and I understand fully the concern that commercial tour overflights will impair visitor enjoyment.

Rocky Mountain National Park is a relatively small park in the Rockies, about 70 miles from Denver. The park receives nearly 3 million visitors each year, almost as many as Yellowstone National Park, which is eight times its size. The park is easily accessible, yet continues to provide quiet, solitude, and remoteness to visitors, especially in the back country.

Several problems are specific to this mountainous park. The elevation of the Park does not allow a large minimum altitude, therefore, according to the National Park Service, natural quiet is unlikely if overflights are permitted at all. In addition, the terrain, consisting of many 13,000 foot peaks and narrow valleys, coupled with unpredictable weather, presents serious safety concerns. Also, the unique terrain of Rocky Mountain National Park would cause air traffic to cumulate over the popular, lower portions of the park as pilots are forced to navigate around the dangerous peaks and high winds.

Not only would the overflights be concentrated directly over the most popular portions of the park, but more powerful, and louder, helicopters must be used to achieve the necessary lift at a high altitude.

In August the members of the Clinton administration's appointed task force on commercial tour overflights toured Rocky Mountain National Park. One of the participants, a spokesman for the National Air Transportation Association observed the altitude of the park and extreme weather conditions and stated, ''I don't know that there's anything here that being in a helicopter would make that much

more interesting than what can be seen from the road.''

These distinctive qualities lead to the conclusion that the best solution to overflight disturbance is a ban on commercial tour flights at Rocky Mountain National Park. It is important for me to affirm that this legislation would only ban commercial tour overflights. It is not intended to have any adverse effect on emergency, military and administrative flights or on commercial high-level airlines or private planes.

A commercial tour overflight ban has widespread support throughout my State. State and local officials in areas adjacent to the park, including Larimer County, Grand County, and the city of Estes Park have indicated their concerns with flights over the park, and they support a ban. In the last session of Congress the entire Colorado delegation went on record in support of an overflight ban. The Governor of Colorado has also expressed a fear shared by many that such disturbances could cause a loss of tourism.

Rocky Mountain National Park has been fortunate enough to be free from overflights to this point, partially because local towns have discouraged companies that might provide such services. In addition, there are no existing private property rights that are infringed upon by the implementation of a permanent commercial tour overflight ban.

At the beginning of this year the FAA issued a temporary ban on sightseeing flights over Rocky Mountain National Park. However, I remain concerned as we await final ruling by the FAA on park overflights and consider the possibility that such low-flying aircraft could be permitted in the park.

In 1995, one of our top Denver newspapers editorialized that the FAA should make Rocky Mountain National Park off-limits to low-flying aircraft use, the sooner the better. Now, 2 years later, it is time to take action on imposing a permanent ban on scenic overflights.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. D'AMATO):

S. 1144. A bill disapproving the cancellation transmitted by the President on August 11, 1997, regarding Public Law 105–33; to the Committee on Finance.

DISAPPROVAL LEGISLATION

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on this the first full day of Senate business since our adjournment for the August recess, I come to the floor with my colleague and friend from New York, Senator D'AMATO, to address an issue of importance to New York, and of surpassing significance to our constitutional form of government. On August 11, for the first time in our history, President Clinton exercised his new authority under the Line Item Veto Act. In doing so he repealed, a provision of Federal law intended to relieve New York of up to $2.6 billion in disputed Medicaid claims. The provision had been included at Senator D'AMATO's behest, and with my full support, in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, one of the two major reconciliation bills signed into law on August 5 in a ceremony at the White House.

Senator D'AMATO and I rise today to state for the record our firm opposition to the President's repeal of the New York Medicaid provision, and to introduce a ''disapproval bill'' to reverse the President's action. I will also speak to the underlying question of the constitutionality of the Line Item Veto Act.

Each year, for 21 years now, I have issued a report on the balance of payments, as we put it, between New York State and the Federal Government. The twenty-first edition, now prepared in collaboration with the Taubman Center on State and Local Government at the John F. Kennedy School of Government will be published toward the end of this month. Let me report for purposes of this comment, however, that it will show that New York has the third highest poverty rate in the Nation and the fourth highest Cost of Living Index—as computed by the Friar-Leonard State Cost of Living Index. This has resulted in an extraordinarily high level of Medicaid costs for the State and especially for the city of New York.

This level of payments might have been sustainable with a more equitable Federal-State matching formula. If, for example, the Federal Government paid 73 percent as it does in Arkansas. But we were capped at 50 percent. As my colleague from New York knows, the current Federal-State Medicaid matching formula was taken directly from the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946, under which the matching rate is based on the square of the ratio of State per capita income and national per capita income. In a commencement address at Kingsborough Community College in New York 20 years ago, I suggested, only half jokingly, why not square root? If you are going to have algebra in Federal statutes, why not turn it our way? Given New York's 50-percent match rate, however, something had to be done.

And so, like a number of other States, New York began to impose provider taxes on hospitals, nursing homes, home health agencies, and so forth, as a way of generating revenues to finance specific health care programs. As part of the costs incurred by providers, these taxes were reimbursable, withal at the 50-percent level, by the Federal Government. The taxes all went into additional health care, and no one could claim fraud. However, in recent years some States got too creative in imposing and seeking Federal matching funds for their provider taxes, in some instances using the Federal money for purposes unrelated to health care. This led Congress in 1991 to enact legislation to prevent States from gaming the system. Since New York was confident its taxes were in compliance with the 1991 law, the State continued its practice, all the while seeking a waiver from the Federal health care bureaucracy.

And so, when the time came to draft the 1997 reconciliation bill, Senator D'AMATO, a member of the Committee on Finance, asked that a provision be included that would simply preclude any Federal claims regarding the use of these taxes from 1991 to 1996. I fully supported this measure. The issue had been debated during our markup in the Finance Committee, and the provision was included in the final bill, which was passed by a large 73 to 27 majority. The conference report was adopted by an even larger majority, 85 to 15.

As ranking member of the committee, I was on this floor with our esteemed chairman, Senator ROTH, for several days and in meetings with House conferees and administration officials for an eternity, or so it seemed. Morning, noon, night; mostly night. Let the RECORD reflect that at no point in the course of those deliberations did the subject of the Medicaid waiver come up. No Member of the House challenged it; no representative of the administration said a word to me. In fact, the only administration objection that I know of was buried deep in the 21-page letter of administration views sent by OMB Director Raines on July 7, which said, in pertinent part:

> [T]he Senate bill would deem provider taxes as approved for one State. We have serious concerns about these provisions and would like to work with the Conferees to address the underlying problems.

This was not the clearest possible statement. What, for example, does ''deem'' mean? Further, the term ''serious concerns'' is used any number of times in the administration's views, yet in none of those other instances did a line item veto result. ''Serious concerns.'' I ask my friend from New York, does that sound like a veto threat to him? In 20 years in the Senate, this Senator has heard many veto threats made, but never one like that. Yet this is evidently how we should expect things to work in the era of the line item veto.

This leads to my second, larger, point. I am one of those—and I am not alone—who hold that the line-item veto is unconstitutional in that it violates the presentment clause of article I, section 7, which states:

> Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve, he shall sign it, but if not, he shall return it.

When the Line Item Veto Act was first debated in the Senate in the spring of 1995, I argued—along with our revered colleague from West Virginia, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, and others—that the presentment clause means exactly what it says. But I'm afraid not many people were listening.

Recall that the line item veto was part of item one in the Contract With America, which was then only a few months old. But we said: ''Don't do this! It violates the principle of the separation of powers as we have understood it since George Washington was President.'' For it was President Washington who wrote ''From the nature of the Constitution, I must approve all the parts of a bill or reject it in toto.''

In lengthy statements here on the floor, Senators BYRD, LEVIN, Hatfield, and I—among others—argued as emphatically as we could. We cited the relevant case law—INS versus Chadha, Bowsher versus Synar; we quoted prominent constitutional scholars—Laurence H. Tribe, Michael J. Gerhardt. Yet in the end we were in a regrettably small minority. The Line Item Veto Act passed the Senate on March 23, 1995, by a vote of 69 to 29. When the conference report came back in March of 1996—a full year later—it passed by a vote of 69–31. Of the 31 Senators opposed, four of us felt the principle at stake was so consequential that it demanded immediate scrutiny by the courts. For which the Line Item Veto Act had explicitly provided: Section 3 of the act provides for ''expedited review'' of the statute's constitutionality by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, with direct appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. The act further stated that ''any Member of Congress or any individual adversely affected'' could bring an action ''on the ground that any provision of this part violates the Constitution.''

Accordingly, on January 2 of this year, the first business day after the Line Item Veto Act took effect, I joined with Senator BYRD, Senator CARL LEVIN of Michigan, former Senator Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon, and Representatives HENRY A. WAXMAN of California and DAVID E. SKAGGS of Colorado, as plaintiffs in a lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of the measure. We were represented on a pro bono basis by a team of distinguished and learned counsel, including Louis R. Cohen; Charles J. Cooper; Lloyd N. Cutler; Michael Davidson; and Alan B. Morrison. Oral argument was heard on March 21 by Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. And less than 3 weeks later, on April 10, Judge Jackson held for us and declared the bill unconstitutional. He wrote in his opinion:

> . . . the Act effectively permits the President to repeal duly enacted provisions of federal law. This he cannot do. . . . The duty of the President with respect to such laws is to ''take care that [they] be faithfully executed.'' U.S. Const. art. II, sec. 3. Canceling, i.e., repealing, parts of a law cannot be considered its faithful execution.

On June 26, however, the Supreme Court vacated the district court's judgment, holding in a 7–2 decision that as Members of Congress, we did not have ''standing'' to sue, as we could not demonstrate any personal, or ''judicially cognizable,'' injury. We do not agree; in our view, the measure shifts the balance of power between the Congress and President in direct contravention of article I, something that can only be done by constitutional amendment. But, of course, the Court left it for others to sue.

Now we can. As a consequence of the President's decision to use the line-item veto on a measure designed to help New York, surely there will now be a lawsuit that will persuade the Supreme Court to strike down the measure as unconstitutional. All manner of New Yorkers presumably have standing; they have suffered injury. The Court was explicit that in such a case, the act was open to constitutional challenge. Let the Governor sue. The Comptroller. The Speaker. Mayors. Hospital administrators. Nurses unions. I shall be honored to join in. Expedited judicial review will again be provided pursuant to section 3 of the Line Item Veto Act; the action will again begin in the district court in Washington, with direct appeal to the Supreme Court. This time round, I trust the Court will declare the statute unconstitutional. As Justice John Paul Stevens wrote in his dissent to the Court's June 26 decision:

> If the [Act] were valid, it would deny every Senator and every Representative any opportunity to vote for or against the truncated measure that survives the exercise of the President's cancellation authority. Because the opportunity to cast such votes is a right guaranteed by the text of the Constitution, I think it clear that the persons who are deprived of that right by the Act have standing to challenge its constitutionality. . . . [T]he same reason that the respondents have standing provides a sufficient basis for concluding that the statute is unconstitutional.

Once the constitutional issue is disposed of, and even if it is not, and very possibly before it is, I know my colleague from New York will join me in saying that the issue of the equity of the Medicaid matching formula must be addressed. It is too extreme an example of discrimination to go on for another half century. Three years ago, President Clinton said as much. On a visit to New York City in May 1994, he spoke at a breakfast of the Association for a Better New York. Inviting questions, the President was asked by State Comptroller H. Carl McCall whether anything would be done to relieve the State of the ''crushing burden'' imposed by Medicaid. The President replied:

> There's no question that the formula should be changed, and that states like New York with high per capita incomes but huge numbers of poor people are not treated fairly under a formula that only deals with per capita income.

There was no reference to this in the President's recent veto message of the New York provision. Rather, the contrary:

> No other state in the nation would be given this provision, and it is unfair to the rest of our nation's taxpayers to ask them to subsidize it.

This was not entirely accurate, although there is no reason to suppose the President was aware of this. In the absurdly dense 1,600-page bill Congress had sent him, there was a small provision, adopted in the Finance Committee, which raises the Medicaid matching level for Alaska from the bottom rate of 50 percent to the national average of 59.6 percent. The Senators from Alaska made the simple case that the cost of living in Alaska is well above the national average. This is reflected in higher incomes, which the Medicaid formula wrongly interprets as greater wealth. They asked for nothing more than the national average. The District of Columbia got an increased match rate as well. Hawaii asked also, but the bill had been closed by then. Senator D'AMATO and I say it is time to open the issue up.

The case for legislative remedy is surely overwhelming. And we intend to use the new attention that has been drawn to this issue by the President's veto to press that case at every opportunity.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, may I suggest the absence of a quorum so I will have an opportunity to concur with my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New York? Let me say, No. 1, that I totally support his presentation as it related to the manner in which this veto took place. It is something that none of us were apprised of or aware of; that there had been extended negotiations with his administration during this process. It came as a total surprise. But I would like to take one moment and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. 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. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I send, for myself and Mr. D'AMATO, a bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be appropriately referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise this morning, along with Senator MOYNIHAN, to introduce legislation to ''disapprove'' President Clinton's line-item veto that cancels a Medicaid provision in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 which provides health care to the poorest of the poor in New York. Let me say that that is the legislation which has just been sent to the desk. That is legislation to disapprove this veto. Let me also say that I must speak out not about the authority of the line-item veto, which I support, but about its use in this particular case.

Mr. President, I have to tell you—and I listened intently to Senator MOYNIHAN making his presentation with respect to the manner in which the entire budget negotiations and the process was conducted. The fact of the matter is that the administration and the President agreed during the budget negotiations to accept the provisions that were included in this bill.

The fact of the matter is, I believe it was June 25 when these provisions were adopted by the full Senate. Mr. President, there was no secret. The administration knew. The administration had ample time all during that process to say ''no'', this is unacceptable.

I have to tell you, I am shocked and outraged that the administration has singled out New York for this particular provision by stating that this is an ''item that would have given preferential treatment to only New York.''

Mr. President, that is blatantly, patently false. It is a total misstatement.

I hope that the President will have an opportunity to examine this because I believe that his advisers have given him very poor advice.

I can't believe, knowing the President's commitment to attempt to deal with the problem of the uninsured, particularly the children—he had full knowledge of the manner and the totality of dealing with the shortcomings because we are attempting to reduce the burdens, we are attempting to get our Medicaid and Medicare costs under control. In this bill, notwithstanding that the administration claimed and advised the President and his people that this was a special provision just for New York, there are instance after instance, in case after case after case, where other States received similar treatment, as they can and should have in order to push the tremendous cuts —15 percent-plus in some cases. There were going to be 25 percent cuts that hospitals dealing with a disproportionate share of this Nation's poor would otherwise have had to make. That is DSH payments.

Let's understand what we are talking about. The average person—what are you talking about? What is this DSH? How do you take care, in large metropolitan areas in the North, the South, the East, and the West of our country, of those who do not have medical insurance? What do those hospitals do? Close their doors? Go bankrupt? Who is to pay for them?

So there was a conscious effort by the committee to see to it that States with these disproportionate problems in terms of dealing with the uninsured, with those who had just Medicaid and Medicaid alone, who cannot sustain the operations of our medical centers, to give relief. Indeed, Mr. President, I believe if one were to add up the totality of the money provided, it would be in the area of $700 to $800 million that was given in relief to pushing the cuts that these States and these institutions would otherwise absorb.

Let me give you just some of the States. Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Maine, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont.

Mr. President, to suggest that New York was the only one, indeed, New York could have been included. And if draftsmanship had been used, if we had known that we would have been singled out in this manner, I tell you we could have included the provision within the budget in such a way that all of these States including New York would have had to be vetoed then.

Are we saying it is the poor of New York who should be disadvantaged? We don't begrudge help to those States that are needing it. This is not an attempt to game the system. And let me talk about that.

There came a point in time when the Federal Government became aware that some States were gaming the system. In other words, certain States were guilty of scamming. That was wrong, and both Senator MOYNIHAN and I provided the support, and it passed unanimously, that we put a stop to that. But let's understand that is not what New York was doing.

For example, for those who were gaming the system, a provider would pay a $5,000 provider tax to the State. The State would then draw a matching $5,000 from the Federal Government and then reimburse the provider. It was a scam. It was simply a bookkeeping entry to get the Federal Government to pick up an expense that the State never really incurred and the provider did not incur.

That is wrong. That is not our system. New York was not then and is not now involved in that scam. This wasn't an attempt to bill poor people for services and build roads or not use those moneys. That has never been the allegation. And, indeed, as a matter of fact, New York has had a long history of requiring insurers to pay assessments on hospital services. Thereby, that assessment over and above that particular service would go to help the poorest of the poor. And, indeed, we now have a program by utilizing these provider taxes that provides insurance for those families who could not purchase it for their youngsters. We provide up to 140,000 youngsters, children up to the age of 19, with insurance. It comes from this provider tax.

Let me say that these assessments provide $1.1 billion a year in gross provider tax collections and are used for dealing with uninsured children, the poorest of the poor. The Balanced Budget Act contained language which specifically determined that New York provider taxes meet the legitimate requirements. That is what we did.

Now, Mr. President, we have attempted for more than 2 years to get a resolve of this matter from HCFA. Nothing. Nothing. No response. Delay, delay, delay, delay. You can't do that to a community. You are not doing it just to a State government. That impacts on the lives of hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people. Is that fair?

And so, Mr. President, I find it incomprehensible and absolutely a tragedy that the President would have received this kind of advice. People, I believe, did not tell the President the entire story. I cannot believe that he really would want to veto a provision, the dollars of which are used to take care of the truly needy. I hope that between the time this legislation that we have introduced comes to a vote, we can get a resolve of this matter, not to deal with it in a confrontational, adversarial way, but in a way that makes sense, in a way that is fair, that is fair intellectually, that is fair morally, that is fair ethically.

And I want to make it clear that I concede nothing. If we have to fight, why then we will, because this is a battle not about a State being treated fairly or unfairly but about its people and their needs. This is a battle that says that a State does have a right to raise revenues in a particular manner and to utilize them for the purpose which I have attempted to outline.

I want to commend my colleague, who, as the ranking member of Finance and, indeed, the senior member on Budget, was there every moment of the negotiations, and never once were we told this is a special treatment.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Never.

Mr. D'AMATO. Never once. And so for it to be sprung on us —I was out of the country—I said, when asked, that I was shocked, truly shocked. Again, I think the President is a big enough person to look at this in a way, or to say to those in charge at HCFA, come on, let's resolve this. Let's see to it that New York's problem, which is one of seeing to the needs of the uninsured—and, by the way, we have plans in speaking to the administration—and Senator MOYNIHAN and I have been conferring with the health department people. They believe that this program can be and will be in the fullness of time—it is a program to provide insurance where families pay a very modest amount, in some cases $25 a month, and some none depending upon their income—that it can be expanded to take care of up to 500,000 young people, youngsters, children who otherwise would not be insured.

Mr. President, we are not going to give up the battle. It is a battle that we are committed to winning on behalf of the poor, on behalf of the needy, on behalf of the uninsured, on behalf of the many working families that do not have full coverage. And I am proud and privileged to join the senior Senator from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, in an attempt to get justice for these children and for those in need.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. May I just congratulate my colleague and friend for the tone of his statement, its tenor. He is not seeking confrontation with the administration. He is seeking insurance for the poorest of poor children in

our State. I was able to say earlier that in the annual balance of payments study that we have been putting out for 2 years, New York has the third highest poverty rate in the Nation and the fourth highest cost of living. These children are at stake.

The Senator has made the point, and I congratulate the Senator for it, in that mode and making clear because the record is there that this issue was never raised prior to the veto. It was a decision made after the bill was signed, I think. I don't know. And I think that some reassessment of the process, the procedure might bring change in judgment.

Again, I thank my friend, and I am telling him how pleased and honored I am to be associated with him in this matter.

By Mr. GRAMS:

S. 1145. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide simplified and accurate information on the Social Security trust funds, and personal earnings and benefit estimates to eligible individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION ACT

Mr. GRAMS. Madam President, I rise today to introduce legislation to require the Social Security Administration to provide key information to the American people for retirement planning.

In that regard, I plan to send my bill to the desk in just a moment.

But to explain that, every working American has a significant part of each paycheck designated to the Social Security Program, but few know how much they've contributed over their lifetime, the real value of their Social Security investment, or how much they'll need for a secure retirement.

As average life-expectancy increases and the oldest baby boomers approach retirement, the answers to those three questions become critically important, for there's growing concern over the future of Social Security and how individuals should prepare themselves for retirement.

Over the next 33 years, the number of retirees and their dependents who are eligible for Social Security benefits will increase by more than 100 percent; from 30 million in 1997 to more than 60 million in 2030, while the number of workers 20 to 64 years old will increase by only 20 percent.

By 2030, the ratio of workers per retiree will be the smallest ever, straining the entire Social Security system to the breaking point. Most of these older Americans will rely on Social Security benefits as their major source of retirement income.

For many families, Social Security is the largest and most important financial investment they'll make, consuming up to one-eighth of their total lifetime income. Yet, the Federal Government remains unaccountable for the dollars working Americans have invested in the program.

Current laws do not require the Social Security Administration, [SSA], the agency managing the Social Security trust funds, to send clear and complete account statements to individual taxpayers.

Therefore, Americans don't receive adequate information about the retirement benefits they can expect to receive, the rate of return from their Social Security investment, or the future financial status of the Social Security trust funds—information, by the way, private investment agencies are required to provide to their investors.

As a result, the vast majority of today's baby boomers won't be financially secure at retirement.

My legislation would help to correct this problem and bring Social Security closer to meeting the disclosure requirements expected of private investment firms. This legislation will help ensure that working Americans receive the information they need to plan for a secure retirement.

In 1989, Congress passed the personal earnings and benefits estimate statements, it is commonly known as PEBES. That legislation requires the SSA to send to eligible individuals statements on their yearly earnings and estimated benefits.

A recent study by the General Accounting Office, the accounting arm of Congress, suggests that while the PEBES is useful, it is extremely difficult for average Americans to understand and, in fact, could be misleading. Therefore it isn't as effective as it could be or should be.

Moreover, the current PEBES statement does not include the information an individual needs to most effectively plan for retirement.

My proposal would require Washington to provide key information on the real value, or the yield, of a worker's investment in the Social Security Program by counting employers' contributions as workers' earnings to calculate the rate of return. Washington currently excludes this type of contribution from a worker's earnings statement.

The employer's share of Social Security is a labor cost that's ultimately borne by the employee; it is only fair that it be counted as a worker's contribution.

To ensure that the information is easy to understand, my legislation would also direct the SSA to provide benefit estimates in real rather than current dollars. To show the impact of inflation on Social Security benefits, consider the case of a typical individual retiring in 2043. That American is 25 years old today, retiring in the year 2043.

The current benefit estimate found in PEBES will tell this worker that he or she can expect to receive $98,989—nearly $100,000 annually in Social Security benefits. That sounds pretty good, doesn't it? But most workers will never consider the effects of inflation on this number. They'd never guess that an income of $98,989 in 2043 will actually be the equivalent of only $14,180 today because of inflation.

If the PEBES includes such misleading information, it is likely that more working Americans will misunderstand and, therefore, overestimate the value of the benefits they will receive from Social Security. Only after it is too late will they find themselves financially unprepared for retirement.

Not only would my legislation direct the SSA to include all of the most important information found in PEBES on a single, easy-to-read form, but the SSA would also be required to provide the current and projected balance in the Social Security trust funds, and let individuals decide on their future by providing them honest information today.

With this information, Americans will be able to quickly and easily determine what the PEBES report is about and find the information essential to successful retirement planning.

Working American need to know up front what they can and cannot expect out of the Social Security system compared against what they are paying into it.

Giving individuals an honest accounting of that information serves the fundamental objectives of the Social Security Program by enabling workers to judge to what degree they should supplement their contributions with other forms of retirement savings such as pension plans and personal savings and investments.

While much more needs to be accomplished to preserve and strengthen the Social Security safety net for today and tomorrow, the approach I've outlined would be an important first step in that attempt.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 1146. A bill to amend title 17, United States code, to provide limitations on copyright liability relating to material on-line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE DIGITAL COPYRIGHT CLARIFICATION AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I speak today on an issue of great importance to copyright law and to the continued growth of electronic commerce on the Internet. In December 1996, two treaties were adopted by the diplomatic conference of the World Intellectual Property Organization [WIPO] to update international copyright law. These treaties would extend international copyright law into the digital environment, including the Internet. However, these treaties do not provide a comprehensive response to the many copyright issues raised by the flourishing of the Internet and the promise of digital technology. We must endeavor to keep the scales of copyright law balanced, providing important protections to creators of content, while ensuring their widespread distribution. To begin the discussion I am introducing today the Digital Copyright Clarification and Technology Education Act of 1997.

Any discussion of this issue, even in the most simple terms, raises many

important issues. We must foster the growth of the Internet, which provides such great opportunity to our country because it is the most participatory form of mass communication ever developed. It draws people together from all corners of the globe to share and communicate on an unprecedented level, and brings all levels of government closer to the public. The Internet also holds great promise for education. Students—rural, suburban, and urban—are increasingly able to access a wealth of information right at their computer that was previously beyond their reach.

In addition, the Internet offers significant commercial possibilities. Small businesses can reach out across the globe and conquer the distances between them and potential customers. Individuals can view merchandise and make purchases without leaving home. Hopefully, soon a system will develop to allow individuals to contract electronically with traditional force of law for contracts on paper. However, this potential will never be realized without a system that fairly protects the interests of those who own copyrighted material; those who deliver that material via the Internet; and individual users. The implications here are far-reaching, with impacts that touch individual users, companies, libraries, universities, teachers and students.

The legislation I am introducing today would accomplish several goals. First, the legislation would clarify the extent of liability for entities who transfer information via the Internet without control of the content. Second, the bill would provide for a rapid response to copyright infringement with the cooperation of the copyright owner and the on-line service to take down the infringing material, helping to curtail piracy. Third, the Act will provide for the use of digital technology in education, research, and library archives, including updating the fair use doctrine for electronic media. Fourth, the legislation provides a standard for liability based on individual conduct, not a standard that constrains the development of new technology.

We must confirm that the entities who facilitate the operation of the global information infrastructure not be unfairly liable for literally billions of transmissions that individual users send via the Internet or post on the World Wide Web every week. We cannot make the Internet too costly to operate. Liability for infringement of copyright should reflect the degree of control that any party had in the determination of the content of the offending message. Those providing the infrastructure that makes the Internet possible should not be held liable for the content of messages to which they have no access. Often, the copyright holders will be best situated to make a determination of whether their copyrighted material is being infringed.

In addition, two very real considerations in the final outcome are the capabilities and limits of current technology. It is not possible to monitor every communication on the Internet, not even to look at every homepage on the World Wide Web, even if it were desirable. In January 1997, one estimate put the number of Internet hosts at more than 16 million. Each could host multiple homepages, and those individual sites could be composed of multiple individual pages. One individual host, GeoCities, boasts of more than half a million homesteaders, with 5,000 new residents arriving daily. As of May 1997 there were more than 40 million people on the Web, a breathtaking increase from the 1 million in December 1994. To state the facts of the exploding traffic growth in a different way, one major infrastructure provider, of which there are many, reports traffic of 250 terabytes a month—a terabyte is a thousand billion bytes—which translates into almost six billion bytes a minute—for one carrier. More importantly, any wholesale reading of messages would constitute the largest full scale attack on our individual privacy ever undertaken. We are confident that those delivering the mail do not read our sealed letters and we should have that same confidence in our e-mail and other electronic communications. It would be impossible for any carrier to review all of the material; and we cannot create a legal obligation that is technologically impossible to satisfy. Clearly, the potential for copyright infringement is real—as real as the impossibility of requiring a service provider to monitor every communication, including e-mail, homepages, and chat rooms.

Another important issue is the right of reproduction as specifically related to ephemeral copying. As a message is sent through cyberspace copies of the message are reproduced, in a sense. This is a reality of computer technology. For the most part an entire copy never exists anywhere, except at the points of distribution and receipt. The Internet was designed to send packets, pieces of a message expressed in digital form, a full message is not sent from one point to another. In the process of delivering the message multiple copies of each packet are sent so if a path is blocked path or data lost, the end message can be totally reassembled. Additionally, a full copy may be assembled on the recipient's server, where the message would reside until the recipient pulls down the file, or a copy may be made on a user's hard drive during the simple act of reading a document on-line. Obviously, to make this sort of copy illegal would be a move that flies in the face of the operations of the Internet and would destroy the World Wide Web. We need to make clear the status of these temporary and necessary copies within communications networks.

The passage of appropriate copyright legislation goes beyond the implications of liability and technical operations. The outcome of this debate will affect educators and students across the country. One important aspect for education is to guarantee that computers can be used in distance learning, in a way that television and video recorders have been used for years. The copyright laws have long recognized the need to ensure that the copyright laws do not stand in the way of the opportunities that the technology promises to provide students in rural areas. Unfortunately, the current law reflects the technology that was current when it was passed, largely video. We need to update these laws to reflect the enormous potential of the digital era. Part of the work in this area may include defining the classroom to reflect that in many instances the classroom is no longer a physical space.

In addition, the fair use doctrine in the Copyright Act should be amended to make clear that fair use applies regardless of the manner in which the material is distributed. A sound fair use doctrine is critical to continued interoperability of various systems, which in effect allows the Internet to exist and grow. Fair use encourages others to build freely on the ideas and information in a work while guaranteeing the author's right to their original expression. Currently, fair use may be made of a work for teaching, commentary, research, scholarship, criticism, and even news reporting. We should not tolerate discriminatory treatment based on a means of distribution or an alternative technology. Fair use in one medium should be fair use in another.

Finally, we must facilitate the preservation of copyrighted materials by libraries, archives, and universities. These institutions should be able to preserve their works, many of which represent the cultural heritage of the United States, in the best means possible, including digitally. To require that these institutions purchase new copies of existing works, but in digital format, could cost untold billions of dollars. Many works could never be made available digitally as they are no longer available in a format available for purchase.

Mr. President, we have made an effort to provide access to technology to all students in the last couple of years. In 1996, Congress appropriated $200 million to provide teachers with the training and support needed for access to technology, and to ensure that effective software and on-line resources would be available for use with the curriculum. The fiscal year 1998 budget request from the administration for this program is $425 million, with the House Appropriations Committee approving $460 million. Approving nearly $700 million over 2 years to guarantee that education can be delivered in a digital format, while impeding or denying delivery of digital material by neglecting our copyright law makes no sense. A decision has been made that students must prepare to operate in an on-line world. We must unlock the teaching

potential of the Internet and we must now guarantee that the appropriate material is made available, so that our students can receive a full education while taking advantage of the tremendous strides made in technology.

The Missouri State Librarian recently wrote to me that Missouri's strong distance education programs could flourish or wither, depending on the outcome of this debate. I suspect this is the case in all States with strong distance learning programs to serve rural areas. These programs allow residents in even the most remote areas to have the same access to education as those who live near schools, colleges, or universities. These programs cannot operate as effectively without the assurance that educators can use materials over computer networks.

Equally important, Mr. President, we must begin a process internationally that is structured to balance the rights of copyright owners with the needs and technological limitations of those who enable the distribution of the electronic information, and with the rights and needs of individual end users. The current treaties and statements are not sufficient, and include some language that could create legal uncertainty. The loose language could lead to law that ignores technical realities, blindly shifts liability and ignores serious issues. The language must be clarified through the enactment of legislation in conjunction with the Senate's ratification of the treaties.

Moreover, some of the proposed treaty implementation language attempts to attack copyright violations from the position of the technology that may be used, rather than placing the blame on those who are infringing the copyright. We cannot legislate technology. Just as we have seen the legislated 56-bit encryption become obsolete so too will any technology frozen in place by legislation. We must end policies of the Government that hinder technology, but, more importantly we must not initiate new policies that express an inherent fear of new technology.

We must recognize other realities. Scores of software programs are illegally copied on-line, and intellectual piracy is an issue. However, some of this problem relates to the failure of the law, particularly copyright law, to keep up with the swift advance of technology. In a digital environment, hundreds of copies can be made and distributed in the blink of an eye. These copies are reproductions; they are perfect recreations of the original. The speed with which copies can be made makes the traditional ways of enforcing the copyright laws—a court order—obsolete. Copyright laws must evolve to embrace the new medium of digital storage and transmission. Those who provide the content for the Internet need some assurance that their valuable work will not become worthless because piracy. The approach in the Digital Copyright Clarification and Technology Education Act of 1997 requires that service providers cooperate with content providers by taking action after they are notified that illegal material is posted, or being transmitted on their systems. The benefits to copyright holders are notable. A copyright owner will be able to stop the illegal distribution of the material quickly without having to use the courts as a first measure. This approach solves the largest problem for on-line piracy, by providing a quick response to illegal activity which will preserve the value of the material.

Mr. President, one of the many important values held in this country is the freedom of expression. The United States must continue to be a leader in the preservation of freedom of expression around the world. Many countries are looking to the United States to be a leader on these important issues. We have the opportunity to send a strong message internationally that copyright law must be revised to fit the realities of a digital environment, and that by doing so we can encourage the growth and evolution of the Internet, while protecting all parties involved, with zero tolerance for illegality.

I look forward to working with all interested parties, service providers, educators, entertainers, authors and others as this issue develops. I welcome the involvement of Senators who may have an interest in this legislation and the opportunity to work together to develop sound policy.

Mr. President, the administration took a lead role in the copyright debate that took place in an international forum. We must continue this leadership in the Senate, in order to secure the U.S. role not only as a leader in the manufacture of technology and development of content, but also as a leader in fashioning a fair and just approach to the use of digital technology and information.

Mr. president, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

S. 1146

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 ''Digital Copyright Clarification and Technology Education Act of 1997''.

TITLE I—DIGITAL COPYRIGHT CLARIFICATION

SEC. 101. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to clarify the application of copyright law in the unique environment of Internet and on-line communication;

(2) to foster the continued growth and development of the Internet as a means of communication and commerce, including the lawful distribution of intellectual property;

(3) to protect the rights of copyright owners in the digital environment;

(4) to clarify that providing network services and facilities with respect to the transmission of electronic communications of another person does not result in liability under the Copyright Act;

(5) to clarify that Internet and on-line service providers are not liable for third-party copyright infringements unless they have received notice in compliance with this Act of the infringing material and have a reasonable opportunity to limit the third-party infringement; and

(6) to create incentive for the rapid elimination of infringing material residing on an electronic communications system or network without litigation.

SEC. 102. CLARIFICATION OF LIABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 511 the following new section:

''§ 512. Liability relating to material on the Internet and on-line

''(a) MATERIAL BEING TRANSMITTED THROUGH AN ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM OR NETWORK.—

''(1) NETWORK SERVICE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS.—A person shall not be liable for direct, vicarious or contributory infringement of copyright arising out of providing electronic communications network services or facilities with respect to a copyright infringement by a user. A person shall be considered to provide 'network services and facilities' when such person transmits, routes or provides connections for material on behalf of a user over an electronic communications system or network controlled or operated by or for the person, including intermediate and transient storage, the processing of information, and the provision of facilities therefor, if—

''(A) the provision of services is for the purpose of managing, controlling or operating a communications system or network, supplying local access, local exchange, telephone toll, trunk line, private line, or backbone services, including network components or functions necessary to the transmission of material contained in electronic communications carried over those services; or

''(B) the transmission of material over the system or network on behalf of a user does not involve the generation or material alteration of content by the person.

''(2) PRIVATE AND REAL-TIME COMMUNICATION SERVICES.—A person shall not be liable for direct, vicarious or contributory infringement of copyright arising from supplying to another—

''(A) a private electronic communication, including voice messaging or electronic mail services, or any other communication for which such person lacks either the technical ability or authority under law to access or disclose such communication to any third party in the normal course of business; or

''(B) real-time communication formats, including chat rooms, streamed data, or other virtually simultaneous transmissions.

''(3) INFORMATION LOCATION TOOLS.—No person shall be liable for direct, vicarious or contributory infringement of copyright arising out of supplying a user of network services or facilities with—

''(A) a site-linking aid or directory, including a hyperlink or index;

''(B) a navigational aid, including a search engine or browser; or

''(C) the tools for the creation of a site-linking aid.

''(b) MATERIAL RESIDING ON A SYSTEM OR NETWORK.—

''(1) COOPERATIVE PROCEDURE FOR EXPEDITIOUS RESPONSE TO CLAIMS OF INFRINGEMENT.—A person shall not be liable for direct, vicarious or contributory infringement of copyright arising out of the violation of any of the exclusive rights of the copyright owner by another with respect to material residing on a system or network used in conjunction with electronic communications that is controlled or operated by or for the

person, unless upon receiving notice complying with paragraph (b)(3), the person fails expeditiously to remove, disable, or block access to the material to the extent technologically feasible and economically reasonable for a period of ten days, or until receiving a court order concerning the material, whichever is less.

''(2) Paragraph (b)(1) shall apply where such person—

''(A) did not initiate the placement of the material on the system or network;

''(B) did not determine the content of the material placed on the system or network; and

''(C) did not contract for placement of the specific material on the system or network by another person in order to provide that content as part of the person's service offering.

''(3) A person shall not be deemed to have notice that material residing on a system or network used in conjunction with electronic communications is infringing unless the person—

''(A) is in receipt of a notification that the particular material is infringing. Such notification shall:

''(i) pertain only to allegedly infringing material that resides on a system or network controlled or operated by or for the person;

''(ii) be submitted in accordance with directions displayed on the person's system or network indicating a single place or person to which such notifications shall be submitted;

''(iii) be signed, physically or electronically, by an owner of an exclusive right that is allegedly infringed, or by a person authorized to act on such owner's behalf;

''(iv) provide an address, telephone number, and electronic mail address, if available, at which the complaining party may be contacted in a timely manner;

''(v) describe the material claimed to be infringing, including information reasonably sufficient to permit the person expeditiously to identify and locate the material;

''(vi) provide reasonable proof of a certificate of copyright registration for the material in question, a filed application for such registration, or a court order establishing that use of the material in the manner complained of is not authorized by the copyright owner or the law;

''(vii) contain a sworn statement that the information in the notice is accurate, that the complaining party is an owner of the exclusive right that is claimed to be infringed or otherwise has the authority to enforce the owner's rights under this title, and that the complaining party has a good faith belief that the use complained of is an infringement;

''(viii) be accompanied by any payment that the Register of Copyrights determines is necessary to deter frivolous and de minimis notices; and

''(B) A person who is an employee or agent of a nonprofit educational institution, library or archives, acting within the scope of his employment, or such an educational institution, library or archives itself, shall not be deemed to have notice under subparagraph (A) if that person reasonably believed (i) that the allegedly infringing use was a fair use under Sec. 10 or (ii) was otherwise lawful; and

''(C) The Register of Copyrights may, by regulation, establish guidelines identifying additional information to be included in the notice and shall issue a standard notice form in both electronic and hard copy formats, which complies with this paragraph, but failure of a party to provide any such additional information, or failure to use any issued form, shall not invalidate the notice.

''(4) MISREPRESENTATIONS AND REDRESS FOR WRONGFUL NOTIFICATIONS.—Any person who materially misrepresents that material online is infringing in a notice described in paragraph (b)(3)(A), shall be liable in a civil action that may be brought in an appropriate United States district court or State court for statutory damages of not less than $1,000, and any actual damages, including costs and attorneys' fees, incurred by—

''(A) the actual copyright owner or the alleged infringer arising out of the disabling or blocking of access to or removal of such material; or

''(B) any person who relies upon such misrepresentation in removing, disabling, or blocking access to the material claimed to be infringing in such notice.

''(5) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY BASED UPON REMOVING, DISABLING, OR BLOCKING ACCESS TO INFRINGING MATERIAL.—A person shall not be liable for any claim based on that person's removing, disabling, or blocking access for a period of ten days, or until the person receives a court order concerning the material, whichever is less, to material residing on a system or network used in conjunction with electronic communications that is controlled or operated by or for that person in response to notice pursuant to paragraph (b)(3)(A) that the material is infringing, whether or not the material is infringing.

''(6) OTHER DEFENSES NOT AFFECTED.—A person's removing, disabling, or blocking access to material residing on a system or network used in conjunction with electronic communications that is controlled or operated by or for that person, pursuant to paragraph (1), or the failure to do so, shall not adversely bear upon the consideration by a court of any other issue pertaining to liability or remedy, including any other limitation on liability established in paragraph (a), any other applicable defense, any claim that the service provider's alleged conduct is not infringing, or whether or not such conduct is willful or innocent.''

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the following:

''512. Liability relating to material on the Internet and on-line.''

TITLE II—TECHNOLOGY FOR TEACHERS AND LIBRARIANS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Technology for Educators and Children (TECH) Act.

SEC. 202. FAIR USE.

(a) TRANSMISSIONS.—The first sentence of section 107 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''or by any other means specified in that section,'' the following: ''and by analog or digital transmission,''; and

(b) DETERMINATION.—Section 107 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: ''In making a determination concerning fair use, no independent weight shall be afforded to—

''(1) the means by which the work has been performed, displayed or distributed under the authority of the copyright owner; or

''(2) the application of an effective technological measure (as defined under section 1201(c)) to the work.''.

SEC. 203. LIBRARY EXEMPTIONS.

Section 108 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''Notwithstanding'' at the beginning of subsection (a) and inserting: ''Except as otherwise provided and notwithstanding'';

(2) by inserting after ''copyright'' in subsection (a)(3): ''if such notice appears on the copy or phonorecord that is reproduced under the provisions of this section'';

(3) in subsection (b) by—

(A) deleting ''a copy or phonorecord'' and inserting in lieu thereof: ''three copies or phonorecords''; and

(B) deleting ''in facsimile form''; and

(4) in subsection (c) by—

(A) deleting ''a copy or phonorecord'' and inserting in lieu thereof: ''three copies or phonorecords'';

(B) deleting ''in facsimile form''; and

(C) inserting ''or if the existing format in which the work is stored has become obsolete,'' after ''stolen,''.

SEC. 204. DISTANCE EDUCATION.

(a) TITLE CHANGE.—The title of section 110 of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 110. Limitations on exclusive rights: Exemption of certain activities''.

(b) PERFORMANCE, DISPLAY AND DISTRIBUTION OF A WORK.—Section 110(2) of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(2) performance, display or distribution of a work, by or in the course of an analog or digital transmission, if—

''(A) the performance, display or distribution is a regular part of the systematic instructional activities of a governmental body or a nonprofit educational institution;

''(B) the performance, display or distribution is directly related and of material assistance to the teaching content of the transmission; and

''(C) the work is provided for reception by—

''(i) students officially enrolled in the course in connection with which it is provided; or

''(ii) officers or employees of governmental bodies as part of their official duties or employment.''

(c) EPHEMERAL RECORDINGS OF WORKS.—Section 112(b) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by deleting ''transmit a performance or display of'' and inserting in lieu thereof: ''perform, display or distribute''.

SEC. 205. LIMITATIONS ON EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS.

(a) TITLE.—The title of section 117 of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ Limitations on exclusive rights: Computer programs and digital copies'';

(b) DIGITAL COPIES.—Section 117 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(a)'' before ''Notwithstanding'' and inserting the following as a new subsection (b):

''(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 106, it is not an infringement to make a copy of a work in a digital format if such copying—

''(1) is incidental to the operation of a device in the course of the use of a work otherwise lawful under this title; and

''(2) does not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work and does not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interest of the author.''.

TITLE III—WIPO TREATY IMPLEMENTATION

SEC. 301. WIPO IMPLEMENTATION.

Title 17 of the United States Code is amended by adding the following sections:

''§ 1201. Circumvention of certain technological measures

''(a) CIRCUMVENTION CONDUCT.—No person, for the purpose of facilitating or engaging in an act of infringement, shall engage in conduct so as knowingly to remove, deactivate or otherwise circumvent the application of operation of any effective technological measure used by a copyright owner to preclude or limit reproduction of a work or a portion thereof. As used in this subsection, the term 'conduct' does not include manufacturing, importing or distributing a device or a computer program.

''(b) CONDUCT GOVERNED BY SEPARATE CHAPTER.— Notwithstanding subsection (a), this section shall not apply with respect to conduct or the offer or performance of a service governed by a separate chapter of this title.

''(c) DEFINITION OF EFFECTIVE TECHNOLOGICAL MEASURE.—As used in this section, the term 'effective technological measure' means information included with or an attribute applied to a transmission or a copy of a work in a digital format, or a portion thereof, so as to protect the rights of a copyright owner of such work or portion thereof under chapter one of this title and which—

''(1) encrypts or scrambles the work or a portion thereof in the absence of access information supplied by the copyright owner; or

''(2) includes attributes regarding access to or recording of the work that cannot be removed without degrading the work or a portion thereof.

''§ 1202. Integrity of copyright management information

''(a) FALSE COPYRIGHT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION.—No person shall knowingly provide copyright management information that is false, or knowingly publicly distribute or import for distribution copyright management information that is false, with intent to induce, facilitate, or conceal infringement.

''(b) REMOVAL OR ALTERATION OF COPYRIGHT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION.—No person shall, without authority of the copyright owner or other lawful authority, knowingly and with intent to mislead or to induce or facilitate infringement—

''(1) remove or alter any copyright management information;

''(2) publicly distribute or import for distribution a copy or phonorecord containing copyright management information that has been altered without authority of the copyright owner or other lawful authority; or

''(3) publicly distribute or import for distribution a copy or phonorecord from which copyright management information has been removed without authority of the copyright owner or other lawful authority: *Provided*, That the conduct governed by this subsection does not include the manufacturing, importing or distributing of a device.

''(c) DEFINITION OF COPYRIGHT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION.—As used in this chapter, the term 'copyright management information' means the following information in electronic form as carried in or as data accompanying a copy or phonorecord of a work, including in digital form:

''(1) The title and other information identifying the work, including the information set forth in a notice of copyright.

''(2) The name and other identifying information of the author of the work.

''(3) The name and other identifying information of the copyright owner of the work, including the information set forth in a notice of copyright.

''(4) Terms and conditions for uses of the work.

''(5) Identifying numbers or symbols referring to such information or links to such information.

''(6) Such other identifying information concerning the work as the Register of Copyrights may prescribe by regulations: *Provided*, That the term 'copyright management information' does not include the information described in section 1002, section 1201(c), or a chapter of this title other than chapters one through nine of this. *Provided further*, That, in order to assure privacy protection, the term 'copyright management information' does not include any personally identifiable information relating to the user of a work, including but not limited to the name, account, address or other contact information of or pertaining to the user.

''§ 1203. Civil remedies

''(a) CIVIL ACTIONS.—Any person aggrieved by a violation of section 1201(a) or 1202 may bring a civil action in an appropriate United States district court against any person for such violation.

''(b) POWERS OF THE COURT.—In an action brought under subsection (a), the court—

''(1) may grant a temporary and a permanent injunction on such terms as it deems reasonable to prevent or restrain a violation;

''(2) may grant such other equitable relief as it deems appropriate;

''(3) may award damages pursuant to subsection (c);

''(4) may allow the recovery of costs by or against any party other than the United States or an officer thereof; and

''(5) may award a reasonable attorney's fee to the prevailing party.

''(c) AWARD OF DAMAGES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the court finds that a violation of section 1201(a) or 1202 has occurred, the complaining party may elect either actual damages as computed under paragraph (2) or statutory damages as computed under paragraph (3).

''(2) ACTUAL DAMAGES.—The court may award to the complaining party the actual damages suffered by him or her as a result of the violation, and any profits of the violator that are attributable to the violation and are not taken into account in computing the actual damages, if the complaining party elects such damages instead of statutory damages at any time before final judgment is entered.

''(3) STATUTORY DAMAGES.—(A) The court may award to the complaining party statutory damages for each violation of section 1201(a) of not less than $250 or more than $2,500, as the court considers just, if the complaining party elects such damages instead of actual damages at any time before final judgment is entered.

''(B) The court may award to the complaining party statutory damages for each violation of section 1202 of not less than $500 or more than $20,000, as the court considers just, if the complaining party elects such damages instead of actual damages at any time before final judgment is entered.

''(4) REPEATED VIOLATIONS.—In any case in which the court finds that a person has violated section 1201(a) or 1202 within three years after a final judgment against that person for another such violation was entered, the court may increase the award of damages to not more than double the amount that would otherwise be awarded under paragraph (2) or (3), as the court considers just.

''(5) INNOCENT VIOLATION.—The court may reduce or remit altogether the total award of damages that otherwise would be awarded under paragraph (2) or (3) in any case in which the violator sustains the burden of proving, and the court finds, that the violator was not aware and had no reason to believe that its acts constituted a violation of section 1201(a) or 1202.''.

SEC. 302. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) Revising the item relating to section 110 to read as follows:

''110. Limitations on exclusive rights: Exemption of certain activities''; and

(2) Revising the item relating to section 117 to read as follows:

''117. Limitations on exclusive rights: Computer programs and digital copies''.

(b) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The table of chapters for title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''12. Copyright Protection and Management Systems ..... 1201''.

SEC. 303. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections one through seven and section 9(a) of this Act, and the amendments made by sections one through seven and section 9(a) of this Act, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) WIPO TREATIES.—Section 8 and section 9(b) of this Act, and the amendments made by section 8 and section 9(b) of this Act, shall take effect on the date on which both the World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty and the World Intellectual Property Organization Performances and Phonograms Treaty have entered into force with respect to the United States.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 61

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 61, a bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend eligibility for veterans' burial benefits, funeral benefits, and related benefits for veterans of certain service in the United States merchant marine during World War II.

S. 102

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 102, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve medicare treatment and education for beneficiaries with diabetes by providing coverage of diabetes outpatient self-management training services and uniform coverage of blood-testing strips for individuals with diabetes.

S. 230

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 230, a bill to amend section 1951 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the Hobbs Act), and for other purposes.

S. 364

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] were added as cosponsors of S. 364, a bill to provide legal standards and procedures for suppliers of raw materials and component parts for medical devices.

S. 385

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 385, a bill to provide reimbursement under the medicare program for telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 394

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 394, a bill to partially restore compensation levels to their past equivalent in terms of real income and establish the procedure for adjusting

future compensation of justices and judges of the United States.

S. 532

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 532, a bill to authorize funds to further the strong Federal interest in the improvement of highways and transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to establish an Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring, to provide for the imposition of sanctions against countries engaged in a pattern of religious persecution, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 803, a bill to permit the transportation of passengers between United States ports by certain foreign-flag vessels and to encourage United States-flag vessels to participate in such transportation.

S. 852

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 852, a bill to establish nationally uniform requirements regarding the titling and registration of salvage, nonrepairable, and rebuilt vehicles.

S. 863

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 863, a bill to authorize the Government of India to establish a memorial to honor Mahatma Gandhi in the District of Columbia.

S. 887

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] were added as cosponsors of S. 887, a bill to establish in the National Service the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom program, and for other purposes.

S. 912

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 912, a bill to provide for certain military retirees and dependents a special medicare part B enrollment period during which the late enrollment penalty is waived and a special medigap open period during which no underwriting is permitted.

S. 927

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] were added as cosponsors of S. 927, a bill to reauthorize the Sea Grant Program.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army to close the United States Army School of the Americas.

S. 1051

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1051, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to enhance protections against unauthorized changes of telephone service subscribers from one telecommunications carrier to another, and for other purposes.

S. 1062

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] were added as cosponsors of S. 1062, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions toward religious understanding and peace, and for other purposes.

S. 1100

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1100, a bill to amend the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, the legislation approving such covenant, and for other purposes.

S. 1105

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1105, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a sound budgetary mechanism for financing health and death benefits of retired coal miners while ensuring the long-term fiscal health and solvency of such benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 1133

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1133, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirment accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses and to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts.

S. 1141

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] were added as cosponsors of S. 1141, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to take into account newly developed renewable energy-based fuels and to equalize alternative fuel vehicle acquisition incentives to increase the flexibility of controlled fleet owners and operators, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, a concurrent resolution recognizing and commending American airmen held as political prisoners at the Buchenwald concentration camp during World War II for their service, bravery, and fortitude.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 42

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], and the Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, a concurrent resolution to authorize the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a congressional ceremony honoring Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew.

SENATE RESOLUTION 94

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLELAND] and the Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 94, a resolution commending the American Medical Association on its 150th anniversary, its 150 years of caring for the United States, and its continuing effort to uphold the principles upon which Nathan Davis, M.D. and his colleagues founded the American Medical Association to ''promote the science and art of medicine and the betterment of public health.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 111

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] and the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 111, a resolution designating the week beginning September 14, 1997, as ''National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week,'' and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

DORGAN AMENDMENT NO. 1060

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill (S. 1061) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 30, line 21, strike ''$1,531,898,000.'' and insert ''$1,539,898,000: *Provided*, That in addition to any other amounts made available, either directly or indirectly, under this item for heart and stroke-related research, an additional $8,000,000 shall be used for such research.''.

On page 35, line 22, strike ''$211,500,000'' and insert ''203,500,000''.

ASHCROFT (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1061

Mr. ASHCROFT (for himself, Mr. HELMS, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. COATS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

On page 77, strike lines 6 through 11, and insert the following (and redesignate the following section accordingly):

SEC. 508. (a) None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be expended for any abortion.

(b) None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be expended for health benefits coverage that includes coverage for abortion.

(c) The term ''health benefits coverage'' means the package of services covered by a managed care provider or organization pursuant to a contract or other arrangement.

SEC. 509. (a) The limitations established in the preceding section shall not apply to an abortion—

(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

(2) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed.

(b) Nothing in the preceding section shall by construed as prohibiting the expenditure by a State, locality, entity, or private person of State, local, or private funds (other than a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds) for abortion services or coverage of abortion by contract or other arrangement.

(c) Nothing in the preceding section shall be construed as restricting the ability of any managed care provider or organization from offering abortion coverage or the ability of a State or locality to contract separately with such a provider for such coverage with State funds (other than a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds).

KERREY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1062

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KERREY (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

On page 40, line 24, strike the period and insert '': *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 418(a) of the Social Security Act, for fiscal year 1997 only, the amount of payment under section 418(a)(1) to which each State is entitled shall equal the amount specified as mandatory funds with respect to such State for such fiscal year in the table transmitted by the Administration for Children and Families to State Child Care and Development Block Grant Lead Agencies on August 27, 1996, and the amount of State expenditures in fiscal year 1994 or 1995 (whichever is greater) that equals the non-Federal share for the programs described in section 418(a)(1)(A) shall be deemed to equal the amount specified as maintenance of effort with respect to such State for fiscal year 1997 in such table.''.

INHOFE (AND CLELAND) AMENDMENT NO. 1063

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CLELAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

On page 70, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

''From funds provided under the second preceding paragraph, not less than $2,225,000 shall be available for conducting a disability return to work demonstration initiative, which focuses on providing persons who have lost limbs with an integrated program of prosthetic and rehabilitative care and job placement assistance.''

INHOFE AMENDMENT NO. 1064

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

On page 59, strike lines 13 through 18.

MCCAIN AMENDMENT NO. 1065

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

On page 49, after line 26, add the following:

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the payments described in subsection (b) shall not be considered income or resources in determining eligibility for, or the amount of benefits under, a program or State plan under title IV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.

(b) The payments described in this subsection are payments made by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 657 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2584).

D'AMATO AMENDMENTS NOS. 1066–1067

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. D'AMATO submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1066

On page 45, line 13, strike ''$854,074,000'' and insert ''894,074,000 of which $40,000,000 shall be made available to carry out title III of such Act''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1067

On page 45, line 13, strike ''$854,074,000'' and insert ''$854,074,000 (and an additional amount of $40,000,000 that shall be used to carry out title III of such Act)''.

DORGAN AMENDMENT NO. 1068

Mr. DORGAN proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

On page 30, line 21, strike ''$1,531,898,000.'' and insert ''$1,539,898,000''.

On page 35, line 22, strike ''$211,500,000'' and insert ''203,500,000''.

SPECTER AMENDMENT NO. 1069

Mr. SPECTER proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT COUNSEL.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) press reports appearing in the early Spring of 1997 reported that the FBI and the Justice Department withheld national security information from the Clinton administration and President Clinton regarding information pertaining to the possible involvement by the Chinese government in seeking to influence both the administration and some members of Congress in the 1996 elections;

(2) President Clinton subsequently stated, in reference to the failure by the FBI and the Justice Department to brief him on such information regarding China: ''There are significant national security issues at stake here,'' and further stated that ''I believe I should have known'';

(3) there has been an acknowledgment by former White House Chief to Staff Leon Panetta in March 1997 that there was indeed coordination between the White House and the DNC regarding the expenditure of soft money for advertising;

(4) the Attorney General in her appearance before the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 30, 1997 acknowledged a presumed coordination between President Clinton and the DNC regarding campaign advertisements;

(5) Richard Morris in his recent book, *Behind the Oval Office*, describes his firsthand knowledge that ''the president became the day-to-day operational director of our [DNC] TV ad campaign. He worked over every script, watched each ad, ordered changes in every visual presentation and decided which ads would run when and where;''

(6) there have been conflicting and contradictory statements by the Vice President regarding the timing and extent of his knowledge of the nature of a fundraising event at the Hsi Lai Buddhist Temple near Los Angeles on April 29, 1996;

(7) the independent counsel statute requires the Attorney General to consider the specificity of information provided and the credibility of the source of information pertaining to potential violations of criminal law by covered persons, including the President and the Vice President;

(8) the independent counsel statute further requires the Attorney General to petition the court for appointment of an independent counsel where the Attorney General finds that there is a reasonable likelihood that a violation of criminal law may have occurred involving a covered person;

(9) the Attorney General has been presented with specific and credible evidence pertaining to potential violations of criminal law by covered persons and there is a reasonable likelihood that a violation of criminal law may have occurred involving a covered person; and

(10) the Attorney General has abused her discretion by failing to petition the court for appointment of an independent counsel.

(b) It is the Sense of the Senate that the Attorney General should petition the court immediately for appointment of an independent counsel to investigate the reasonable likelihood that a violation of criminal law may have occurred involving a covered person in the 1996 presidential federal election campaign.

GREGG AMENDMENT NO. 1070

Mr. GREGG proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . (a) PROHIBITION OF FUNDS FOR NATIONAL TESTING IN READING AND MATHEMATICS.—None of the funds made a available in this Act may be used to develop, plan, implement, or administer any national testing program in reading or mathematics.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the following:

(1) The National Assessment of Educational Progress carried out under sections 411 through 413 of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 9010–9012).

(2) The Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS).

COATS (AND GREGG) AMENDMENT NO. 1071

Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. GREGG) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1070 proposed by Mr. GREGG to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

At the end of the pending amendment add the following:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act, may be used to develop, plan, implement, or administer any national testing program in reading or mathematics unless the program is specifically authorized by Federal statute.

SPECTER AMENDMENT NO. 1072

Mr. SPECTER proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

On page 39, before the period on line 25, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That $2,000,000 of the amount available for research, demonstration, and evaluation activities shall be available for carrying out demonstration projects on Medicaid coverage of community-based attendant care services for people with disabilities which ensures maximum control by the consumer to select and manage their attendant care services".

DURBIN AMENDMENT NO. 1073

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

On page 49, after line 26, add the following:

SEC. _____. (a) STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the General Accounting Office, shall conduct a comprehensive study concerning efforts to improve organ donation at hospitals. Under such study, the Secretary shall survey at least 5 percent of the hospitals participating in the organ donation program under the Public Health Service Act to examine—

(1) the differences in protocols for the identification of potential organ donors;

(2) whether each hospital has a system in place for such identification of donors; and

(3) protocols for outreach to the relatives of potential organ or tissue donors.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report concerning the study conducted under subsection (a), that shall include recommendations on hospital best practices—

(1) that result in the most efficient and comprehensive identification of organ and tissue donors; and

(2) for communicating with the relatives of potential organ donors.

WELLSTONE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1074

Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FORD, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. BREAUX, Ms. MOSLEY-BRAUN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. REID, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BRYAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. BAUCUS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . PARKINSON'S DISEASE RESEARCH.

(a) SHORT TITLE—This section may be cited as the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act of 1997''.

(b) FINDING AND PURPOSE.—

(1) FINDING.—Congrss finds that to take full advantage of the tremendous potential for finding a cure or effective treatment, the Federal investment in Parkinson's must be expanded, as well as the coordination strengthened among the National Institutes of Health research institutes.

(2) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to provide for the expansion and coordination of research regarding Parkinson's, and to improve care and assistance for afflicted individuals and their family caregivers.

(c) PARKINSON'S RESEARCH.—Part B of title IV of the Pubic Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PARKINSON'S DISEASE

''SEC. 409B. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall establish a program for the conduct and support of research and training with respect to Parkinson's disease (subject to the extent of amounts appropriated under subsection (e)).

''(b) INTER-INSTITUTE COORDINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall provide for the coordination of the program established under subsection (a) among all of the national research institutes conducting Parkinson's research.

''(2) CONFERENCE.—Coordination under paragraph (1) shall include the convening of a research planning conference not less frequently than one every 2 years. Each such conference shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives a report concerning the conference.

''(c) MORRIS K. UDALL RESEARCH CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall award Core Center Grants to encourage the development of innovative multidisciplinary research an provide training concerning Parkinson's. The Director shall award not more than 10 Core Center Grants and designate each center funded under such grants as a Morris K. Udall Center for Research on Parkinson's Disease.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to Parkinson's, each center assisted under this subsection shall—

''(i) use the facilities of a single institution or a consortium of cooperating institutions, and meet such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Director of the NIH; and

''(ii) conduct basic and clinical research.

''(B) DISCRETIONARY REQUIREMENTS.—With respect to Parkinson's, each center assisted under this subsection may—

''(i) conducted training programs for scientists and health professionals;

''(ii) conduct programs to provide information and continuing education to health professionals;

''(iii) conduct programs for the dissemination of information to the public;

''(iv) separately or in collaboration with other centers, establish a nationwide data system derived from patient populations with Parkinson's, and where possible, comparing relevant data involving general populations;

''(v) separately or in collaboration with other centers, establish a Parkinson's Disease Information Clearinghouse to facilitate and enhance knowledge and understanding of Parkinson's disease; and

''(vi) separately or in collaboration with other centers, establish a national education program that fosters a national focus on Parkinson's and the care of those with Parkinson's.

''(3) STIPENDS REGARDING TRAINING PROGRAMS.—A center may use funds provided under paragraph (1) to provide stipends for scientists and health professionals enrolled in training programs under paragraph (2)(B).

''(4) DURATION OF SUPPORT.—Support of a center under this subsection may be for a period not exceeding five years. Such period may be extended by the Director of NIH for one or more additional periods of not more than five years if the operations of such center have been reviewed by an appropriate technical and scientific peer review group established by the Director and if such group has recommended to the Director that such period should be extended.

''(d) MORRIS K.UDALL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN PARKINSON'S DISEASE RESEARCH.—The Director of NIH shall establish a grant program to support investigators with a proven record of excellence and innovation in Parkinson's research and who demonstrate potential for significant future breakthroughs in the understanding of the pathogensis, diagnosis, and treatment of Parkinson's. Grants under this subsection shall be available for a period of not to exceed 5 years.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 and 2000.''.

COATS (AND FRIST) AMENDMENT NO. 1075

Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. FRIST) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

On page 49, after line 26, add the following:

COMPREHENSIVE INDEPENDENT STUDY OF NIH RESEARCH PRIORITY SETTING

SEC. . (a) STUDY BY THE INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine to conduct a comprehensive study of the policies and process used by the National Institutes of Health to determine funding allocations for biomedical research.

(b) MATTERS TO BE ASSESSED.—The study under subsection (a) shall assess—

(1) the factors or criteria used by the National Institutes of Health to determine funding allocations for disease research;

(2) the process by which research funding decisions are made;

(3) the mechanisms for public input into the priority setting process; and

(4) the impact of statutory directive on research funding decisions.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the Secretary of Health and Human Services enters into the contract under subsection (a), the Institute of Medicine shall submit a report concerning the study to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—The report under paragraph (1) shall set forth the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Institute of Medicine for improvements in the National Institutes of Health research funding policies and processes and for any necessary congressional action.

(d) FUNDING.—Of the amount appropriated in this title for the National Institutes of Health, $300,000 shall be made available for the study and report under this section.

GORTON (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1076

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GORTON (for himself, Mr. GRAMS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

On page 49, after line 26, add the following:

SEC. ____. (a) Section 2110(b)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C 1397jj(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(A) PRIOR COVERAGE UNDER A STATE-FUNDED HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE PROGRAM.—A child shall not be considered to be described in paragraph (1)(C) notwithstanding that the child is covered under a health insurance coverage program that has been in operation since before July 1, 1997, and that is offered by a State which receives no Federal funds for the program's operation.

''(B) STATES WITH MEDICAID APPLICABLE INCOME LEVELS AT OR ABOVE 200 PERCENT.—In the case of any State that, as of August 5, 1997, has, under a waiver authorized by the Secretary or under section 1902(r)(2), established a medicaid applicable income level for all children 17 years of age or younger or 18 years of age or younger (at the option of the State) residing in the State that is at or above 200 percent of the poverty line, such State may, notwithstanding subparagraphs (B)(ii) and (C) of paragraph (1), consider a child whose family income exceeds the mandatory income level (expressed as a percent of the poverty line) applicable for the age of such child under section 1902(l)(2), as in effect on August 5, 1997, in order for the child to be eligible for medical assistance under a State plan under title XIX, but does not exceed 200 percent of the poverty line, to be a targeted low-income child for purposes of this title if—

''(i) such child did not previously have health insurance coverage; and

''(ii) the State has submitted and had approved under section 2106 a plan amendment that specifies how the State will ensure that only children described in clause (i) are considered targeted low-income children in accordance with this subparagraph.''.

(b) Section 1905(u)(2)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(u)(2)(C)) (as added by section 4911(a)(2) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'optional targeted low-income child' means a child who—

''(i) is a targeted low-income child, as defined in section 2110(b)(1), who would not qualify for medical assistance under the State plan under this title based on such plan as in effect on April 15, 1997 (but taking into account the expansion of age of eligibility effected through the operation of section 1902(l)(2)(D)), or

''(ii) is considered to be a targeted low-income child under section 2110(b)(3).''.

(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 4901(a) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 4911(a)(2) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

COATS (AND NICKLES) AMENDMENT NO. 1077

Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. NICKLES) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

At the end of the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . LIMITATON ON USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the amounts subject to the provision of subsection (e) of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act of 1997'' may be expended for any research that utilizes human fetal tissue, cells, or organs that are obtained from a living or dead embryo or fetus during or after an induced abortion. This subsection does not apply to human fetal tissue, cells, or organs that are obtained from a spontaneous abortion or an ectopic pregnancy.

DURBIN (AND COLLINS) AMENDMENT NO. 1078

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 1061, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . REPEAL OF TOBACCO INDUSTRY SETTLEMENT CREDIT.—Subsection (k) of section 9302 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, as added by section 1604(f)(3) of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, is repealed.

SENATE RESOLUTION 118—RELATIVE TO THE LATE DIANA, PRINCESS OF WALES

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BIDEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 118

Whereas the Senate and the American people heard the announcement of the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, with profound sorrow and deep regret;

Whereas the Princess of Wales, touched the lives of millions of Americans and people throughout the world as an example of compassion and grace;

Whereas the Princess of Wales, was a committed and caring mother who successfully raised two young sons under great pressure and public scrutiny;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the tireless humanitarian efforts of the Princess of Wales, including the areas of—

(1) raising awareness of and attention to breast cancer research and treatment;

(2) HIV/AIDS, particularly in the areas of pediatric AIDS, educating the public regarding the facts of HIV/AIDS transmission, and fostering a public attitude that is intolerant of discrimination against people with HIV/AIDS;

(3) banning antipersonnel landmines from the arsenals of war, as these indiscriminate weapons often result in casualties to civilians, including children, sometimes many years after the armed conflict in which the mines were used; and

(4) eliminating the problem of homelessness around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends to the people of the United Kingdom sincere condolences and sympathy on the death of Diana, Princess of Wales;

(2) recognizes the extraordinary impact of the Princess of Wales' humanitarian efforts around the world;

(3) designates September 6, 1997, as a ''National Day of Recognition for the Humanitarian efforts of Diana, Princess of Wales''; and

(4) the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of Diana, Princess of Wales.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Wednesday, September 10, 1997, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony from the Forest Service on their organizational structure, staffing, and budget for the Alaska Region.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Judy Brown or Mark Rey at (202) 224–6170.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Tuesday, September 16, 1997, at 10 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is oversight of Federal outdoor recreation policy.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Kelly Johnson at (202) 224–3329.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

MR. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 3, 1997, at 10:30 a.m. in room 226 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building to hold a hearing on: ''Closing The Legal Loophole for Union Violence.''

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a Hearing on Tobacco Settlement during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 3, 1997, at 10:00 a.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY, TERRORISM, AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 3, 1997, at 2 p.m. to hold a hearing in room 226, Senate Dirksen Office Building, on: ''The Encryption Debate: Criminals, Terrorists and the Security Needs of Business and Industry.''

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

VETERANS MORTGAGES

• Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, during my tenure as Administrator of the Veterans, Administration a ''fall back and rescue'' plan was formulated to be of assistance to those veterans with VA guaranteed mortgages which might be burdensome.

The proposal which later became a VA regulation is now, as then, referred to as IRRRL which stands for interest rate reduction refinancing loan.

Many thousands of eligible veterans have already benefited from this legislation during the past 17 years of its existence and the VA personnel involved deserve many thanks for their dedicated interest and help.

My concern is not with the legislation or the Department of Veterans Affairs, but rather with the seeming reluctance of many in the mortgage industry to take a more active posture with regard to its implementation.

I have been told by those who are in the know that the numbers of interested lenders is very small in comparison to the need.

I call upon those companies who service GI mortgage loans to be more receptive and to make known throughout the veterans community the existence of these mortgage ''lifelines.''

The main features of the IRRRL are the following: First, in most cases the interest rate will be lower, and the payment will be lower. Documentation is at a minimum and no credit evaluation is done; second, refinancing can be done if the mortgagee is less than 2½ months behind in their payments; and third, the veteran can add up to $6,000.00 to the mortgage for energy efficient improvements, for example, air conditioning, heating systems, insulation, storm door and windows.

In closing, I also encourage Secretary designate Hershel Gober to intensify the VA's efforts to communicate to veterans information on this very vital and viable tool which is available to them. Further, I hope to enlist in the same effort the extremely valuable services of my good friend, former VA Secretary Jesse Brown, whose knowledge and dedication to veterans is unquestioned.•

HONORING THE EMPLOYEES OF CARL F. BOOTH & CO., INC.

• Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the employees of Carl F. Booth & Co., Inc., in New Albany, IN. Each of the company's 44 employees helped construct the wooden case which holds the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address in the newly renovated Jefferson Building of the Library of Congress.

Carl Booth & Co., which produces custom plywood, specializes in providing interior plywood for jets and airplanes. The company has produced plywood for numerous corporate and celebrity jets and Air Force One.

Under the leadership of Carl Booth, the employees of the Indiana woodworking company displayed great dedication and enthusiasm in working on the plywood for the case, which took over 500 man-hours to produce.

We are honored to have such fine workmanship to hold the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address, two important documents in the history of America. I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the employees of Carl Booth & Co. for their contribution to this important project.•

RECOGNITION OF MAYOR BRENDA BARGER OF WATERTOWN, SD

• Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity today to recognize the important work of Mayor Brenda Barger in leading the residents of Watertown, SD, through winter storms and flooding.

Early this year, residents of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota experienced relentless snowstorms and bitterly cold temperatures. Snowdrifts as high as buildings, roads with only one lane cleared, homes without heat for days, hundreds of thousands of dead livestock, and schools closed for a week at a time were commonplace. As if surviving the severe winter cold was not challenge enough, residents of the Upper Midwest could hardly imagine the extent of damage Mother Nature had yet to inflict with a 500-year flood.

Record levels on the Big Sioux River and Lake Kampeska forced over 5,000 residents of Watertown, SD, to evacuate their homes and left over one-third of the city without sewer and water for 3 weeks. The headline of the Watertown Public Opinion on April 6 read ''Watertown in Peril,'' and I will never forget the image of homeowners and neighbors, shrouded in a late-season snow storm, sandbagging against the rising waters of the Big Sioux River and Lake Kampeska.

Brenda Barger held Watertown together with her strength and direction. Some 6 weeks prior to major flooding which began on April 4, Mayor Barger initiated efforts to try and minimize the impact of the impending disaster. Mayor Barger brought together local and county officials, volunteer agencies including the Red Cross, Salvation Army, and others, to brainstorm and compile resource lists of expected needs including equipment, people, and funds.

Despite careful planning, on April 5, an unexpected blizzard hit the State, devastating the area. Everything froze, creating further concerns about what was going to happen once the water began flowing again. Mayor Barger camped out in the city's impromptu crisis center around the clock and helped to direct the efforts of a number of local volunteers, prisoners, and National Guard personnel. Mother Nature caused Mayor Barger to make a number of difficult decisions immediately following the April storm, including ordering the evacuation of nearly 5,000 residents, or one-fourth the population, of Watertown and the shutdown of the water treatment plant at Lake Kampeska. In the following days, Mayor Barger secured over 750 port-a-potties and deployed them on the lawns of those families who could return to their homes. Water trucks were brought in to provide people with a fresh water supply, and Mayor Barger oversaw repairs to the water treatment plant which were completed ahead of schedule.

While those of us from the Midwest will never forget the destruction wrought by this year's floods, I have been heartened to witness first-hand and hear accounts of South Dakotans coming together within their community to protect homes, farms, and entire towns from rising flood waters. Mayor Brenda Barger truly exemplifies the role of a public servant, who, in the face of unimaginable natural destruction, placed the needs of an entire community ahead of personal concern. Now, Mayor Barger is spearheading efforts by Watertown residents to fully repair the damage from this past year and plan for future emergencies.

Mr. President, there is much more to be done to rebuild and repair impacted communities. Mayor Brenda Barger illustrates how the actions of an individual can bring some relief to the victims of this natural disaster. I ask you to join me in thanking her for her selfless efforts and congratulate her on being

recognized during the National Association of Towns and Townships convention in Washington, DC, this week.●

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. T.A. TAYLOR-HUNT

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a very special native of Philadelphia upon her retirement from the U.S. Air Force. This extraordinary woman, Maj. T.A. Taylor-Hunt, has served her country and her community with grace and distinction.

To say that T.A. has had an exemplary military career is an understatement. Her promise as an officer was evident when she received an American Spirit Honor Medal upon graduation from basic training. After completing technical school at Shepard AFB, she began a career in accounting and finance at Dover AFB, with follow-on assignments that took her around the world. At the Strategic Air Command NCO Academy, she was recognized as an Honor Graduate, Distinguished Graduate, Commandant's Award winner, Academic Champion, and Flight Speech Champion. She was the first person in the 25 year history of the Academy to receive so many awards. Likewise, T.A. received an Instructor's Abilities Award at NCO Leadership School as well as the Officer's Training School Flight Academic Achievement Award. As a comptroller, T.A. played a critical role in the financial operations of Operation Desert Storm. In Europe, she helped to establish an Army medical unit in the former Yugoslavia. At the time of her retirement, she was the Deputy Chief of Wartime / Contingency Planning at the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Denver Center.

I would also note that Major Taylor-Hunt graduated summa cum laude from the University of Maryland, and she received her masters degree with distinction from Webster University. Currently, she is attending the University of Denver College of Law.

In addition to the awards I mentioned earlier, Major Taylor-Hunt has received numerous other commendations for her military performance, as well as her extensive community service. Her military awards and decorations include the Meritorious Service Medal, the Air Force Commendation Medal, the Outstanding Unit Award, and the Air Force Special Recognition Ribbon. Some of her other awards include the 1988 Delegate of the Year for the Coastal Charter Chapter American Business Women's Association, the Federal Women's Program Military Officer of the Year, a Community Service Award for the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, and inclusion in the 1996 Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities.

Mr. President, given T.A.'s tireless efforts to help the less fortunate, it is clear that the recognition she received has been well deserved. Her business card describes the way she lives her life. The inscription reads, ''Take Care of Others, God Will Take Care of You.'' And take care of others she has. T.A. devotes a substantial number of hours each week soliciting, collecting, sorting, and distributing donations to the homeless, without the assistance of staff. She not only meets the basic needs of homeless families such as food and clothing, but she also works to correct their credit problems so that they can find permanent housing. Likewise, T.A. volunteers at several shelters, delivers Meals-On-Wheels, and tutors a fourth grade student.

I am proud to say that Major Taylor-Hunt's compassion has been contagious. What started as an effort to help one family living in a school bus has grown into an extensive support network spanning the Denver metropolitan region. Through her leadership, families have found homes; furniture has been donated; hungry people are being fed; children are receiving decent school clothes; and holiday meals and gifts are donated regularly.

In closing, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Maj. T.A. Taylor-Hunt and in extending the Senate's best wishes to her family.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE ONEONTA YANKEES

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the major league baseball season does not end for another month, but today is the end of the regular season of the New York Penn short-season A League.

I am very proud to congratulate two teams for making the playoffs, the Batavia Clippers and, closer to my home in Pindars Corners, the Oneonta Yankees. Oneonta is this year's winner of the New York Penn's Pickney Division, with the second best record in the league. Led by hitting stars such as third baseman Alan Butler and catcher/designated hitter Rene Pinto, behind the pitching of Scott Wiggins and Zach Day, and with the support of the rest of the team which played outstanding baseball this year, the Oneonta Yankees had their best season in 7 years and are going to the playoffs for the first time since 1990.

The Oneonta Yankees have a tradition of success and excellence, having won the New York Penn league title 11 times in their 30 years of existence. The team has been affiliated with the world champion New York Yankees for longer than any other minor-league club in the Yankee organization. Several of today's Yankee stars, including Bernie Williams and Andy Pettitte, began their careers in Oneonta. Don Mattingly—affectionately referred to by the cognoscenti as ''Donnie Baseball''—whose number 23 was just retired at a ceremony at Yankee Stadium this past weekend, also played for the Oneonta Yankees.

As the season ends and the playoffs begin, I want to extend my congratulations to Sam Nader, team owner; Joe Arnold, team manager; and the entire Oneonta Yankees team. I also want to wish them and the Batavia Clippers the best of luck in the post season.●

TRIBUTE TO NORMAN B. TURE

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, It is with great sadness that I rise today to mark the passing of Dr. Norman B. Ture, President of the Institute for Research on the Economics of Taxation and one of the principal architects of supply side economics.

Dr. Ture was a man of principle. He was convinced, and he convinced many others, that public policy must be guided by respect for individual freedom and property rights, reliance on personal responsibility and integrity, and faith in the free market as the means for ordering economic activity. His brilliant economic analysis helped show that increasing marginal income tax rates lower productivity by skewing people's choices away from work and toward leisure activities. He was a major architect of the Reagan tax cuts of the early 1980's, serving as Undersecretary for Tax and Economic Affairs in the Reagan Treasury Department from 1981 to 1982. Less noticed, however, was his significant role in putting together the Kennedy tax cuts of 1963. Whether on a committee staff, in the executive branch or as an independent researcher, Dr. Ture devoted his career to increasing Americans' standards of living by making taxes less onerous.

Dr. Ture also fought to convince public policy makers of the need to make taxes more visible. Hidden taxes on investments and estates, overly broad definitions of income, and onerous regulations that allow government to control economic activities in his view act as drags on the economy and obscure the real costs of government. These policies, Dr. Ture showed, unfairly make government interference in our economic life appear cheap or even cost free. They thereby encourage people to accept more regulation than is in their financial interest, and to give up more of their freedom than they should.

Dr. Ture passed away on August 10. He had fought off lung cancer but finally was felled by cancer of the pancreas. He is survived by his wife, six children, and two grandchildren. I know our thoughts and prayers go out to all Dr. Ture's family in this time of great sorrow.

It is some consolation, however, that we will soon see Dr. Ture's last report. Soon before he died, Dr. Ture finished work on a paper laying out a clean, unbiased, highly visible tax system that would let the people see the price of government and make an informed decision as to how much of it they are willing to pay for. I look forward to the fruitful debate Dr. Ture's final work will no doubt produce.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOAB LESESNE

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Joab Lesesne, a great educator and South Carolinian.

Dr. Lesesne recently celebrated his 25th year as president of Wofford College, a small Methodist-affiliated school, which has become one of the finest small liberal arts schools in the Nation. Its successful evolution is largely due to Dr. Lesesne who first arrived at Wofford 33 years ago as an assistant professor of history. Prior to his post at Wofford, he taught history at Coastal Carolina, part of the University of South Carolina system.

Three years after his arrival at the college, Dr. Lesesne was appointed assistant dean. While in this position, he implemented a visionary interim program during the 1967–68 academic year which continues today. Through this program, students are able to devote themselves to one particular subject for several hours a day for an entire month. The projects range from the study of modern Irish poetry to kayaking down the Rio Grande. The program has contributed to the school's success in turning out well-rounded students with broad interests.

In 1969, Dr. Lesesne was appointed director of development, a position he held for a year before being named dean of the college. After serving as dean from 1970–1972, Dr. Lesesne continued his ascension and was elected president of the college. Today, under his guidance, Wofford continues to break new ground, both locally and nationally.

In 1975, the Wofford Board of Trustees approved full co-education, and the college began admitting women as resident students for the first time in its history. They now comprise approximately 45 percent of the student body. Throughout the Lesesne presidency, Wofford has grown exponentially in its endowments and its campus facilities. Additions include the Campus Life Building, which marked the college's 125th anniversary in 1979, a new residence hall, and the Franklin Olin Building, one of the largest gifts ever made by the prestigious F.W. Olin Foundation. The campus's hospitable setting led the Carolina Panthers to choose Wofford as their summer training camp.

Wofford consistently receives national recognition for its leadership in liberal arts education. It is consistently ranked as one of the ''best buys'' in liberal arts education and recently,a survey showed it to be the national leader in the percentage of students earning academic credits outside the United States through travel or study abroad programs. Furthermore, its academic excellence is complemented by fiscal responsibility. The Lesesne presidency has an enviable record of balanced budgets, tuition well below the national average for Phi Beta Kappa independent colleges, and overall good management.

Dr. Lesesne's record of distinction does not end with Wofford. In 1991, he was chosen as the Citizen of the Year by the Spartanburg Kiwanis Club and, in subsequent years, has received numerous awards from the local and statewide Chambers of Commerce. Additionally, he serves on many boards representing industry, banking, commerce, and education. He is past Chairman of the Board of Directors of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the first southerner ever to hold the post, and is a former president of the Southern University Conference, and former President of the National Association of Schools and Colleges of the United Methodist Church. Additionally, Dr. Lesesne is a retired major general in the South Carolina Army National Guard.

Dr. Lesesne's tenure at Wofford, the longest of any college president in the State, exemplifies the virtues of fortitude and loyalty. Under his steady hand, the school sails forward, faithfully serving its pupils and the community. Joe, in the roles of educator and administrator, is a public servant of the highest order. All of us in South Carolina are proud to call him our own.●

MEXICAN GOVERNMENT DETERMINATION ON APPLE DUMPING

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am dismayed by the decision made Monday by the Mexican Government to impose a 101.1 percent tariff on U.S. Red Delicious and Golden Delicious apples effective September 1. This tariff increase has been imposed in response to an antidumping claim filed by Chihuahua apple growers against U.S. growers earlier this year. Ignoring significant evidence to the contrary, the Mexican Government has issued a preliminary determination that U.S. growers are selling apples in Mexico at half their fair price.

The Mexican Government's determination is wrong. U.S. apple growers have not engaged in dumping. It appears that Mexican officials have virtually ignored the documentation submitted by the U.S. apple industry proving that U.S. apple growers are exporting apples at a fair price. The allegations made by Mexico are ludicrous and the tariff increase unjustified.

As many of my colleagues know, my home State of Washington is the Nation's largest apple producer, and Mexico is the largest market for our apples. This drastic tariff increase will devastate the United States apple industry while allowing Mexican growers, with no competition, to charge exceedingly high prices for their apples.

Together with my colleagues from Oregon and Idaho, I call on the administration to take immediate action on this issue. We cannot allow Mexico to undermine the United States apple industry with these unfair, protectionist trade practices.●

HONORING VOLUNTEER LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, today I rise to honor volunteer law enforcement officers and to give a special note of thanks to those members of the British Special Constables who are now visiting the United States. These constables are volunteer officers who give to their country freely of their time, and sometimes, their lives.

In Michigan, we have over 2,000 such volunteer reserve officers who have made an immeasurably positive impact on the communities they serve. As an American, I am deeply honored by their sacrifice. On behalf of the U.S. Senate, I would like to offer my highest appreciation for the time and talent so generously given by both British and American police reserve officers.

I would also like to recognize the Oakland County Sheriff Reserves for hosting their visit. Thanks is due to the Police Reserve Officer Association of Michigan and the British Special Constables for their efforts in sponsoring the International Reserve Law Officers Conference. This event is a unique opportunity for British and American reservists to exchange ideas and to learn from fellow officers.

I would like to take this opportunity to mention those Constables from Great Britain who are visiting:

Tom Pine, Chief Inspector/Unit Commander, Thames Division—Metropolitan Police.

Brian Lewis, Sergeant, South Wales Police.

Adrian Bates, Inspector, Thames Division—Metropolitan Police.

Mark Balmforth, Police Constable, Metropolitan Police—Area 3.

Harry Waddingham, Special Constable, Thames Division—Metropolitan Police.

Pat Hallisey, Divisional Officer, Metropolitan Police Area 3.

Stuart Winks, Chief Commandant, South Wales Police.

Mark Smith, Special Constable, Thames Division—Metropolitan Police.

John Curley, Special Constable, City of London Police.

Philip Nastri, Divisional Officer, Metropolitan Police Area 3.

Tim Lee, Sub Divisional Officer, Metropolitan Police Area 5.

Windsor Davis, Assistant Chief Commandant, South Wales Police.

Warren Bell, Special Constable, Metropolitan Police Area 3.●

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. HUTCHISON Mr. President, I want to take this time to speak in morning business I assume we are in morning business; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator is correct.

BOSNIA

Mrs. HUTCHISON Mr. President, I want to take this time, along with my

colleague from Kansas, Senator ROBERTS, to talk about an experience that we had in the same place in the world at separate times in the last 2 weeks We were both in Bosnia We had different experiences, but the experiences that we had have brought us to the same conclusion The conclusion is that it is time to go back to the drawing board.

I had the great opportunity—and I did consider it a great opportunity—to walk on the streets of Brcko 1 week before people there started hurling stones at our troops I said at the time that there is going to be trouble here, that we are trying to put a square peg in a round hole, and it will not work We have not set the base for what we are trying to do, and it is not going to be able to be done in 9 months, probably not 2 years, probably not 5 years I think we have to go back to the drawing board.

As I walked on the streets in Brcko, I talked to Serbs, I talked to Muslims I went into a Serb house I went into what was the beginning of a Muslim house We are trying to move Muslim refugees back into a neighborhood where they are supposed to live with Serbs who are there, not 25 feet from each other Are they talking to each other? Are they helping each other build houses or put the roofs on? Are they talking about what they are going to do to bring their communities together? No No, they are not, Mr. President We are talking about putting people who have suffered atrocities in houses 10 feet from each other, and then presumably they are going to try to live together, form a school district together Mr. President, it is not going to work It may work 25 or 50 years from now, but it is not going to work now.

The reason I want to talk about this is because our troops are right in the middle of it Our troops are being put in the position of taking positions between two warring Serb factions They are trying to keep peace in a place where they have not yet come to terms with the issues So I am very worried that the President, though I know he is trying to do the right thing, is not stepping back and asking what have we learned from the last year and a half? What have we learned since Dayton? What can we do to give peace a fair chance? And, most important, how can we make sure that our troops are neutral peacekeepers, so they will not be the targets of the wrath of one faction or another? How can we make sure that our troops are keeping to the mission that they were given, without mission creep, and that our policies underlying the troops that are there are sound policies with a reasonable chance of success?

You know, I was struck by the interview given by General Shalikashvili, who is leaving the Joint Chiefs chairmanship this month, when he said two things He said the troops that are in Bosnia are not the right types of troops to capture war criminals It is a different type of training that is necessary for that—those are my words Second, he talked about the lack of money that we have available right now to make sure that our troops are ready when they are needed to go into a United States security threat He said we don't even have the money to buy parts, and we are not keeping up with training I am thinking to myself, we are spending $3 billion a year in Bosnia on a mission that is ill-defined and a mission that is, I am afraid, creeping into danger, and we are doing it with defense dollars, which is clearly taking from our readiness—$3 billion a year.

So I want to raise some basic questions No. 1, can our troops adequately defend themselves? Thank goodness, today Gen. Wes Clark, the new head of NATO military operations, said, ''Don't fool with American troops because, if you do, we are going to react with force.'' Well, thank goodness I want our troops to defend themselves with all the might that they need to make sure that people do not think they can fire at our troops or throw rocks at them because they are on a peacekeeping mission So, No. 1, can our troops defend themselves?

No. 2, what is the mission? Now, we have been told that the mission is very clear It is to keep the warring parties apart; it is not to capture war criminals And, yes, we keep seeing others trying to draw us into capturing war criminals Now, this does not mean we don't want to capture war criminals Of course, we would like to see these people brought to justice But, Mr. President, I have to say that if we are trying to keep peace, I think we have to determine what we are going to do that will keep peace and what we will do that will hurt peace I think if we are trying to resettle refugees who are not ready to mix yet, that is not going to bring about peace No. 2, if we are going to expand the mission without coming to Congress to explain exactly what our troops are supposed to be doing with regard to capturing war criminals, then we have a shifting mission and not a clear one. So what exactly is the mission?

Mr. President, last but not least, do we have an underlying policy that gives us a real chance for peace? If we don't, if this is not going to work, let's address it now, let's not wait until 9 months from now when our troops are supposed to withdraw. Let's not say, well, we have tried something for a year and a half and it isn't working, but if we just hang in there, then maybe things will get better, and then when 9 months are up, then the cries will come, ''Well, let's keep the troops there.''

Mr. President, I want American troops on the ground if there is a U.S. security interest and if there is a chance for success. I don't mind spending our taxpayer dollars if there is a chance for success. But if we are taking from our own military readiness, if we don't have the spare parts for the equipment that we need for training and readiness, how can we justify spending $3 billion a year for Dayton accords that I don't think have a chance to succeed?

So I think we need to go back to the drawing board. I think the time has come for us to look at what is the underlying best chance for a peaceful coexistence in Bosnia.

Now, I would like to turn to my friend and colleague from Kansas because he also had the opportunity to visit our troops. I will just say that I am so proud of our troops. They are doing a wonderful job. I had lunch in Tuzla with our troops, and they are committed to doing the job they always do well. They are following orders. But, Mr. President, I think we owe our troops something. We owe them an underlying policy that has a chance to succeed. We owe them a clear mission. Mr. President, we are not giving our troops that clear mission. We are not giving them the underlying policy that will have a chance to succeed. I think we owe them that. I think the time has come for the President to say, step back, let's look at the Dayton accords and let's see if we can do something that will make more sense, not 9 months from now, but tomorrow let's start talking about this so that we will have a better chance to leave in 9 months when we have been promised that we will. But when we leave, let's leave with a chance for success.

Mr. President, I am very pleased that my colleague from Kansas also took the time to go and visit with the troops. I think that we have decided, from our different experiences—we were not there together, we were there at different times. But his experiences were very, very vivid. I think because we have visited with our troops and because we have talked to the people, I think we have a real feel for what can be done and what can't be done.

This was my fourth trip to Bosnia. It is not like I just tooled in there one day a couple of weeks ago. I have been there four times. I have to say that I had great hopes for the Dayton accords, even though I did not want our troops on the ground. I led the fight against it. Nevertheless, once they went, I wanted it to succeed. Of course, we all do. But, Mr. President, what we are doing now is not going to succeed, and I don't want to risk one American life and not one more taxpayer dollar until the underlying policy is a policy that has a chance to succeed.

I yield to my friend and colleague from Kansas, Senator ROBERTS.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for yielding. I especially thank her for obtaining this time to discuss our policy, the American policy on Bosnia, at what I consider a special time, a real crossroads time to determine exactly what that policy is.

The Senator has already pointed out that we were in Bosnia over the recent

break at different times—very close, but at different times. I went as a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee and, as a matter of fact, I received briefings in Prague, Budapest, Bosnia, and London. Most of the concern in regard to those people in charge of our intelligence capability was in regard to Bosnia and, obviously, we spoke with the officials within our embassies, as well as the SFOR command and those of the military.

I came back after visiting Sarajevo, Tazar, our staging base in Hungary, and Tuzla, which is the SFOR command center. I must say that I share many of the concerns with the Senator from Texas. There is progress in Sarajevo. If you land in Sarajevo, you will get a briefing by the embassy that indicates that the 90-percent figures in relation to unemployment have now been reduced to 50; the shops, the markets—the famous market that literally exploded on CNN, really that first great atrocity where American people became aware of the severe problems there, that is back in business. The schools are now operating, and we know that there is income in Sarajevo because the gypsies are back. The areas over the main highway obviously are very heavily mined. That is still a big problem. I arrived I think at a very special time, I would tell my colleague from Texas, because it was just after the President's special emissary, Mr. Richard Holbrooke, had arrived in Bosnia. And I must say that in my personal opinion that up to that point we were drifting in Bosnia, and I think with Mr. Holbrooke's arrival there was a new impetus, if you will.

A week prior to that the British—our allies over there, part of the SFOR command—had arrested and captured and killed one or two of the war criminals. As that happened, the Embassy officials that we visited with indicated that certainly did a lot for our credibility in regard to that area; that up to that point there had been some drift.

So I asked all of our intelligence people, I asked the SFOR command, and I asked our Embassy people: Had the mission changed? Because obviously if we are going to adopt that kind of an aggressive posture in Bosnia; that is, really going after the war criminals to locate and to capture and to prosecute them—that certainly is a different kind of mission that many of us here in the Senate, and I might add in the House, envisioned for our United States troops in Bosnia.

They reiterated the following.

No. 1: The relevancy of the United States in Bosnia is peacekeeping, refugee resettlement, economic restoration, democracy building, and the war criminal issue.

I think the mission has been changed. I think it has been changed substantially. I think we have gone from peacekeeping to peace enforcement. I think we now are disarming, if you will, the police that Mr. Karadzic has around him in Srpska. It is a very aggressive overt effort. We are now taking over radio and TV stations and apparently giving them back after a fuss is raised by a mob against our NATO troops.

I think we have a timetable. I think this is a must-do situation prior to the elections to be held later on this month in Srpska. I think we have taken sides in that election overtly. I think it is very clear in that regard. And I think we made a decision that before winter comes in that area we must do something about the war criminals. Why? It is pretty easy to point out.

I know that this is a very small replica of persons indicted for war crimes. I have a much larger chart. Time did not permit me to bring it over from the office. These are 79 individuals that are pictured here—10 are in custody now—of the war criminals or the persons indicted for the war crimes. Let me just say, I said 79 and 78. They are indicted by the U.N. International Criminal Tribunal in the Hague for grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Convention, violations of laws, customs of war, and crimes against humanity.

The person I would like to draw to your attention is a young man 34 years old who is still at large. He is only 34 years old. The charges are from about May 7, 1992, to early July 1992. There were hundreds of Muslim and Croat men and women confined at the Luka camp in inhumane conditions under armed guard. These detainees were systematically killed at Luka almost every day during that time. The accused, often assisted by camp guards, entered Luka's main hangar where most of the detainees were kept, selected detainees for interrogation, beat them, and often shot them. They killed them. It goes on here. I would just say simply that the descriptions involved remind you of the Nazi war crimes. I will not go into that.

But obviously if these people are not brought to justice there is no chance for peace in Bosnia. Who is going to do this job? The Senator from Texas has already indicated that it is pretty obvious now that the NATO troops are. That is a clear difference, or a clear policy change, from peacekeeping. I call it peace enforcement.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I am glad the Senator is on this point because in the original mission statement in the Dayton accords there was a provision to capture war criminals, but it was going to be a police force within the Federation. It was going to be a police force made up of all three of the sectors that would go after war criminals, hopefully in a way that would be responsible. That police force has not materialized. As the Senator from Kansas has said, we are substituting our NATO forces for the police force that is the mission in the Dayton accords. That is a change of mission by any way you read it.

Mr. ROBERTS. I appreciate the Senator's comments.

The young man I was talking about is 34 years old, at large now, and 78 other war criminals are at large as well.

As I have indicated, there is no way that you can bring the Dayton accords to their successful completion with these folks at large.

Let me just say this. Everybody there, every intelligence source, every person that you visit with, whether they be Muslim, Croat or Serb, SFOR command, Russians. We visited with the Russians in their compound. They are really doing a very good job working with us and closely cooperating; and obviously the Brits and the Norwegians; 34 nations are involved in this effort.

We have literally planted the flag. We have an outstanding cooperative effort. We have spent $7 billion in Bosnia. But there are some expenditures too from all those nations involved in the SFOR command. All of these people have indicated very clearly that if we leave, and if we leave, why, the Brits will leave. If we leave, the British will leave.

We both have learned that when we were talking to Embassy officials and members taking part in the interparliamentary conference over there in Great Britain, they said, ''We were with you in terms of our ground troops. When you leave, we leave.'' If we leave, if SFOR leaves, or the American presence in SFOR. Let's not really kid ourselves. Within weeks, why, the fighting will break out again. Yet we have in the other body in the House on the defense appropriations bill a cutoff date saying our troops must come home as of June 1998.

Our Secretary of Defense, our former colleague and dear friend, Secretary Cohen, indicated that the troops will be home in June 1998. The President has said the troops will be home in June 1998. But maybe, I don't know. We are a little nebulous on that.

That is where the candor comes in because I think our policy has become very disingenuous. On the one hand we are building up the troop levels from about 8,500 to 12,000. We have changed the mission from peacekeeping to peace enforcement. Yet, we say in June 1998 we can withdraw the troops. That is not possible.

I personally think that once you plant the flag, once you have 34 nations involved, once you have that kind of cooperation, it is going to be very difficult to withdraw. When the Dayton accords fail, that is going to send a message around the world that we don't want to send. Yet the case has not been made to the American public, to this Senate, or to us by the administration, as to how we are going to accomplish that.

Thank goodness the Senator from Texas has arranged this time so we can sort of have a kickoff here in terms of long-term goals and what I consider to

be short-term politics. I think we need a lot of candor.

I have a related concern. In a meeting with about 18 young Kansans, both men and women in uniform, only 2 plan to stay in the service. They have been over there 9 months. They work 13, 14, 15 hours a day. The personnel tempo, the operational tempo—the Senator from Texas, as a former member of the Armed Services Committee, knows, I know, and everybody even connected with the military knows that we have downsized to the point where the operation and personnel tempo in all the countries involved in the peacekeeping operations—we are wearing out our military. It is not working. When you get 16 out of 18 Kansans, some of whom are very dedicated in midcareer, say they are going to leave because of the pressures on them and their families, working overtime, there is a big problem here. That is a related problem that we have not really talked about in relation to the Bosnian situation.

Let me just say in closing that I would like to refer to the remarks by our colleague from Delaware, Senator BIDEN, who has had many trips to Bosnia. I have his remarks here that he made before the Senate as of this morning.

He says that we have reached a crucial point in our policy toward Bosnia. Resolute American action, combined with allied support and local compliance, could turn the corner.

I also add that I agree with Senator BIDEN. I am not sure we can turn the corner. I want to know what is around the corner. And we need candor.

I also say that he lists the goals—to greatly expand the number of refugees returning to their prewar homes.

The Senator from Texas was in Brcko, talked to the people there, and saw the futility of forced relocation.

I was flying in a helicopter with a one-star Army commander, went over a knoll where Moslems used to live—60 of them. We have tried three times to relocate these people. Each time they have been beaten, and the homes have been destroyed. He has indicated that it might not be a very good idea to try for the fourth time.

Senator BIDEN went on to say—and I agree with him—that we can and must ensure that the country's municipal elections in mid-September are held and are free and fair. I hope we can do that. That will be our best hope. But there once again we are having our troops and the NATO troops take part, and are actually taking part in an election. They are election observers, and more than that. He points out that we must and can guarantee free access to the electronic media. We guarantee the TV station. And Mrs. Plavsic, who is one of the candidates and the best candidate, openly now is supported by NATO forces, and our forces. But now we apparently have given that back to Mr. Karadzic and his people. So we are playing sort of a back and forth business in terms of TV.

Senator BIDEN—and I will just sum up here—in his remarks said that it is absolutely essential for an international military force to remain in Bosnia after June 1998 to guarantee that progress will continue. Thank goodness somebody has been candid. Senator BIDEN has indicated that. He says an international force should be there. Everybody in that whole part of the world indicates that if we are not involved in that international force it will not succeed. That is what happened in the beginning.

So I commend Senator BIDEN for his candor. But then he says—I want the Senator from Texas to pay very close attention in regard to his comments as it relates to NATO expansion. He indicates that not only would all that has been accomplished go up in smoke if fighting reignited—i.e., if we leave—but a failure in Bosnia would signal the beginning of the end for NATO which is currently restructuring itself to meet Bosnia-like challenges in the 21st century.

Senator BIDEN, Senator LUGAR, and many others who are involved in the proposal to expand NATO have indicated that the Congress of the United States is not focused on this issue. The American public is not focused on this issue.

Let me say that Senator HUTCHISON has certainly focused on the issue, and that she is able to have 20 Senators sign a letter to the President expressing many concerns over NATO expansion—tough questions that need to be answered.

In Prague I was very privileged to address the Transatlantic Conference in regard to NATO expansion. I guess you could say that I was sort of the skunk at the expansion picnic in that I took the concerns that the Senator has raised. I raised them with the Czech Republic not because of any lack of support or admiration for the emerging nations. But there again we have planted the flag for NATO expansion. Here we have a situation where the Congress of the United States is going to say, ''OK, we are going to take our troops, and we are going to bring them home after June 1998. But, on the other hand, we are going to go ahead with NATO expansion. And under article V we are going to be committed to American men and women perhaps risking their lives on Polish soil, Czech soil, and Hungarian soil, not to mention the 24 other countries that would like to become involved if we are going to withdraw the troops in regard to Bosnia. You certainly can't propose an expansion of NATO with article V.''

These are the kind of questions that I think we need to raise.

I have gone on much too long here this evening. But I do again want to thank the Senator from Texas for raising these concerns. I have just touched on several concerns. I plan when we have additional time under morning business—or we ought to take the time—to go over all of the concerns that the Senator from Texas has raised, and some of the concerns that I have raised. It is a time for candor because the clock is ticking.

The election will be held at the end of September to determine the future of Bosnia. I do not want to see the Dayton accords fail. But I can tell you one thing, they are not going to be successful if we simply withdraw the troops by June 1998. Then where are we? If we keep them there, where are we?

I asked one of the Embassy officials in Sarajevo, ''When did all of this start?'' I think I am right by saying it was in 1384 when the Turks and the Serbs first got involved in a very difficult conflict and a war. It has not been fully settled since, except for the reign of Marshal Tito who ruled the country with an iron fist.

So I thank the Senator from Texas. I thank her for her leadership. I look forward to continuing to work with her as we try to answer some of these very, very difficult questions.

I thank the Senator. I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for his remarks. I am pleased that he took the time to go over and visit our troops in Bosnia, to find out for himself what the situation was there. He is a distinguished new member of the Armed Services Committee.

I think it is important that all Senators try to go over there because we have a lot at stake. Our troops are on the ground. Up to 12,000 will be there very soon. Their lives are at stake. In addition to that, our taxpayers are footing the bill for $3 billion a year so far, and they have the right to ask, what are we doing there? What are we doing with the $3 billion? Are we doing something that will have a chance to succeed? Those are fair questions.

Americans are generous people. They are valiant. They are committed to freedom, and they want everyone in the world to live in freedom. They would risk their lives, as they have in this century, for the freedom of people who live in Europe and other places. They are willing to risk their lives. They are willing to pay from their pocketbooks, from their families the money if a policy has a reasonable chance to succeed.

I am today raising the question, do we have a reasonable chance to succeed with the underlying policy? There is no question that our troops are doing a great job. There is no question that our new commander, Gen. Wes Clark, is absolutely correct when he says, you fool with American troops and you are going to face the consequences. I am glad we have issued the ultimatum because everybody is on fair notice that you can't throw rocks and shoot at American troops and get by with it.

But it is the underlying policy that I question today. I am calling on the President of the United States, with the leadership of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, to step back and look at the policy. Are

we trying to put the American standard of multiethnic, peaceful democracy into a place that is not ready? I think we are. And I think we are risking a lot doing it. So I am asking the President and his Cabinet members to come together and say, let's look again at Dayton. Let's look at whether the time is now for resettling refugees, for forcing people to live in this Federation with a joint Government of Croats and Muslims and Serbs, all of whom have committed, or had committed on them, terrible atrocities. And we are now saying come together, form a government, have a joint presidency, have a joint government, create a school system that will accommodate a Muslim religion and a Catholic religion and come together and bring all of this in in the next 9 months.

Let us step back. Let us revisit Dayton. Let us see if we can make a Dayton that has a chance to succeed. I will support leaving our troops on the ground beyond June 1998; I will support the money it takes if we have a policy that has a reasonable chance to succeed, that will bring a peaceful coexistence. And I think the time has come to look at a division where people can come together of like mind and form a government that will serve their purposes where they can invest in infrastructure, where we can help them invest in infrastructure, and they can build their factories and they can have jobs and begin to live in peace with their neighbors who are different from them.

That happens all over Europe. In fact, the lesson of history is that many times people who cannot live together split apart. You can name example after example. And it can be done peacefully. Why not let them come together in their own groups, form their governments, create their livelihoods. In the former Bosnia, there were taxes on the minority ethnic groups. There were restraints on what certain minority ethnics could do. They could not be doctors. They could not be small business people around the corner selling hardware. They could not be lawyers. They could only have certain farming-type jobs.

That is not a recipe for success. Why not look at a division that might work. Let them have their government. Let them have an economy. Let us help them build the sewer lines and the roads and the streets and the airports and the factories so they can pull themselves up. Let them trade with their neighbors. Let that be the beginning of getting along together, whether they are Catholic or whether they are Muslim or whether they are orthodox, and then perhaps eventually, after they have had good relationships for years, they will be able to mix and move in to the other country.

I hope that the President of the United States will not continue to say, well, if we just keep trying, we just stay at it, we will have an infinite commitment of American troops and American dollars along with our European allies, all of whom are also stretched in their budgets, all of whom care about their soldiers and their troops just as we do, all of whom, I believe, would like to see a policy that has a chance for success. They are there on the ground because they, too, are generous people.

So I ask the President of the United States, I ask Madeleine Albright, I ask Bill Cohen, go back to the drawing board. Look at something that might have a chance to work. Do not be in a rut trying to put a round peg in a square hole. It is time to look for a round hole. What we are doing now is not working. Maybe a division will not work either, but let us try something that has a better chance. Let us learn from the experience and let us go forward.

Mr. President, we are going to hear a lot more about this. I hope we will not wait 9 months to determine that this is not going to work. Let us start now. Let us give our troops a chance now. Let us give our taxpayers a chance now. Let us give the people of Bosnia more hope than they are seeing now. Senator ROBERTS talked about the experience of these poor Muslim people trying to move back into their old homes and the Serb factions kept them out, beat them up, finally burned their homes up. Mr. President, that is not a recipe for success.

Let us step back. Let us give peace a chance by looking at something new. And let us do something now rather than frittering away 9 months and not having any better chance than we have today.

Thank you, Mr. President.

On behalf of the leader, I would like to close the Senate.

NATIONAL DAY OF RECOGNITION FOR THE HUMANITARIAN EFFORTS OF DIANA, PRINCESS OF WALES

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 118, submitted earlier today by Senators HATCH and LEAHY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 118) expressing condolences on the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, and designating September 6, 1997 as a ''National Day of Recognition for the Humanitarian Efforts of Diana, Princess of Wales.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, all of us have heartfelt grief for the people of Great Britain. That is why the Senate is acting in this resolution, saying this is a woman and a leader who cared so much about AIDS victims, people who did not have the chance in life that she did. I think she really did show many of us that if we will just reach out a helping hand to those less fortunate, it will make a difference.

The Senate stands today in unanimous agreement that we grieve with the people of Great Britain and we will set aside a day of recognition and one in which all of us will be thinking about her accomplishments, the tragic, senseless death that she suffered, and hope that through her children and the Royal Family and all of the British Government and the people of Great Britain good things will come from the leadership she showed and the compassion she showed for others and that because she lived we will all be better people.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in support of the resolution expressing the Senate's condolences upon the death of Diana, Princess of Wales. I can think of no event in recent times that has moved so many people from different parts of the world and different walks of life as the untimely and tragic death of this remarkable woman. Diana was loved and respected worldwide. She meant different things to different people, but the essence of her universal appeal seems to derive from the fact that, at the height of fame and privilege, Diana never lost the simple, human touch.

To many people, the greatest tragedy of Diana's death is the loss to her two young sons, William and Harry. Diana was a committed and caring mother who did a remarkable job rearing her children under great pressure and intense public scrutiny. Many of us have seen the moving footage of Diana hugging her sons unabashedly, or beaming at the end of an amusement park adventure the three of them had shared. These things may seem simple to people outside the spotlight, but they were quite daring for someone charged with molding the character of the future King of England.

Diana's human touch was daring in other ways, too. She may have single-handedly changed the way people around the world view their fellow human beings suffering from AIDS and leprosy when she simply touched their hands. With a simple, compassionate gesture, the princess showed that we can afford to reach out to the sick.

Despite many bouts with personal adversity, Diana never withdrew into the comforts of her privileged background. Instead, she seemed to relish tackling new challenges, becoming a passionate humanitarian who spent countless hours ministering to the sick, the poor, and the forgotten. Many Americans, including a number of my colleagues, knew her from her charitable work with the homeless and with victims of AIDS, breast cancer, leprosy, and other human afflictions.

Most recently, Princess Diana helped to shed light on the horrors of indiscriminate injury and death caused by the worldwide proliferation of anti-personnel landmines. I have joined my

colleague from Vermont, Senator LEAHY, in his effort to enact a ban on the use of landmines, and this campaign received an invaluable boost from the efforts of Princess Diana. I can think of no greater tribute to her legacy than for us to summon the will and courage to enact such a ban.

Mr. President, when the eyes of the world turn to London this Saturday, I hope that passage of this resolution will convey the thoughts and prayers of the American people to the family of the Princess of Wales and the British people. It is the least we can do for someone who deeply touched, and forever changed, so many of our lives.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, as the dean of the women in the Senate, I rise to pay tribute to the life and legacy of Diana, the Princess of Wales. Our hearts go out to her family and to the British people. We believe it is appropriate that we adopt this resolution to create a national day of mourning on September 6, the day of her funeral.

People have expressed surprise at the outpouring of love and grief from the British people. But we shouldn't be surprised. Princess Diana was a remarkable person. We were dazzled by her grace and beauty—but what we truly valued was her compassion.

She was called the people's princess. She was born a member of the aristocracy and married into royalty—but she never forgot that Britain's strength was its ordinary working people. The thousands of people laying flowers and waiting in line for hours to sign the condolence book represent a cross section of Britons. They are the senior citizens, the working mothers, the new immigrants—and especially, the children.

She treated the people she met with respect and compassion and she taught her children to do the same. Many people go through the motions of doing good works. But with Princess Diana, it came from the heart.

The Princess of Wales had her personal challenges. But it is for her public commitments that we will most remember her. She chose her causes carefully. She worked on behalf of those who were most in need. She campaigned for awareness of AIDS and tolerance and compassion for those who suffered from AIDS. She helped support battered women's shelters. She worked on behalf of children's hospitals. She worked to raise money for breast cancer research. These causes were universal in nature and supported by many women around the world.

She was also a leader in the effort to end the use of antipersonnel landmines. She traveled to Angola and Bosnia to show the world the tragic effects of landmines on ordinary civilians. By visiting mine fields and landmine victims, she showed us more than any report or international symposium ever could.

In the U.S. Senate, Senator LEAHY and Senator HAGEL have led our effort to end the use of landmines. I am proud to be part of that effort. We have stopped exporting mines, and are now trying to stop their use. The world's most technologically advanced military does not need a weapon that cannot distinguish between a soldier and a child—who may be killed while playing in a field 10 years after the war is over.

Mr. President, Princess Diana's death was a tragedy. But her life was a triumph. Her legacy is her work on behalf of those in need, and, most importantly, her children—whose lives will reflect the values their mother taught them. We can best honor her legacy by continuing to work as she did for those who are most in need.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table and that any statements relating to this resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 118) and its preamble read as follows:

S. RES. 118

Whereas the Senate and the American people heard the announcement of the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, with profound sorrow and deep regret;

Whereas the Princess of Wales touched the lives of millions of Americans and people throughout the world as an example of compassion and grace;

Whereas the Princess of Wales was a committed and caring mother who successfully raised two young sons under great pressure and public scrutiny;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the tireless humanitarian efforts of the Princess of Wales, including the areas of—

(1) raising awareness of and attention to breast cancer research and treatment;

(2) HIV/AIDS, particularly in the areas of pediatric AIDS, educating the public regarding the facts of HIV/AIDS transmission, and fostering a public attitude that is intolerant of discrimination against people with HIV/AIDS;

(3) banning antipersonnel landmines from the arsenals of war, as these indiscriminate weapons often result in casualties to civilians, including children, sometimes many years after the armed conflict in which the mines were used; and

(4) eliminating the problem of hopelessness around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends to the people of the United Kingdom sincere condolences and sympathy on the death of Diana, Princess of Wales.

(2) recognizes the extraordinary impact of the Princess of Wales' humanitarian efforts around the world; and

(3) designates September 6, 1997, as a ''National Day of Recognition for the Humanitarian efforts of Diana, Princess of Wales''.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Diana, Princess of Wales.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NOS. 105–22, 105–23, 105–24, AND 105–25

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Injunction of Secrecy be removed from the following treaties transmitted to the Senate on September 3, 1997, by the President of the United States:

Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters with Trinidad and Tobago (Treaty Document No. 105–22);

Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters with Barbados (Treaty Document No. 105–23);

Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters with Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada and St. Lucia (Treaty Document No. 105–24);

Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters with related Optional Protocol (Treaty Document No. 105–25).

I further ask that the treaties be considered as having been read the first time, that they be referred, with accompanying papers to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

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

The President's messages are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Port of Spain on March 4, 1996. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty is one of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties being negotiated by the United States in order to counter criminal activities more effectively. The Treaty should be an effective tool to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of crimes, including drug trafficking offenses. The Treaty is self-executing.

The Treaty provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaty includes: taking of testimony or statements of persons; providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; serving documents; locating or identifying persons; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; executing requests for searches and seizures; assisting in proceedings related to restraint, confiscation, forfeiture of assets, restitution, and collection of fines; examining objects and sites; and any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 3, 1997.*

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty

Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Barbados on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Bridgetown on February 28, 1996. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty is one of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties being negotiated by the United States in order to counter criminal activities more effectively. The Treaty should be an effective tool to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of crimes, including drug trafficking offenses. The Treaty is self-executing.

The Treaty provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaty includes: taking of testimony or statements of persons; providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; serving documents; locating or identifying persons; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; executing requests for searches and seizures; assisting in proceedings related to forfeiture of assets, restitution, and collection of fines; and rendering any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 3, 1997.*

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaties Between the Government of the United States of America and the governments of four countries comprising the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States. The Treaties are with: Antigua and Barbuda, signed at St. John's on October 31, 1996; Dominica, signed at Roseau on October 10, 1996; Grenada, signed at St. George's on May 30, 1996; St. Lucia, signed at Castries on April 18, 1996. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaties.

The Treaties are part of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties being negotiated by the United States in order to counter criminal activity more effectively. They should be an effective tool to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of crimes, including ''white-collar'' crime and drug trafficking offenses. The Treaties are self-executing.

The Treaties provide for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaties includes: taking of testimony or statements of persons; providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; serving documents; locating or identifying persons or items; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; executing requests for searches and seizures; assisting in proceedings related to forfeiture of assets, restitution to the victims of crime, and collection of fines; and any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to these Treaties and give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 3, 1997.*

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters (''the Convention''), adopted at the twenty-second regular session of the Organization of American States (OAS) General Assembly meeting in Nassau, The Bahamas, on May 23, 1992, and the Optional Protocol Related to the Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters (''the Protocol''), adopted at the twenty-third regular session of the OAS General Assembly meeting in Managua, Nicaragua, on June 11, 1993. Both of these instruments were signed on behalf of the United States at the OAS headquarters in Washington on January 10, 1995. In addition, for the information of the Senate, I transmit the report of the Department of State with respect to the Convention and the Protocol.

When ratified, the Convention and the Protocol will constitute the first multilateral convention between the United States and other members of the OAS in the field of international judicial cooperation in criminal matters. The provisions of the Convention and Protocol are explained in the report of the Department of State that accompanies this message.

The Convention and Protocol will establish a treaty-based system of judicial assistance in criminal matters analogous to that which exists bilaterally between the United States and a number of countries. These instruments should prove to be effective tools to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of modern criminals, including members of drug cartels, ''white-collar'' criminals, and terrorists. The Convention and Protocol are self-executing, and will not require implementing legislation.

The Convention provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Convention includes: (1) taking testimony or statements of persons; (2) providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; (3) serving documents; (4) locating or identifying persons or items; (5) transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; (6) executing requests for searches and seizures; (7) assisting in forfeiture proceedings; and (8) rendering any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

The Protocol was negotiated and adopted at the insistence of the United States Government, and will permit a greater measure of cooperation in connection with tax offenses. I believe that the Convention should not be ratified by the United States without the Protocol. If the Convention and Protocol are ratified, the instruments of ratification would be deposited simultaneously.

One significant advantage of this Convention and Protocol is that they provide uniform procedures and rules for cooperation in criminal matters by all the states that become Party. In addition, the Convention and Protocol would obviate the expenditure of resources that would be required for the United States to negotiate and bring into force bilateral mutual assistance treaties with certain OAS member states.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Convention and the Protocol, and that it give its advice and consent to ratification, subject to the understandings described in the accompanying report of the Department of State.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 3, 1997.*

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1997

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 4.

I further ask that on Thursday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted, and the Senate immediately resume consideration of amendment No. 1077 to the Labor, HHS appropriations bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mrs. HUTCHISON. For the information of all Members, tomorrow the Senate will immediately resume consideration of amendment No. 1077 offered by Senator COATS to S. 1061, the Labor, HHS appropriations bill. It is hoped that a vote on the Coats amendment will occur by mid morning.

In addition, Members can anticipate additional votes on amendments currently pending to the Labor, HHS appropriations bill and other amendments expected to be offered to the bill throughout Thursday's session of the Senate as we make progress on this important legislation.

As always, Members will be notified as any votes are scheduled. It is hoped that the Senate will complete action on the Labor, HHS appropriations bill tomorrow. Also, as a reminder to all Members, a cloture motion was filed this evening on the motion to proceed to the FDA reform bill. Therefore, Members can anticipate a vote to occur on the cloture motion Friday morning.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:29 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 4, 1997, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 3, 1997:

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 271:

To be captain

MICHAEL F. HOLMES, 0000
HERBERT H. SHARPE, 0000
ERIK N. FUNK, 0000
MARVIN J. PONTIFF, 0000
JOHN J. DAVIN, 0000
RICHARD R. HOUCK, 0000
DAVID M. MOGAN, 0000
RICHARD R. KOWALEWSKI, 0000
JAMES D. SPITZER, 0000
SALLY BRICE-OHARA, 0000
KENNETH W. KEANE, 0000
PETER A. RICHARDSON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. SNYDER, 0000
PAUL D. LUPPERT, 0000
LAWRENCE T. YARBOROUGH, 0000
RONALD J. MORRIS, 0000
RANDOLPH MEADE, 0000
RONALD L. RUTLEDGE, 0000
ERIC N. FAGERHOLM, 0000
GEORGE R. MATTHEWS, 0000
GEOFFREY D. POWERS, 0000
ALAN H. MOORE, 0000
THEODORE C. LEFEUVRE, 0000
RICHARD R. KELLY, 0000
LAWRENCE J. BOWLING, 0000
GLENN W. ANDERSON, 0000
LOREN P. TSCHOHL, 0000
JOHN A. GENTILE, 0000
SURRAN D. DILKS, 0000
TERRENCE C. JULICH, 0000
JOHN M. KRUPA, 0000
JOHN C. MILLER, 0000
GEOFFREY L. ABBOTT, 0000
JAMES S. THOMAS, 0000
JOSEPH A. HALSCH, 0000
WAYNE R. BUCHANAN, 0000
GLENN A. WILTSHIRE, 0000
MARK S. KERN, 0000
JAMES E. EVANS, 0000
STEPHEN J. KRUPA, 0000
RICHARD D. POORE, 0000
JAMES W. DECKER, 0000
GLENN R. GUNN, 0000
WILLIAM W. PETERSON, 0000
SCOTT E. DAVIS, 0000
MARK H. JOHNSON, 0000
GLENN E. GATELY, 0000
JAMES F. MURRAY, 0000
IVAN T. LUKE, 0000
ARTHUR H. HANSON, 0000
MICHAEL K. GRIMES, 0000
JAMES R. MONGOLD, 0000
DAVID J. VISNESKI, 0000
GREGORY J. MACGARVA, 0000
ARN M. HEGGERS, 0000
JAMES W. STARK, 0000
JOHN ASTLEY, 0000
GILBERT J. KANAZAWA, 0000
SCOTT J. GLOVER, 0000
KEVIN L. MARSHALL, 0000
PAUL A. LANGLOIS, 0000
DANIEL B. LLOYD, 0000
JOHN P. CURRIER, 0000
WAYNE E. JUSTICE, 0000
WILLIAM R. WEBSTER, 0000
ERIC A. NICOLAUS, 0000
CHARLES J. DICKENS, 0000
HOWARD P. RHOADES, 0000
ROBERT D. ALLEN, 0000
JODY A. BRECKENRIDGE, 0000
RUSSELL N. TERRELL, 0000
GREGORY F. ADAMS, 0000
WILLIAM L. ROSS, 0000
BEVERLY G. KELLEY, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624.

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PHILLIP M. BALISLE, 0000
CAPT. KENNETH E. BARBOR, 0000
CAPT. LARRY C. BAUCOM, 0000
CAPT. ROBERT E. BESAL, 0000
CAPT. JOSEPH D. BURNS, 0000
CAPT. JOSEPH A. CARNEVALE, JR., 0000
CAPT. JAY M. COHEN, 0000
CAPT. CHRISTOPHER W. COLE, 0000
CAPT. DAVID R. ELLISON, 0000
CAPT. LILLIAN E. FISHBURNE, 0000
CAPT. RAND H. FISHER, 0000
CAPT. ALAN M. GEMMILL, 0000
CAPT. DAVID T. HART, JR., 0000
CAPT. KENNETH F. HEIMGARTNER, 0000
CAPT. JOSEPH G. HENRY, 0000
CAPT. GERALD L. HOEWING, 0000
CAPT. MICHAEL L. HOLMES, 0000
CAPT. EDWARD E. HUNTER, 0000
CAPT. THOMAS J. JURKOWSKY, 0000
CAPT. WILLIAM R. KLEMM, 0000
CAPT. MICHAEL D. MALONE, 0000
CAPT. WILLIAM J. MARSHALL, III, 0000
CAPT. PETER W. MARZLUFF, 0000
CAPT. JAMES D. MCARTHUR, JR., 0000
CAPT. MICHAEL J. MCCABE, 0000
CAPT. DAVID C. NICHOLS, JR., 0000
CAPT. GARY ROUGHEAD, 0000
CAPT. KENNETH D. SLAGHT, 0000
CAPT. STANLEY R. SZEMBORSKI, 0000
CAPT. HENRY G. ULRICH, III, 0000
CAPT. GEORGE E. VOELKER, 0000
CAPT. CHRISTOPHER E. WEAVER, 0000
CAPT. ROBERT F. WILLARD, 0000
CAPT. CHARLES B. YOUNG, 0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE U.S. OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE, UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

ROBERT J. SPERMO, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 1552 (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)), 12203 AND 12204:

*CARL M. GOUGH, 0000
DAVID A. MASSA, 0000
*GEORGE F. MATECKO, 0000
SAMUEL STRAUSS, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 12203(A), 12204(A), AND 12207:

To be colonel

SHRI KANT MISHRA, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 12203, 12204, AND 12207:

To be colonel

DAVID S. FEIGIN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 624 AND 628:

To be major

CLYDE A. MOORE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 624 AND 628:

To be colonel

TERRY A. WIKSTROM, 0000

To be lieutenant colonel

CARL B. HALL, 0000

To be major

RICHARD C. BUTLER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE U.S. ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 12203, 12204, AND 12207:

To be colonel

JAMES H. WILSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 12203, AND 12211:

To be colonel

ELLIS E. BRUMRAUGH, JR., 0000
HOMER G. HOBBS, 0000
MICHAEL J. JENNINGS, 0000
WILLIAM F. KUEHN, 0000
JAMES H. MONTGOMERY, 0000
ELIZABETH A. NELSON, 0000
ALAN D. O'ROUKE, 0000
LAWRENCINE L. PRILLERMAN, 0000
ALLAN V. STRICKER, 0000
JOHN C. ZIMMERMAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GRATEN D. BEAVERS, 0000
BRIAN C. DONLEY, 0000
DARRELL C. DYER, 0000
KENNETH J. HANKO, 0000
GARY HERRINGTON, 0000
MATTHEW A. HORN, 0000
JAMES L. JOHNSON, 0000
ROGER W. KRAUEL, 0000
HOWARD A. KRIENKE, 0000
WILLIAM D. MCKEOWN, 0000
JAMES I. NISHIMOTO, 0000
HARRY J. PHILIPS, 0000
DAVID E. SERVINSKY, 0000
ALISON L. M. SIMMONS, 0000
WILLIAM S. SPRAITZAR,0000
GEORGE R. THOMAS, 0000
JOHN W. THORPE, 0000
MATTHEW L. VADNAL, 0000
JOHN E. ZUPKO, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be colonel

WILLIAM C. JOHNSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be major

TONY WECKERLING, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 624 AND 628:

To be major

JEFFREY E. LISTER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be major

HARRY DAVIS, JR., 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be major

MICHAEL D. DAHL, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be major

JAMES C. CLARK, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

To be colonel

JOSEPH ARGYLE, 0000
HANS E. ARVIDSON, 0000
JAMES M. BENGE, 0000
ROBERT F. DONS, 0000
WILEY J. FAIRCLOTH, JR., 0000
STEPHEN M. GOLDEN, 0000
LARRY L. HAGAN, 0000
VIRGIL E. HEMPHILL, JR., 0000
RICHARD E. IMM, 0000
DOYLE W. ISAAK, 0000
STEPHEN A. JENNINGS, 0000
NAMIR MREYOUD, 0000
JEB S. PICKARD, 0000
FORREST R. POINDEXTER, 0000
LONDE A. RICHARDSON, 0000
SARLA K. SAUJANI, 0000
RASA S. SILENAS, 0000
CHARLES R. TOLLINCHE, 0000
SALIMI A. WIRJOSEMITO, 0000

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT L. BLOOD, 0000
KENNETH F. DESROSIER, 0000
GLENN E. DICKEY, 0000
RAYMOND S. DOUGHERTY, 0000
LOUIS D. ELDRIDGE, 0000
DOUGLAS M. ERICKSON, 0000
BRENT L. GILLILAND, 0000
DENNIS N. GRAHAM, 0000
MARK R. GUILDER, 0000
WILLIAM K. HAMILTON, 0000
JAY B. HIGGS, 0000
KEVIN M. HIRSCHEY, 0000
VINCENT T. JONES, 0000
FRANK J. LORUSSO, 0000
SUSAN L. MALANE, 0000
KAREN M. MATHEWS, 0000
HOWARD T. MCDONNELL, 0000
VICTOR M. PINEIRO-CARRERO, 0000
DALE R. TIDABACK, 0000
ROBERT F. TODARO, 0000

JOHN H. WAGONER, 0000
ROBERT A. WILLIAMSON, 0000
MARTIN B. YULES, 0000

To be major

ROOSEVELT ALLEN JR., 0000
RICHARD C. BATZER, 0000
DEBORAH K. BRADLEY, 0000
JOSEPH A. BRENNAN, 0000
PAUL E. BROWN, 0000
WILLIAM E. DINSE, 0000
SCOTT A. DRAPER, 0000
DANIEL G. DUPONT, 0000
ROGER J. GOLLON, 0000
DANIEL M. GREISING, 0000
CRAIG D. HARTRANFT, 0000
JOHN C. KRESIN, 0000
MICHAEL J. KUCSERA, 0000
JEROME P. LIMOGE JR., 0000
ANDREW D. MARKIEWITZ, 0000
JANET Y. MARTIN, 0000
PAGE W. MCNALL, 0000
GUILLERMO E. ORRACA, 0000
JOSE VILLALOBOS, 0000
DANIEL C. WEAVER, 0000
DAVID L. WELLS, 0000

To be captain

LOUISE M. BRYCE, 0000
JAY S. TAYLOR, 0000

I NOMINATE THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be major

MICHAEL D. ELLER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY. THE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*) ARE NOMINATED FOR A REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE NURSE CORPS, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS, MEDICAL CORPS, DENTAL CORPS, MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS, JUDGE ADVOCATE CORPS, AND CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

*JAMES L. ATKINS, 0000
*HOLLY L. DOYNE, 0000
*ROBERT A. DRAGOO, 0000
*EUGENE T. ETZKORN, 0000
*SHARON FEENEY-JONES, 0000
*JOSEPH B. HANLEY, 0000
*CHARLES H. HOKE, 0000
*MOO O. HWANG, 0000
*RITA C. JACQUES, 0000
*ROBERT V. JONES, 0000
*JAMES W. KIKENDALL, 0000
*DOLORES A. LOEW, 0000
*ALLAN R. MAYER, 0000
*DOMINGO A. SISON, 0000
*MARIA H. SJOGREN, 0000
*DONALD L. STEINWEG, 0000
*DAVID N. TAYLOR, 0000
*WILLIAM P. WIESMANN, 0000

To be lieutenant colonel

*JAIME I. ALBORNOZ, 0000
*ALICIA Y. ARMSTRONG, 0000
*DONALD D. BAILEY, 0000
*JAMES T. BERKENBAUGH, 0000
*VERNON R. BRUCE, 0000
*MARC G. COTE, 0000
*THOMAS F. DEFAYETTE, 0000
*WAYNE C. FARMER, 0000
*KENNETH L. FERSTER, 0000
*THOMAS M. FITZPATRICK, 0000
*EDWARD FLETCHER, 0000
*LILLIAN A. FOERSTER, 0000
*DEAN R. GUILITTO, 0000
*CARLA HAWLEY-BOWLAND, 0000
*BRIAN R. JOHNSON, 0000
*YOUNG O. KIM, 0000
*JAMES E. MARK, 0000
*MICHAEL D. MATSON, 0000
*CHARLES E. MCQUEEN, 0000
*THOMAS C. MICHELS, 0000
*OWEN J. MULLEN, 0000
*BHAGYA MURTHY, 0000
*ANN B. RICHARDSON, 0000
*JEANNETTE SOUTH-PAUL, 0000
*S. STEINFELD-MCKENNON, 0000
*NICH SUTHUN, 0000
*JAMES P. TURNER, 0000
*LEO F. VOEPEL, 0000
*DAVID M. WILDER, 0000

To be major

*RICHARD H. BIRDSONG, 0000
*PETRA GOODMAN, 0000
*ROBERT K. HOOD, 0000
*MARCIA J. IMDIEKE, 0000
*DEBORAH J. KENNY, 0000
*GORDON A. LEWIS, 0000
*PATRICK G. SESTO, 0000
*JAMES E. SHEIL, 0000
*NANCY E. SOLTEZ, 0000
*R. STRUTTON-AMAKER, 0000
*JOHN A. STUART, 0000
*WILLIAM L. TOZIER, 0000
*KEITH R. VESELY, 0000
*PAUL D. WELSCH, 0000

To be captain

*MICHAEL P. ABLE, 0000
*EDWARD H. BAILEY, 0000
*MARGARET B. BAINES, 0000
*BRIAN R. BAUER, 0000
*ERIC J. BAUMGARDNER, 0000
*MICHAEL R. BELL, 0000
*LORANEE E. BRAUN, 0000
*SCOTT E. BRIETZKE, 0000
*RICHARD O. BURNEY, 0000
*JEFFREY M. CALLIN, 0000
*ARTHUR L. CAMPBELL, 0000
*KEVIN M. CIEPLY, 0000
*MICHAEL A. COLE, 0000
*BRIAN C. CORNEILSON, 0000
*QUINDOLA M. CROWLEY, 0000
*COLIN Y. DANIELS, 0000
*THO N. DANIELS, 0000
*RHONDA DEEN, 0000
*SHAD H. DEERING, 0000
*MICHAEL DLUGOPOLSKI, 0000
*DAVID M. EASTY, 0000
*RICHARD R. ESSICK, 0000
*MARY M. FOREMAN, 0000
*KIMMO T. FULLER, 0000
*JOHN S. GERSCH, 0000
*ROBERT V. GIBBONS, 0000
*KELLY R. GILLESPIE, 0000
*MATTHEW J. GILLIGAN, 0000
*MELISSA L. GIVENS, 0000
*ERIC J. GOURLEY, 0000
*TIMOTHY GRAMMEL, 0000
*RICHARD C. GROSS, 0000
*STACEY L. GRUM, 0000
*KURT A. GUSTAFSON, 0000
*SAM E. HADDAD, 0000
*JOHN P. HARVEY, 0000
*DONALD L. HELMAN, 0000
*JEFFREY V. HILL, 0000
*ROBERT H. HOLLAND, 0000
*JOHN D. HOWE, 0000
*JAMIA E. HOWELL, 0000
*DANIEL J. IRIZARRY, 0000
*MICHAEL D. ISACCO, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER G. JARVIS, 0000
*WILLIAM C. KEPPLER, 0000
*KURT G. KINNEY, 0000
*DINAH R. KIRK, 0000
*MICHAEL E. KLEIN, 0000
*JEFFREY K. KLOTZ, 0000
*CRAIG T. KOPECKY, 0000
*HENRY J. KYLE, 0000
*MICHAEL O. LACEY, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER L. LANGE, 0000
*INGER M. LERRA, 0000
*WILLIAM D. LEUSINK, 0000
*DALE H. LEVANDOWSKI, 0000
*JENNIFER LINDSAY–DODOO, 0000
*TIMOTHY C. MACDONNELL, 0000
*SHAWN A. MACLEOD, 0000
*MICHAEL E. MARTINE, 0000
*SHARON P. MCKIERNAN, 0000
*IAN K. MCLEOD, 0000
*SEAN K. MCVEIGH, 0000
*CLAY R. MILLER, 0000
*JANICE NICKIE–GREEN, 0000
*MARK A. PACELLA, 0000
*TARAK H. PATEL, 0000
*EDWARD J. PENA–RUIZ, 0000
*JEREMY G. PERKINS, 0000
*ANTHONY E. PUSATERI, 0000
*MATTHEW S. RICE, 0000
*JAMES H. ROBINETTE, 0000
*CHARLES H. ROSE, 0000
*TROY W. ROSS, 0000
*DAVID S. SACHAR, 0000
*EVELYN SANGSTER–CLARKE, 0000
*STEPHEN J. SEKAC, 0000
*SEAN M. SHOCKEY, 0000
*DAVID R. SHOEMAKER, 0000
*ADAM H. SIMS, 0000
*NITEN SINGH, 0000
*RICHARD R. SMITH, 0000
*CARMEN A. STELLA, 0000
*KEITH D. SUMEY, 0000
*TIMOTHY S. TALBOT, 0000
*SUSANNAH Q. TAPLEY, 0000
*BRIGILDA C. TENEZA, 0000
*SEAN F. THOMAS, 0000
*RAYMOND F. TOPP, 0000
*JESSIE L. TUCKER, 0000
*BRADLEY S. VANDERVEEN, 0000
*RODNEY A. VILLANUEVA, 0000
*MATTHEW J. VREELAND, 0000
*BEN WEBB, 0000
*KIMBERLY A. WENNER, 0000
*HARRY L. WHITLOCK, 0000
*WAYNE K. WHITTENBERG, 0000
*JOSEPH A. WILLIAMS, 0000
*JUSTIN T. WOODSON, 0000

To be first lieutenant

*WESLEY J. ANDERSON, 0000
*SANDRA J. BEGLEY, 0000
*DONALD J. CHAPMAN, 0000
*FRANK C. GARCIA, 0000
*EDWARD L. HILL, 0000
*KRISTOPHER S. HULL, 0000
*EMMA J. MCCLAIN, 0000
*CLIFTON R. MCCREADY, 0000
*JEFFERY L. MOSSO, 0000
*AMANDA R. NEWSOM, 0000
*BRANDON J. PRETLOW, 0000
*CYRUSS A. TSURGEON, 0000
*JOSEPH K. WEAVER, 0000

To be second lieutenant

*DAVID A. BURNS, 0000
*LAWRENCE A. EDELL, 0000
*SHAWN P. FITZGERALD, 0000
*JOHN D. FOSTER, 0000
*KATHERINE KING, 0000
*LORIANN R. MCKEEVER, 0000
*TIMOTHY J. MORRIS, 0000
*DANIEL S. PARK, 0000
*JETH B. REY, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER L. ROBISHAW, 0000
*MICHAEL SABOL, 0000
*JEFFREY A. SAELI, 0000
*JONATHAN M. WILEY, 0000
*SCOTT WILKINSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE SECTIONS 624 AND 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

FRANK J. ABBOTT, 0000
PAUL F. ABEL, JR., 0000
HENRY E. ABERCROMBIE, 0000
ROBERT B. ABRAMS, 0000
*STEPHEN C. ABSALONSON, 0000
JACK H. ACHS, 0000
HECTOR J. ACOSTA, 0000
MICHAEL S. ADAMS, 0000
WILLIAM F. ADAMS, 0000
GARY A. AGRON, 0000
EILEEN M. AHEARN, 0000
MICHAEL W. ALEXANDER, 0000
CHARLES ALLEN, III, 0000
CHRISTOPHER E. ALLEN, 0000
DAVID L. ALLWINE, 0000
RODNEY K. ALSTON, 0000
JAMES E. ALTY, JR., 0000
WILLIAM F. ANDERSON, 0000
CYNTHIA J. ANDREWS, 0000
KEITH P. ANTONIA, 0000
MARK H. ARMSTRONG, 0000
MICHAEL P. ARMSTRONG, 0000
RICHARD E. ARNOLD, 0000
FRANCISCO J. ASCORBE, 0000
MARIAN L. AUSTIN, 0000
ROBERT J. AVALLE, JR., 0000
VICTOR B. AYERS, 0000
KEVIN M. BADGER, 0000
MARTIN P. BAGLEY, 0000
ALVIN L. BAILEY, 0000
MARK D. BAINES, 0000
RALPH O. BAKER, 0000
JOHN S. BALDINI, JR., 0000
JAMES B. BALOCKI, 0000
WILLIAM BALOGH, 0000
STEFAN J. BANACH, 0000
MARK W. BAREFIELD, 0000
BRIAN D. BARHAM, 0000
CHARLES T. BARHAM, 0000
THERESA L. BARTON, 0000
RICHARD C. BASSETT, 0000
ALLEN W. BATSCHELET, 0000
KATHLEEN M. BATTON, 0000
FRANKLIN R. BAUM, JR., 0000
BARRY E. BAZEMORE, 0000
GREGORY A. BEACHAM, 0000
WILLIAM K. BEAMER, 0000
JEFFREY A. BEDEY, 0000
JAMES L. BEDINGFIELD, 0000
MICHAEL D. BEERY, 0000
LESLIE H. BELKNAP, 0000
MARGARET H. BELKNAP, 0000
CRAIG A. BERGQUIST, 0000
RUSS H. BERKOFF, 0000
PAUL W. BERNDT, 0000
BRENDA K. BESS, 0000
PAUL R. BETHEA, 0000
ROBERT L. BETHEA, JR., 0000
TERRY W. BEYNON, 0000
MICHAEL D. BIANCHI, 0000
TIMOTHY R. BILDERBACK, 0000
*ARTHUR E. BILODEAU, 0000
JAMES A. BILOTTO, 0000
ELISABETH J. BILYEU, 0000
MARK C. BINGAMAN, 0000
GWENDOLYN BINGHAM, 0000
JOHN T. BINKLEY, 0000
STEPHEN P. BIRDSALL, 0000
KENNETH W. BISHOP, 0000
THOMAS R. BLACK, 0000
WILLIAM D. BLACKLEDGE, 0000
BILLY M. BLACKWELL, 0000
*GLORIA D. BLAKE, 0000
TAB A. BLAZEK, 0000
JOHN G. BLITCH, 0000
RICHARD E. BLOSS, 0000
JAMES R. BLUE, 0000
JEFFREY B. BLYTH, 0000
CHARLES A. BOAZ, JR., 0000
RANDALL J. BOCKENSTEDT, 0000
JEROME L. BOERSTE, 0000
DAISIE D. BOETTNER, 0000
MICHAEL E. BONHEIM, 0000
PAUL A. BONNEWITZ, 0000
WILLIAM L. BOOKS, 0000
ANN L. BOOTH, 0000
GREGORY J. BORDEN, 0000
KENNETH P. BORETTI, 0000
GEORGIA H. BOUIE, 0000
ALAN G. BOURQUE, 0000
BRUCE A. BOWMAN, 0000
JOSEPH T. BOYD, 0000
MICHAEL S. BOYLE, 0000
TIMOTHY A. BOYLES, 0000
DAVID C. BRADLEY, 0000
MICHAEL A. BRADLEY, 0000

WAYNE M. BRAINERD, 0000
LLEWELLYN BRANDON, 0000
ROBERT A. BRENNAN, 0000
*CLAY F. BRIDGES, 0000
PETER C. BRIGHAM, 0000
JASEY B. BRILEY, 0000
JOHN M. BRITTEN, 0000
MICHAEL P. BROGAN, 0000
*STEVEN M. BROUSE, 0000
CRAIG A. BROWN, 0000
GARY B. BROWN, 0000
JAMES B. BROWN, 0000
KATHLEEN R. BROWN, 0000
KEVIN W. BROWN, 0000
*STEVEN J. BROWN, 0000
TIMOTHY BROWN, 0000
WILLIAM H. BROWN, 0000
KATHLEEN F. BROWNING, 0000
MAITLAND M. BROWNING, JR., 0000
DWIGHT M. BRUCE, 0000
ROBERT H. BRUCE, 0000
DANIEL V. BRUNO, 0000
VICTORIA M. BRUZESE, 0000
WILLIAM D. BRYAN, 0000
CARLTON A. BUCHANAN, 0000
JEFFREY S. BUCHANAN, 0000
NATHAN A. BUCHHEIT, 0000
EUGENE R. BUCKNER, 0000
WILLIAM F. BUECHTER, 0000
STEPHEN G. BULLOCK, 0000
RONALD L. BUMGARNER, 0000
THOMAS W. BUNING, 0000
*JON D. BUNN, 0000
THOMAS BUONFORTE, 0000
OLGER D. BURCH III, 0000
LARRY C. BURNETT, 0000
MICHAEL J. BURNS, 0000
DOUGLAS A. BURRER, 0000
WELDON K. BURTON, 0000
GLENN BUTLER, 0000
RALPH A. BUTLER, 0000
TYMOTHY W. CADDELL, 0000
ROBERT B. CADIGAN, 0000
JAMES B. CAMP, JR., 0000
CHARLES D. CANEDY, 0000
CARLOS G. CAPLLONCH, 0000
PHILIP J. CAREY, 0000
KATHRYN H. CARLSON, 0000
SUSAN P. CARLSON, 0000
MATTHEW T. CARR, 0000
PEGGY R. CARSON, 0000
WILLIAM C. CARTER, 0000
MICHAEL D. CASE, 0000
ROBERT G. CAUDLE, 0000
RICHARD G. CERCONE, JR., 0000
*MARK B. CHAKWIN, 0000
JAY W. CHAMBERS, JR., 0000
STEPHEN CHAN, 0000
CURTIS P. CHEESEMAN, 0000
CLARENCE K. CHINN, 0000
JOHN M. CHIU, 0000
RICHARD R. CLAIRMONT, 0000
*DAVID L. CLARK, 0000
DONALD I. CLARKE, 0000
MICHAEL J. CLIDAS, 0000
MICHAEL C. CLOY, 0000
CHARLES F. COAN, 0000
LAURA J. COAXUM, 0000
LEWIS C. COCHRAN, 0000
ROBIN D. COFER, 0000
GEORGE G. COFFELT, 0000
TIMOTHY R. COFFIN, 0000
ANDREW H. COHEN, 0000
ANGEL L. COLON, 0000
HECTOR L. COLON, 0000
CARL J. COLWELL, 0000
THOMAS J. COMODECA, 0000
VALERIE B. CONERWAY, 0000
KEVIN P. CONGO, 0000
JAMES T. CONLEY, JR., 0000
*SUE E. CONLON, 0000
JOHN P. CONNELL, 0000
JEFFERY S. COOK, 0000
ARTHUR B. COOPER, 0000
RICHARD C. COPLEN, 0000
THOMAS W. CORDINGLY, 0000
CHARLES G. COUTTEAU, 0000
CHARLES W. COXWELL, JR., 0000
BRIAN A. CRAWFORD, 0000
*CARDON B. CRAWFORD, 0000
DAVID L. CRAWFORD, 0000
JENNIFER W. CRAWFORD, 0000
JAMES B. CROCKETT III, 0000
WILLIAM M. CROCOLL, 0000
JOSEPH P. CROWLEY, 0000
JACQUELINE E. CUMBO, 0000
STEVEN M. CUMMINGS, 0000
KENDAL W. CUNNINGHAM, 0000
CRAIG J. CURREY, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. CURRY, 0000
HENRY A. CURRY, 0000
PETER E. CURRY, 0000
ARNE CURTIS, 0000
KENNETH R. DAHL, 0000
THOMAS P. DALIO, 0000
EDWARD B. DALY, 0000
GARY N. DANIEL, JR., 0000
MITCHELL P. DANNER, 0000
WILLIAM E. DASCH, JR., 0000
PETER A. DAVIDSON, 0000
WALTER J. DAVIES, 0000
MICHAEL F. DAVINO, 0000
GLEN L. DAVIS, 0000
GORDON B. DAVIS, JR., 0000
MICHAEL J. DAVIS, 0000
PETER E. DAVIS, 0000
STUART D. DAVIS, 0000
*WAYNE K. DAVIS, 0000
DUANE K. DAVISTON, 0000
TIM L. DAY, 0000
WILLIAM S. DECAMP, JR., 0000
PETER DEFLURI III, 0000
MICHAEL J. DELANEY, 0000
WILLIAM F. DELANEY, 0000
ROBERTO L. DELGADO, 0000
ROBERT DELISLE, JR., 0000
GEORGE G. DEMARSE, 0000
MARK P. DEMIKE, 0000
DAVID A. DEPASTINA, 0000
RICHARD G. DEPPE, JR., 0000
PHILIP J. DERMER, 0000
JEAN M. DETTLING, 0000
HAROLD M. DICK, 0000
CURTIS A. DIGGS, 0000
RICHARD H. DIGIOVANNI, 0000
NORVEL L. DILLARD, 0000
DANIEL P. DILLON, 0000
MICHAEL S. DILLON, 0000
LOUIS A. DIMARCO, 0000
JOSEPH P. DISALVO, 0000
PAUL R. DISNEY, JR., 0000
JOHN M. DISTER, 0000
RICHARD J. DIXON, 0000
TIMOTHY D. DIXON, 0000
KEVIN R. DODGE, 0000
BRYAN L. DOHRN, 0000
YVONNE DOLL, 0000
JANICE L. DOMBI, 0000
ROBERT DOMITROVICH, 0000
THOMAS W. DONNELLY, JR., 0000
KEVIN S. DONOHUE, 0000
DENISE M. DONOVAN, 0000
MICHAEL E. DONOVAN, 0000
GARRIE P. DORNAN, 0000
MICHAEL C. DOROHOVICH, 0000
JOSEPH P. DOTY, 0000
MARK F. DOUGLASS, 0000
JON N. DOWLING, 0000
ROBERT C. DOWLING, 0000
DENNIS J. DOWNEY, 0000
BOBBY L. DRIESNER, 0000
CHARLES H. DRIESSNACK, 0000
PATRICK J. DUBOIS, 0000
JOHN F. DUFFY, 0000
DENNIS J. DUGAN, 0000
STEPHEN C. DUNCAN, 0000
CHARLES DUNN, III, 0000
BRIAN D. DURANT, 0000
CHARLES W. DURR, 0000
JAMES F. DUTTWEILER, 0000
ROBERT M. DYESS, JR., 0000
SCOTT A. EAGEN, 0000
RICKY J. EARLEYWINE, 0000
ALLEN C. EAST, 0000
CLAY EASTERLING, 0000
TODD J. EBEL, 0000
RALPH I. EBENER, JR., 0000
NATHAN R. EBERLE, 0000
ANTULIO . ECHEVARRIA, 0000
ANAS T. ECONOMY, III, 0000
TIMOTHY J. EDENS, 0000
DALLAS M. EDWARDS, 0000
ERIC L. EDWARDS, II, 0000
MICHAEL C. EDWARDS, 0000
ROBERT S. ELIAS, 0000
FRANK A. EMERY, 0000
JEFFERY W. ENGBRECHT, 0000
RUSSELL W. ENGLISH, 0000
RICHARD J. EVERSON, 0000
ROBERT E. EVERSON, 0000
MARK V. EVETTS, 0000
EDWARD L. FABIAN, JR., 0000
MATTHEW B. FAGAN, 0000
SAMUEL E. FAIRES, 0000
MICHAEL J. FALLON, 0000
DAVID J. FARACE, 0000
BILLY D. FARRIS, II, 0000
MICHAEL FENN, 0000
JANICE W. FERGUSON, 0000
QUILL R. FERGUSON, 0000
ROBERT S. FERRELL, 0000
JEFFREY D. FIELD, 0000
FRANCIS X. FIERKO, 0000
CARL S. FILIP, 0000
SEAN M. FINNEGAN, 0000
ANDREW R. FISCHER, 0000
CARL E. FISCHER, 0000
KENNETH K. FISHER, JR., 0000
KELLY F. FISK, 0000
ROBERT E. FITE, JR., 0000
DEBRA L. FIX, 0000
CHRISTINA F. FLANAGAN, 0000
HARRY D. FLANAGAN, 0000
MICHAEL B. FLEMING, 0000
CHARLES V. FLETCHER, 0000
MARY P. FLETCHER, 0000
PAUL J. FLYNN, 0000
WILLIAM C. FLYNT III, 0000
CARLOS I. FONT, 0000
*WILLIAM G. FORD, 0000
PETER W. FOREMAN, 0000
TODD H. FOREMAN, 0000
JERRY M. FORMAN, 0000
JOHN B. FORSYTH, 0000
MICHAEL W. FORTANBARY, 0000
KIRK L. FOSTER, 0000
HARRISON D. FOUNTAIN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER W. FOWLER, 0000
LAWRENCE C. FOWLER, 0000
BRYAN C. FOY, 0000
TONY R. FRANCIS, 0000
TIMOTHY H. FRANK, 0000
HARRY M. FRANKLIN, 0000
*MARK R. FRANKLIN, 0000
MARY L. FRANKLIN, 0000
THOMAS FREEMAN, JR., 0000
DANIEL P. FRENCH, 0000
ROBERT B. FRENCH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER C. FRY, 0000
PATRICK E. FULLER, 0000
WILLIAM K. FULLER, 0000
WILLIAM B. FULLERTON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. FULTON, 0000
JOHN J. GALLAND, 0000
ALFRED W. GAMMONS, JR., 0000
HERIBERTO GARCIA, 0000
MARTIN J. GARCIA, 0000
MARK C. GARDNER, 0000
JOHN W. GARMANY, JR., 0000
NEIL A. GARRA, 0000
MARGUERITE C. GARRISON, 0000
THAD A. GASSMAN, 0000
RICHARD G. GAY, JR., 0000
KEITH G. GEIGER, 0000
KEITH A. GEORGE, 0000
KATHLEEN A. GERENDA, 0000
ANTHONY L. GERMAN, 0000
GREGORY M. GEROVAC, 0000
STEPHEN J. GERRAS, 0000
PAUL C. GERTON, 0000
DAVID L. GILBERT, 0000
VERNDELL H. GILDHOUSE, 0000
PAUL D. GILLEY, JR., 0000
WALTER L. GILLIAM, 0000
JEROME P. GILMAN, 0000
ANTHONY GLENN, 0000
JESSIE J. GOGGINS, 0000
PAUL K. GONZALES, 0000
JULIUS B. GOODMAN, 0000
CHARLES W. GORE, 0000
NORMAN M. GRADY, 0000
ANTHONY T. GRANT, 0000
RICHARD E. GRAVES, 0000
JAMES A. GRAY, 0000
JOSEPH G. GREEN, III, 0000
MATTHEW J. GREEN, 0000
RICHARD L. GREENE, JR., 0000
WARREN O. GREENE, 0000
MARK T. GRESZLER, 0000
GARY R. GRIMES, 0000
JOSEPH D. GRINER, 0000
WILLIAM J. GRISWOLD, JR., 0000
BRIAN L. GROFT, 0000
DAVID C. GROHOSKI, 0000
JANET E. GROSS, 0000
MICHAEL J. GROVE, 0000
SUSAN K. GRUBB, 0000
WILLIAM R. GRUBBS, 0000
ROBERT D. GRYMES, 0000
DANIEL J. GUILMETTE, 0000
SAMUEL A. GUTHRIE, 0000
BRUCE L. GWILLIAM, 0000
BILLY J. HADFIELD, 0000
DAVID L. HAGG, 0000
CATHERINE G. HAIGHT, 0000
DAVID B. HAIN, 0000
JOHN L. HAITHCOCK, JR., 0000
SCOTT A. HALASZ, 0000
JAY H. HALE, 0000
DONALD L. HALL, 0000
MICHAEL A. HALLISEY, 0000
FREEBERG S. HALTER, 0000
CINDY K. HAMILTON, 0000
SCOTT E. HAMPTON, 0000
MICHAEL D. HANLEY, 0000
MARIAN R. HANSEN, 0000
RICHARD D. HANSEN, JR., 0000
ROBERT P. HANSEN, 0000
WILLIAM E. HARMON, 0000
RICHARD L. HARMS, 0000
RONALD H. HARPER, 0000
THOMAS P. HARRELL, 0000
EARNEST D. HARRIS, 0000
THOMAS G. HARRIS, 0000
DONALD M. HARRISON, 0000
*SUSAN D. HARRISON, 0000
THEODORE C. HARRISON, 0000
WILLIAM T. HARRISON, 0000
CONSTANCE A. HARTMAN, 0000
CARROL I. HARVEY, 0000
JAMES T. HARVILL JR., 0000
DAVID D. HAUGHT, 0000
STEVEN P. HAUSTEIN, 0000
SAMUELL R. HAWES, 0000
JOHN E. HAXTON, 0000
MARK W. HAYES, 0000
ROBERT W. HAYNIE, 0000
RUDOLPH C. HAYNIE, 0000
EDWARD A. HEALY, JR., 0000
FALKNER HEARD, III, 0000
MICHAEL G. HEGARTY, 0000
CHARLES G. HEIDEN, 0000
MARK S. HELD, 0000
DARRALL R. HENDERSON, 0000
ROBERT J. HENRY, 0000
SCOTT A. HENRY, 0000
RILEY L. HENSLY, 0000
WALTER M. HERD, 0000
JUAN J. HERNANDEZ, 0000
ERNEST J. HEROLD, III, 0000
ROBERT T. HESS, 0000
JEFFERY A. HILL, 0000
RICKY E. HILL, 0000
SCOTT A. HILL, 0000
STEPHEN L. HILL, 0000
RAYMOND S. HILLIARD, 0000
PAUL S. HILTON, 0000
ERNEST M. HINES, II, 0000
JAMES E. HINNANT, 0000
MARK W. HINTON, 0000
WILLIAM C. HIX, 0000

JANETT L. HODNETT, 0000
PETER F. HOFFMAN, 0000
KURT G. HOFFMANN, 0000
STEVEN P. HOFFPAUER, 0000
MICHAEL E. HOGAN, 0000
LEON W. HOJNICKI, 0000
ROBERT M. HOLMES, JR., 0000
JAMES A. HOLTZCLAW, 0000
*MICHAEL H. HONEYCUTT, 0000
RICHARD D. HOOKER, JR., 0000
OLIVETTE M. HOOKS, 0000
EARL E. HOOPER, 0000
CYNTHIA O. HOPE, 0000
RICHARD M. HORNACK, JR., 0000
GREGORY C. HOSCHEIT, 0000
PAMELA O. HOWARD, 0000
STEPHEN F. HOWARD, 0000
JAMES R. HOY, JR., 0000
TERRY L. HOYT, 0000
DANNY T. HUBER, 0000
JOSEPH D. HUBER, JR., 0000
RICHARD A. HUGGLER, 0000
STEPHEN E. HUGHES, 0000
JEFFREY W. HUMPHREY, 0000
OREN L. HUNSAKER, 0000
CARL W. HUNT, 0000
JONATHAN B. HUNTER, 0000
DAVID E. HUNTERCHESTER, 0000
BRUCE H. HUPE, 0000
WAYNE R. HUSEMANN, 0000
STEPHEN N. HYLAND, JR., 0000
TED G. IHRKE, 0000
ANTHONY R. INCORVATI, II, 0000
JOEL W. INGOLD, 0000
FRANK P. IPPOLITO, 0000
FERDINAND IRIZARRY, II, 0000
JEFFERY L. IRVINE, 0000
DONALD E. JACKSON, 0000
ERNEST F. JACKSON, 0000
WILLIAM D. JACKSON, 0000
WILLIS F. JACKSON, JR., 0000
RHONDA K. JAKUBIK-WORKMAN, 0000
WILLIE A. JAMES, 0000
JEFFREY JARKOWSKY, 0000
MICHAEL J. JAYE, 0000
CINDY R. JEBB, 0000
GREGORY L. JOHANSEN, 0000
ROBERT A. JOHN, 0000
HIRAM N. JOHNSON, 0000
MARK E. JOHNSON, 0000
MARK T. JOHNSON, 0000
MICHAEL R. JOHNSON, 0000
ROBERT L. JOHNSON, JR., 0000
SAMUEL H. JOHNSON, 0000
MARK A. JOHNSTONE, 0000
DONALD M. JONES, 0000
FRANKLIN K. JONES, 0000
KATHY J. JONES, 0000
KERMIT C. JONES, 0000
MARK W. JONES, 0000
MARSHALL J. JONES, 0000
ROBERT T. JONES, 0000
WINSTON M. JONES, 0000
BILLY J. JORDAN, JR., 0000
JOHN D. JORDAN, 0000
FRANK A. JORDANO, 0000
MICHAEL R. JORGENSON, 0000
RAY A. JOSEY, 0000
BRIAN R. JOYCE, 0000
KENNETH G. JUERGENS, 0000
ANTHONY J. JUSTI, JR., 0000
JEFFREY T. KAPPENMAN, 0000
ROBERT W. KARPIAK, 0000
RICHARD W. KAUMANS, 0000
LESLIE B. KAYE, 0000
BRIAN KEETH, 0000
BRYAN D. KEIFER, 0000
TERRY J. KELLEY, 0000
THOMAS M. KELLEY, 0000
MICHAEL V. KELLY, 0000
DOUGLAS B. KELSEY, 0000
CARLA D. KENDRICK, 0000
ROBERT KENDRICK III, 0000
ALEXANDER D. KENDRIS, 0000
HOWARD J. KILLIAN III, 0000
RICHARD J. KILROY, JR., 0000
JIYUL KIM, 0000
GERALD A. KINCAID, JR., 0000
DAVID M. KING, 0000
MARYSE J. KING, 0000
KEVIN M. KIRMSE, 0000
JOHN A. KIZLER, 0000
DALE E. KLEIN, 0000
BRIAN L. KLIMA, 0000
ROBERT W. KLINE, 0000
DAN J. KNAPPENBERGER, 0000
EARL E. KNIGHT, 0000
THOMAS G. KNIGHT, JR., 0000
JAMES A. KNOWLES, 0000
JAMES A. KNOWLTON, 0000
TIMOTHY A. KOKINDA, 0000
WILLIAM J. KOLB, 0000
THEODORE W. KOUFAS, 0000
EDWARD KOZACK, 0000
DAVID A. KRAMER, 0000
MICHAEL A. KRIZ, 0000
THOMAS W. KULA, 0000
HON C. KWAN, JR., 0000
DWAYNE A. LACEWELL, 0000
CATHERINE H. LACINA, 0000
RAYMOND L. LAMB, 0000
GLEN D. LAMBKIN, JR., 0000
LYNDA R. LAMITIE, 0000
TOMMY L. LANCASTER, 0000
SCOTT A. LANG, 0000
KELLY M. LANGDORF, 0000
GERALD P. LAPP, 0000
DAVID D. LAVENDER, 0000
GERALD S. LAWSON, 0000
BRIAN R. LAYER, 0000
RONALD D. LEET, JR., 0000
ALBERT F. LEFTWICH, 0000
JON S. LEHR, 0000
LISA A. LEMZA, 0000
LARRY L. LETNER, 0000
BRADLEY J. LIBERG, 0000
RONALD N. LIGHT, 0000
DOMINIC J. LILAK, 0000
WILLIAM LIN, 0000
BRIAN S. LINDAMOOD, 0000
JAMES B. LINDER, 0000
KEVIN S. LINDSAY, 0000
DAVID H. LING, 0000
MICHAEL D. LINGENFELTER, 0000
DOUGLAS J. LITAVEC, 0000
DEBRA R. LITTLE, 0000
MICHAEL V. LITWINOWICZ, 0000
MARION A. LIVENGOOD, 0000
JOHN T. LLOYD, 0000
XAVIER P. LOBETO, 0000
BOBBY LOCKLEAR, 0000
GUY A. LOFARO, 0000
*JEAN M. LOISEAU, 0000
GARY W. LONGANECKER, 0000
PAUL M. LOOMIS, 0000
CHARLENE M. LOPER, 0000
MARK A. LORING, 0000
DANIEL T. LOSCUDO, 0000
*KEITH R. LOVEJOY, 0000
BARRETT F. LOWE, 0000
*KENNETH A. LUCAS, 0000
JAMES P. LUDOWESE, 0000
ALFRED E. LUNT, III, 0000
THOMAS C. LUTHER, 0000
THOMAS B. LYLES, JR., 0000
CHARLES P. LYNCH, 0000
JOHN D. LYNCH, 0000
THOMAS F. LYNCH, III, 0000
*ALAN T. MABRY, 0000
SEAN B. MACFARLAND, 0000
FRANCIS A. MACHINA, JR., 0000
HEATHER J. MACIAS, 0000
MICHAEL G. MACIVOR, 0000
PARIS M. MACK, 0000
SHARON M. MACK, 0000
ROBERT W. MACKAY, 0000
THOMAS F. MACKAY, 0000
WILLIAM A. MACKEN, 0000
RANDALL L. MACKEY, 0000
JAMES G. MACNEIL, 0000
DONALD M. MACWILLIE, 0000
PATRICK M. MADDEN, 0000
BETH A. MADDOX, 0000
JONATHAN A. MADDUX, 0000
CARMEN J. MADERO, 0000
CORY W. MAHANNA, 0000
DANIEL P. MAHONEY, 0000
SCOTT D. MAIR, 0000
ALAN W. MAITLAND, 0000
KEVIN W. MANGUM, 0000
GERALD J. MANLEY, 0000
DAVID L. MANN, 0000
PETER R. MANSOOR, 0000
GEORGE P. MARQUARDT, 0000
PATRICK M. MARR, 0000
LLOYD W. MARSHALL, 0000
*GEORGE D. MARTIN III, 0000
MARK D. MARTIN, 0000
GERALD B. MARTINO, 0000
DORIOT A. MASCARICH, 0000
RICHARD J. MASON, JR., 0000
ANTON E. MASSINON, 0000
JAMES J. MATHIS, 0000
DAVID S. MAXWELL, 0000
MARIE A. MAY, 0000
MARK N. MAZARELLA, 0000
MARK L. MCALISTER, 0000
DOUGLAS L. MCALLASTER, 0000
LAWENCE E. MCANNENY, 0000
MICHAEL T. MCBRIDE, 0000
CURTIS L. MCCABE, 0000
ROBERT M. MCCALL, 0000
DOUGLAS E. MCCALLUM, 0000
KEVIN J. MCCLUNG, 0000
WILLIAM N. MCCONNELL, 0000
NELSON MCCOUCH, III, 0000
CARY S. MCCOY III, 0000
JAMES R. MCCREIGHT, 0000
EVERETT K. MCDANIEL, 0000
DAVID R. MCDONALD, JR., 0000
JAMES D. MCDONOUGH, JR., 0000
KEVIN T. MCENERY, 0000
RALPH M. MCGEE, 0000
THOMAS J. MCGRATH, 0000
THOMAS M. MCGUINNESS, 0000
PUAL A. MCGUIRE, JR., 0000
STEPHEN E. MCGUIRE, 0000
WILLIAM R. MCINNIS, 0000
MARK J. MCKEARN, 0000
JAMES H. MCKENZIE, JR., 0000
MARK E. MCKNIGHT, 0000
LESTER T. MCMANNES, JR., 0000
LAWRENCE P. MEDLER, JR., 0000
MICHAEL T. MEEKS, 0000
JOHN J. MEGNIA, 0000
CHARLES R. MEHLE II, 0000
ROBERT A. MELANSON, 0000
FREDERIC L. MERCHANT, 0000
DAVID L. MERRIFIELD, 0000
FRANCIS R. MERRITT, 0000
CHRISTOPHER B. MEYER, 0000
ROBERT D. MICHAUD, 0000
DANNY L. MICHIE, 0000
ROBERT L. MILBURN, 0000
MARION L. MILES, JR., 0000
BRICK T. MILLER, 0000
DEREK A. MILLER, 0000
EARL E. MILLER, 0000
GARRETT R. MILLER, 0000
JOHN H. MILLER, 0000
ROSE M. MILLER, 0000
ZECHARA J. MILLER, 0000
EDWARD T. MILLIGAN, 0000
MICHAEL D. MINER, 0000
PHILLIP MINOR, 0000
CHARLES M. MINYARD, 0000
RALPH L. MITCHELL, 0000
RONALD F. MITCHELL, 0000
JOEL A. MITTELSTAEDT, 0000
MICHAEL K. MIXEN, 0000
MARK J. MOELLER, 0000
JONATHAN J. MOENCH, 0000
DAVID L. MOLINELLI, 0000
LEONARD R. MONTFORD, JR., 0000
JOSHUA H. MONTGOMERY, 0000
FRANKIE D. MOORE, 0000
JOHN M. MOORE, 0000
STEVEN R. MOORE, 0000
STEVEN W. MOORE, 0000
JOE L. MORALEZ, JR., 0000
FRANK N. MORIN, 0000
DOUGLAS J. MORRISON, 0000
TIMOTHY F. MOSHIER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER V. MOYLAN, 0000
JOSEPH P. MUDD, 0000
GREGORY A. MUILENBURG, 0000
PAUL J. MULLIN, 0000
PATRICK G. MULVIHILL, 0000
MICHAEL J. MURPHY, 0000
BARRY G. MURRAY, 0000
JOHN M. MURRAY, 0000
TYRONE C. MUSSIO, 0000
JOSEPH C. MYERS, 0000
MICHAEL K. NAGATA, 0000
MARK D. NEEDHAM, 0000
SUSAN B. NEUMANN, 0000
MICHAEL A. NEWCOMB, 0000
ROBERT B. NEWMAN, 0000
ROBERT A. NEWTON II, 0000
JAMES M. NICHOL, JR., 0000
CAMILLE M. NICHOLS, 0000
JOHN W. NICHOLSON, JR., 0000
PATRICE A. NICKOLS, 0000
DOUGLAS E. NIELSEN, 0000
KAREN L. NIGARA, 0000
PAUL F. NIGARA, 0000
DEAN S. NOGLE, 0000
JERE P. NORMAN, JR., 0000
GLENWOOD NORRIS, JR., 0000
WILLIAM R. OAKS, 0000
ROGER R. OBEN, 0000
ROBERT A. OBRIEN III, 0000
ROBERT T. OBRIEN, JR., 0000
EDWIN S. OCONNOR, 0000
THOMAS E. ODONOVAN, 0000
JEFFREY R. OESER, 0000
TIMOTHY M. OHARA, 0000
LEWIS L. OHERN, JR., 0000
STANFORD OLIVER, 0000
JOHN A. OLSHEFSKI, 0000
MARK P. ONEILL, 0000
WILLIAM M. ORIET, 0000
MORTON ORLOV II, 0000
DAVID C. OSBORNE, 0000
RUSSELL M. OSBURN, 0000
DENNIS R. OWEN, 0000
EDWARD H. OWEN, 0000
DONALD K. OWENS, 0000
KEVIN C. OWENS, 0000
ALVA L. PACE, 0000
MICHAEL M. PACHECO, 0000
KEVIN J. PALGUTT, 0000
ROBERT A. PARKER, 0000
DEWEY F. PATRICK, 0000
LAWARREN V. PATTERSON, 0000
MARK S. PATTERSON, 0000
EUGENE P. PAULO, 0000
JOHN C. PAULSON, 0000
EUGENE A. PAWLIK, JR., 0000
ROMEY P. PELLETIER, 0000
DAMON C. PENN, 0000
DEBBRA J. PEREZ, 0000
MICHAEL J. PERGANDE, 0000
*CINDY L. PERRY, 0000
KENNETH J. PERRY, 0000
MARK J. PERRY, 0000
PAUL A. PERRY, 0000
STEVEN W. PETERSON, 0000
WILLIAM J. PETREE, 0000
JAMES A. PHELPS, 0000
CHARLES E. PHILLIPS, JR., 0000
ILEAN PHILLIPS, 0000
WARREN E. PHIPPS, JR., 0000
AUNDRE F. PIGGEE, 0000
CHRIS A. PILECKI, 0000
LESTER W. PINKNEY, 0000
STEVEN S. PINTER, JR., 0000
MARK R. PIRES, 0000
MARTIN B. PITTS, 0000
KEVIN P. POLCZYNSKI, 0000
RUSSELL L. POLING, 0000
MICHAEL R. POLLACK, 0000
WALTER H. POLLARD, 0000
WILLIAM B. POMEROY II, 0000
RANDOLPH W. PONDER, 0000
RICHARD J. POOLE, 0000
THOMAS G. POPE, 0000
JOSEPH N. POULIOT, JR., 0000
JOEL A. POWELL, 0000
JOHN D. POWELL, 0000
WILLIAM J. PRANTL, 0000

KENNETH L. PRENDERGAST, 0000
DEBRA L. PRESSLEY, 0000
YVONNE J. PRETTYMAN-BECK, 0000
MICHAEL I. PREVOU, 0000
RODNEY K. PRICE, 0000
DAVID W. PRIDE, 0000
LARRY H. PRUITT, 0000
WILLIAM T. PUGH, 0000
DANNY G. PUMMILL, 0000
DAVID P. PURSELL, 0000
PAUL A. PUSECKER III, 0000
MARTIN J. QUEENAN, 0000
DANIEL J. RAGSDALE, 0000
JAMES R. RALPH III, 0000
ENRIQUE RAMOS, 0000
GREGORY S. RASSATT, 0000
*BERNABE RATIO, 0000
ALEXANDER B. RAULERSON, 0000
PATRICK H. RAYERMANN, 0000
DOUGLAS E. RAYMOND, 0000
WALTER R. RAYMOND, JR., 0000
CLEON W. RAYNOR, 0000
RICKY J. REA, 0000
RONALD D. REAGAN, 0000
WILLIAM G. REAGLE, 0000
MYLES REARDON, JR., 0000
KEITH F. RECK, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. REDDISH, 0000
BRUCE D. REDLINE, 0000
DANIEL K. REED, 0000
DOUGLASS B. REED, 0000
GRADY G. REESE, JR., 0000
WILLIAM D. REESE, 0000
JARROLD M. REEVES, JR., 0000
CARLTON B. REID, JR., 0000
BRUCE J. REIDER, 0000
JAMES R. REINHARDT, 0000
STEWARD E. REMALY, 0000
DAVID A. RENAUD, 0000
PERRY A. RENIKER, 0000
ISRAEL REYES, 0000
JAMES R. RICE, 0000
BRYAN D. RICHARDSON, 0000
MARK D. RIDER, 0000
RICARDO R. RIERA, 0000
STEPHEN R. RIESE, 0000
DENNIS M. RINGLIEB, 0000
WILLIAM J. RISSE, 0000
MARK L. RITTER, 0000
MICHAEL F. ROACHE II, 0000
*JEFFREY S. ROBERTS, 0000
CHARLES W. ROBINSON, JR., 0000
RODERICK ROBINSON III, 0000
JOHN M. ROCHE, 0000
DAVID W. RODGERS, 0000
ANTHONY J. ROJEK, 0000
ROBERT A. ROMICH, 0000
GREGORY K. ROOKS, 0000
ROBERT H. ROOME, 0000
TERRY J. ROPES, 0000
MICHAEL S. ROSE, 0000
DIRK C. ROSENDAHL, 0000
DAVID H. ROSS, 0000
HARRY V. ROSSANDER, 0000
JOHN G. ROSSI, 0000
MICHAEL A. ROSSI, 0000
DINO D. ROTH, 0000
MATTHEW J. ROTHLISBERGER, 0000
RICHARD J. RUNDE, JR., 0000
CARL RUNYON, 0000
KEITH E. RYAN, 0000
PATRICK E. RYAN, 0000
TERRENCE P. RYAN, 0000
THOMAS E. RYAN, 0000
BENNET S. SACOLICK, 0000
STEVEN L. SALAZAR, 0000
RONALD F. SALYER, 0000
DAVID W. SAMEC, 0000
MARK H. SAMISCH, 0000
DONALD M. SANDO, 0000
DONNA J. SANGIORGIO, 0000
*JOAN P. SANGL, 0000
LAWRENCE SANSONE, 0000
TIMOTHY A. SASSENRATH, 0000
WAYNE A. SAUER, 0000
ROBERT S. SAUNDERS, 0000
WALTER J. SAWYER, 0000
TIMOTHY C. SAYERS, 0000
JESS A. SCARBROUGH, 0000
DAVID J. SCARCHILLI, 0000
GARY A. SCHEID, 0000
PAUL A. SCHIELE, 0000
MICHAEL J. SCHILLER, 0000
PHILIP J. SCHLATTER, 0000
DAREL D. SCHOENING, 0000
THOMAS J. SCHWARTZ, 0000
ANDREW K. SCHWEIKERT, 0000
ROBERT E. SCURLOCK, JR., 0000
THOMAS C. SEAMANDS, 0000
GEORGE A. SEARS II, 0000
MICHAEL K. SEIDL, 0000
GARY M. SERVOLD, 0000
JOSEPH D. SETTE, 0000
JERRY D. SHARP, JR. 0000
JOHN R. SHARP, 0000
KAREN E. SHEALAWSON, 0000
MARK J. SHEEHAN, 0000
RICHARD W. SHEPPARD, 0000
TIMOTHY M. SHERWOOD, 0000
RICHARD E. SHIPKOWSKI, 0000
JAMES D. SHUMWAY, IV 0000
THOMAS E. SIDWELL, 0000
JORGE L. SILVEIRA, 0000
JAMES M. SIMMONS, 0000
VIRGINIA W. SIMONSON, 0000
JOHN B. SIMPSON, III 0000
ROBERT W. SIMPSON, 0000
JOHN M. SISK, 0000
GEORGE P. SLAGLE, 0000
THOMAS F. SMALL, 0000
RICHARD S. SMARR, 0000
DAVID A. SMITH, 0000
DOUGLAS E. SMITH, JR. 0000
EUGENE B. SMITH 0000
GARY L. SMITH, 0000
JACK F. SMITH, JR. 0000
JAMES E. SMITH, 0000
*JAY Q. SMITH, 0000
JEFFOREY A. SMITH, 0000
KEVIN B. SMITH, 0000
STEPHEN T. SMITH, 0000
THOMAS M. SMITH, 0000
WILLIAM E. SMITH, 0000
LAWRENCE R. SNEAD, III 0000
JEFFREY J. SNOW, 0000
ROBERT D. SNYDER, 0000
LOWELL E. SOLIEN, 0000
KEITH D. SOLVESON, 0000
DAVID L. SONNIER, 0000
MATTHEW L. SORENSON, 0000
DEREK A. SORIANO, 0000
JUAN B. SOTO, 0000
ROBERT V. SOUTHERN, 0000
SUSAN R. SOWERS, 0000
DON P. SPENCER, 0000
MARK A. SPIEGEL, 0000
MERRILL F. SPROUL, 0000
PATRICK T. STACKPOLE, 0000
CHARLES A. STAFFORD, 0000
STEPHEN G. STALVEY, 0000
ALLAN T. STANDRE, 0000
GARY R. STANLEY, 0000
JOHN H. STAUFFER, II, 0000
GRANT D. STEFFAN, 0000
JAMES E. STEINKE, 0000
BILL D. STEPHENS, JR., 0000
STEVEN T. STEVENS, 0000
WILLIAM W. STEVENSON, 0000
DEBORAH M. STEWART, 0000
MICHELLE D. STOLESON, 0000
TIMOTHY R. STOY, 0000
STEVEN M. STRAIT, 0000
JEFFREY S. STRICKLAND, 0000
KENNETH R. STRICKLAND, 0000
JAMES M. STUTEVILLE, 0000
JEFFREY C. SUGRUE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER C. SULLIVAN, 0000
JOHN A. SUPRIN, 0000
ERIC C. SURLES, 0000
EUGENE S. SURMACZ, 0000
DAVID W. SUTHERLAND, 0000
BRIAN SUTTON, 0000
KNUT N. SVENDSEN, 0000
THOMAS SVISCO, 0000
ANTHONY SWAIN, 0000
JOHNNIE E. SWEATTE III, 0000
MICHAEL T. SWENSON, 0000
PETER J. TABACCHI, 0000
ERNEST A. TAFOYA, 0000
MICHAEL J. TALIENTO, JR., 0000
STEVEN C. TALKINGTON, 0000
WILLIAM J. TARANTINO, 0000
JOHN A. TARTALA, 0000
THOMAS L. TATE, 0000
ANTOINE D. TAYLOR, 0000
JOHN J. TAYLOR, 0000
PETER F. TAYLOR, JR., 0000
PHILLIP M. TEMPLE, 0000
STEPHEN V. TENNANT 0000
LOUISE V. TERRELL, 0000
DEBRA A. THEDFORD, 0000
JOHN S. THIEL, 0000
DAVID L. THOMAS, JR., 0000
PETER A. THOMAS, 0000
RICHARD G. THOMAS, JR., 0000
JOSEPH E. THOME, JR., 0000
DAVID S. THOMPSON, 0000
GARY J. THOMPSON, 0000
JEFFREY G. THOMPSON, 0000
LANCE B. THOMSON, 0000
GARY M. THORNE, 0000
PAUL D. THORNTON, 0000
JOHN P. TIDD, 0000
CHRISTINE M. TILLMAN, 0000
MARK E. TILLMAN, 0000
MARTIN R. TILLMAN, 0000
PHILIP R. TILLY, 0000
MICHAEL G. TITONE, 0000
KENNETH L. TOPPING, 0000
KIMETHA G. TOPPING, 0000
GERALD TORRENCE, 0000
BRADFORD C. TOUSLEY, 0000
RICHARD C. TOWNES, 0000
RICHARD S. TRACEY, 0000
TODD J. TRAVAS, 0000
DOUGLAS D. TRENDA, 0000
RAYMOND A. TREVINO, 0000
LYN O. TRONTI, 0000
MICHAEL V. TRUETT, 0000
RONALD D. TUGGLE, 0000
CLEMSON G. TURREGANO, 0000
BARRY N. TYREE, 0000
JOHN UBERTI, 0000
GREGORY J. ULSH, 0000
PHILIPPE J. UPPERMAN, 0000
DAVID W. VADEN, 0000
RAMON VALLE, 0000
RICHARD W. VANALLMAN, 0000
RAYMOND T. VANPELT, 0000
ROBERT J. VASTA, 0000
JAMES M. VAUGHN, 0000
JOHN K. VAUGHN, 0000
ARNOLD K. VEAZIE, 0000
DAVID W. VERGOLLO, 0000
ANTHONY C. VESAY, 0000
ALFRED VIANA, 0000
LANCE A. VOGT, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. VOLK, 0000
*BRYAN S. VULCAN, 0000
MICHAEL L. WACLAWSKI, 0000
RODERICK K. WADE, 0000
WILLIAM O. WADE, III, 0000
THOMAS D. WAHLERT, 0000
WILLIAM A. WALK, 0000
JAMES M. WALKER, JR., 0000
WALTER M. WALKER, 0000
DOROTHEA I. WALLACE, 0000
JOSEPH K. WALLACE, 0000
*SUSAN C. WALLACE, 0000
*ROBERT S. WALSH, 0000
ROBERT C. WALTER, 0000
STEPHEN WALTERS, 0000
JAMES M. WARING, 0000
MICHAEL L. WARSOCKI, 0000
JAMES N. WASSON, 0000
ROGER WATERS, 0000
JAMES L. WATSON, JR., 0000
KEVIN L. WATSON, 0000
RONALD A. WATTS, 0000
ANDREW F. WEAVER, 0000
JAMES R. WEBER, 0000
KEVIN A. WEDMARK, 0000
BRANDA M. WEIDNER, 0000
MARK R. WEITEKAMP, 0000
RONALD W. WELCH, 0000
GERALD L. WELLS, 0000
STEPHEN M. WELLS, 0000
JOHN A. WENZEL, 0000
*TIMOTHY L. WHALEN, 0000
WILLIAM L. WHEELEHAN, 0000
CHARLES WHITE, 0000
DAVID F. WHITE, 0000
RANDALL T. WHITE, 0000
RONALD E. WHITE, 0000
TIMOTHY L. WHITE, 0000
RANDY R. WIERS, 0000
PERRY L. WIGGINS, 0000
JOHN A. WILCOX, 0000
BRENT A. WILDASIN, 0000
JOHN A. WILHELM, 0000
JOHN C. WILHELM, 0000
*ANTHONY L. WILLIAMS, 0000
BENJAMIN H. WILLIAMS III, 0000
DEBORAH L. WILLIAMS, 0000
DONNA L. WILLIAMS, 0000
HERMAN WILLIAMS III, 0000
RANDY L. WILLIAMS, 0000
RICKEY K. WILLIAMS, 0000
ROBERT A. WILLIAMS, 0000
RUSSELL WILLIAMS, 0000
VIRGIL S. WILLIAMS, 0000
ALBERT S. WILLNER, 0000
CHARLES L. WILSON, 0000
GEORGETTE P. WILSON, 0000
JOHN P. WILSON, 0000
LANCE L. WILSON, 0000
STANLEY W. WILSON, 0000
THOMAS K. WILSON, 0000
STEPHEN E. WINKLER, 0000
WAYNE M. WINTERLING, 0000
MICHAEL B. WINZELER, 0000
DANIEL V. WISE, 0000
JEFFREY R. WITSKEN, 0000
DANIEL G. WOLFE, 0000
THOMAS F. WOLOSZYN, 0000
JOE A. WOOD, 0000
JOHN K. WOOD, 0000
KENT T. WOODS, 0000
EDMUND W. WOOLFOLK, JR., 0000
HAROLD H. WORRELL, JR., 0000
DAVID V. WREFORD, 0000
JERRY V. WRIGHT, 0000
JOHN T. WRIGHT, 0000
PHILLIP D. WRIGHT, 0000
LARRY D. WYCHE, 0000
EDGAR J. YANGER, 0000
MICHELLE F. YARBOROUGH, 0000
MICHAEL S. YARMIE, 0000
MARK W. YENTER, 0000
RONALD YOUNG, 0000
THOMAS S. YOUNG, 0000
MARK A. ZAMBERLAN, 0000
PETER B. ZWACK, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 624 AND 531:

To be major

*MADELFIA A. ABB, 0000
*WILLIAM R. ABB, 0000
*ROBERT L. ABBOTT, 0000
*DAVID A. ACCETTA, 0000
DAVID P. ACEVEDO, 0000
*JAMES H. ADAMS, 0000
*RICHARD K. ADDO, 0000
PAUL S. AGUE II, 0000
ANTONIO A. AGUTO, JR., 0000
PETER D. AHL, 0000
ADAM R. ALBINA, 0000
CARL A. ALEX, 0000
*JAMES E. ALEXANDER, 0000
*ROBERT A. ALEXANDER, 0000
*THOMAS A. ALLAIRE, 0000
*LARRY D. ALLEN, 0000
SHAWN D. ALLEN, 0000
*RICHARD L. ALLISON, JR., 0000

PEDRO G. ALMEIDA, 0000
*JAMES E. ALTHOUSE, 0000
*CHARLOTTE D. ALVARENGA, 0000
MATTHEW H. AMBROSE, 0000
*ANTONIO J. AMOS, 0000
*DUANE E. AMSLER, JR., 0000
GEORGE A. ANDARY, 0000
DAVID P. ANDERS, 0000
DEBORAH K. ANDERSON, 0000
*DUANE T. ANDERSON, 0000
*JOHN M. ANDERSON, 0000
*THOMAS J. ANDERSON, 0000
MARTY A. ANGELI, 0000
JEFFREY P. ANGERS, 0000
*STANFORD E. ANGION, 0000
JOSEPH W. ANGYAL, 0000
*EDWINA D. ANTHONY, 0000
MICHAEL E. ANTI, 0000
CARMINE C. APICELLA, 0000
*WILLIAM G. APIGIAN, 0000
*JAIME L. APO, 0000
JAN F. APO, 0000
*MICHAEL APODACA, 0000
KEVIN V. ARATA, 0000
PAUL J. ARCANGELI, 0000
*REGINALD D. ARMSTRONG, 0000
*GARY R. ARNOLD, 0000
*THOMAS S. ARRINGTON, 0000
PAUL L. ARTHUR, 0000
JOSEPH E. ARTIAGA, 0000
SAMUEL L. ASKEW III, 0000
RICHARD A. AST, 0000
*FRANCIS G. ATKINSON, 0000
FERNANDO AVALOS, 0000
*BRYAN F. AVERILL, 0000
MARC D. AXELBERG, 0000
*STEVEN W. AYERS, 0000
*WALTER AYMERICH, 0000
RANDY J. BACHMAN, 0000
*CLARK R. BACKUS, 0000
*DENNIS L. BACON, 0000
*TEREZ A. BADGER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. BADO, 0000
PETER J. BADOIAN, 0000
RUSSELL N. BAILEY, 0000
*GREGORY C. BAINE, 0000
ARTHUR H. BAIR III, 0000
BRUCE W. BAKER, 0000
JAMES E. BAKER, JR., 0000
*TONY M. BAKER, 0000
MARK BAKUM, 0000
*MARK J. BALLESTEROS, 0000
*MARK E. BALLEW, 0000
LEIGH M. BANDY, 0000
TRACY P. BANISTER, 0000
DOUGLAS T. BANKS III, 0000
MICHAEL J. BARA, 0000
MARK A. BARBOZA, 0000
WAYNE S. BAREFOOT, JR., 0000
*BRIAN T. BARRETT, 0000
BENJAMIN J. BARRIS, 0000
PATRICK M. BARRY, 0000
ROBERT G. BARTHOLET, 0000
*ERIC P. BATTINO, 0000
THOMAS A. BATTLE, 0000
*PAUL K. BAUMANN, 0000
HILLARY R. BAXTER, 0000
MARK D. BAXTER, 0000
*RONALD H. BAYHI, 0000
KEITH A. BEAN, 0000
*PATRICK C. BEATTY, 0000
JOHN G. BECHTOL, 0000
ANTHONY F. BECK, 0000
CURTIS L. BECK, 0000
WILLIAM R. BECKMAN, 0000
BRIAN P. BEDELL, 0000
*DAVID A. BEECH, 0000
STEVEN D. BEHEL, 0000
TED J. BEHNCKE, 0000
RONNIE L. BELL, JR., 0000
THOMAS G. BELL, 0000
*LOUIS J. BELLO, 0000
JOHN J. BELME IV, 0000
STEVEN D. BELTSON, 0000
*STEPHEN J. BENAVIDES, 0000
*MICHAEL A. BENDER, 0000
*KIM L. BENESH, 0000
*BRIAN D. BENNETT, 0000
*ROBERT W. BENNETT, JR., 0000
*GEORGETTA S. BENNETTATTAWAY, 0000
CHARLES H. BENSON III, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. BENSON, 0000
*TABB B. BENZINGER, 0000
*ANDREW M. BERRIER, 0000
*PHARISSE BERRY, 0000
MICHAEL J. BESSASPARIS, 0000
*ROBERT S. BEVELACQUA, 0000
*PAUL BEZZEK, 0000
BALRAM J. BHEODARI, 0000
*ROBERT D. BIALEK, 0000
*GARY M. BIDELMAN, 0000
ELIZABETH A. BIERDEN, 0000
MONIQUE C. BIERWIRTH, 0000
*WILLIAM F. BIGELOW, 0000
ALLAN L. BILYEU, 0000
ELLEN A. BIRCH, 0000
STEPHEN M. BIRCH, 0000
JOSEPH F. BIRCHMEIER, 0000
JAMES E. BIRD III, 0000
JOHN H. BIRDSONG III, 0000
*TIMOTHY E. BIRKENBUEL, 0000
*MARTIN O. BIXBY, 0000
*MARCUS C. BLACK, JR., 0000
*OLIVER A. BLACK, 0000
CRYSTAL S. BLACKDEER, 0000
MICHAEL D. BLACKWELL, 0000
JOHN F. BLAIR, 0000
*OBEDIAH T. BLAIR, 0000
*THOMAS S. BLAIR, 0000
ERIK T. BLECHINGER, 0000
BRADLEY D. BLOOM, 0000
*RICHARD L. BLOOMER, 0000
*GUSTAVO E. BLUM, 0000
ROGER M. BOBER, 0000
*JEFFREY T. BOCHONOK, 0000
KURT A. BODIFORD, 0000
RALPH BOECKMANN, 0000
*ALFRED H. BOEHM, 0000
*KENNETH M. BOERSMA, 0000
*WILLIAM L. BOLDEN, JR., 0000
NORMAN C. BOLING II, 0000
*BOB G. BOND, 0000
*HENRY T. BOOKER, 0000
*ROBERT W. BORDERS, 0000
*MICHAEL D. BORG, 0000
WILLIAM M. BORUFF, 0000
SCOTT P. BOSSE, 0000
ROLAND J. BOSTICK, 0000
*BRIAN E. BOSWORTH, 0000
MARY C. BOURG, 0000
JEFFREY R. BOURNE, 0000
*MARK C. BOUSSY, 0000
CALVERT L. BOWEN III, 0000
*ALLEN T. BOYD, 0000
*RAFEAL D. BOYD, 0000
*WILLIAM K. BOYETT, 0000
*MARGARET S. BOZGOZ, 0000
SAUL BRACERO, 0000
*BRENT E. BRACEWELL, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER E. BRADBERRY, 0000
*DENNIS C. BRADFORD, 0000
JEFFREY A. BRADFORD, 0000
*IVAN D. BRADLEY, 0000
*LISA M. BRADLEY, 0000
DAVID L. BRAND, 0000
*HAROLD T. BRANDENBURG, JR., 0000
*MARK S. BRANDON, 0000
MARY E. BRANSFORD, 0000
*DAVID M. BRANSTETTER, 0000
GARY M. BRENNIS, 0000
HOWARD K. BREWINGTON, 0000
*VON M. BRICKHOUSE, 0000
MICHAEL R. BRIDGES, 0000
*GREGORY K. BRIGHT, 0000
DARRELL L. BRIMBERRY, 0000
*GARY M. BRITO, 0000
DAVID M. BROCK, 0000
*JAMES L. BROGAN, 0000
SCOTT E. BRONSON, 0000
ANDREW I. BROWN, 0000
BARTON B. BROWN II, 0000
*BOBBY J. BROWN, 0000
*CHESTER F. BROWN, 0000
GEORGE C. BROWN, 0000
*JAY M. BROWN, 0000
*JOHN O. BROWN, 0000
KEITH BROWN, 0000
MICHAEL E. BROWN, 0000
ROSS A. BROWN, 0000
TIMOTHY D. BROWN, 0000
*STEPHEN M. BRUCE, 0000
*JOHN R. BRUDER, 0000
SCOTT F. BRUNER, 0000
*CHERYL P. BRUTON, 0000
ANNE L. BRYANT, 0000
*TODD A. BRYMER, 0000
SHAWN P. BUCK, 0000
DAVID W. BUCKINGHAM, 0000
SHAWN A. BUDKE, 0000
*GREGG E. BUEHLER, 0000
*PHILIP W. BUFORD, 0000
*DANNIE L. BULLOCK, JR., 0000
KATHRYN A. BURBA, 0000
*DAVID E. BURCH, 0000
*JOHN C. BURDETT, JR., 0000
DEBRA L. BURGER, 0000
JOHN R. BURGER, 0000
CHARLES F. BURKE, 0000
*GREGORY J. BURKE, 0000
ROBERT E. BURKS, JR., 0000
WILLARD M. BURLESON II, 0000
*MATTHEW J. BURNS, 0000
JAMES S. BURNSIDE, 0000
*AL T. BURRS, JR., 0000
ROBERT C. BUSCHER, JR., 0000
*HOLLIS L. BUSH, JR., 0000
*WILLIAM C. BUTCHER, 0000
BRIAN D. BUTLER, 0000
JOHN P. BUTLER III, 0000
*MICHEL L. BUTLER, 0000
ROLAND S. BUTLER, 0000
LYNN K. BYERS, 0000
*MICHAEL A. BYRD, 0000
ROBERT K. BYRD, 0000
*PAMELA M. BYRNE, 0000
STEPHEN R. CAIN, 0000
ROBERT W. CAIRNS, 0000
MARION K. CALLAHAN, 0000
JOHN T. CALLERY, 0000
JOSEPH R. CALLOWAY, 0000
*OTIS CALVIN, 0000
*ASHAWN D. CAMPBELL, 0000
*DEBRA K. CAMPBELL, 0000
*DENNIS L. CAMPBELL, 0000
*LESTER J. CAMPBELL, 0000
ANDREW C. CAMPI, 0000
KATHLEEN A. CANNON, 0000
*WILLIAM K. CANTRELL, 0000
*DION A. CANTU, 0000
JOSE A. CARBONE, 0000
ANTHONY C. CARIELLO, 0000
MARK J. CARLSON, 0000
*ROBERT K. CARNAHAN, 0000
*DANIEL W. CARPENTER, 0000
MAXEY B. CARPENTER III, 0000
DOUGLAS A. CARR, 0000
JAMES T. CARR, 0000
CHARLES L. CARRICK III, 0000
JONATHAN L. CARROLL, 0000
*ROBERT J. CARROLL, 0000
*ROBIN P. CARROW, 0000
CURTIS J. CARSON, 0000
DAVID H. CARSTENS, 0000
REBECCA CARTER, 0000
*DENNIS A. CASH, 0000
*MICHAEL A. CASPER, 0000
*ROBERT J. CASPER, 0000
ROBERT M. CASSIDY, 0000
HUGH C. CATE III, 0000
*JOHN CATINO, JR., 0000
ROBERT J. CAULFIELD, JR., 0000
*BRUCE D. CAULKINS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER G. CAVOLI, 0000
*RANDALL R. CEPHUS, 0000
ALGIS J. CESONIS, 0000
*MACIE M. CHAMBERS, 0000
*WILLIE J. CHANDLER, 0000
*MICHAEL G. CHANG, 0000
*JOHN E. CHAPMAN, 0000
NICHOLAS P. CHARLES, 0000
*SHARON Y. CHARLES, 0000
LUIS R. CHAVEZ, 0000
*JOHN T. CHENERY, 0000
*JOHN A. CHICOLI, 0000
*CHONGKIN CHIN, 0000
*DARRELL W. CHINN, 0000
*TIMOTHY J. CHMURA, 0000
*HERBERT M. CHONG, 0000
BRYCE R. CHRISTENSEN II, 0000
THOMAS V. CHRISTENSEN, 0000
*DEIDRE R. CHUNG, 0000
HONG K. CHUNG, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER CHURCHBOURNE, 0000
TIMOTHY D. CHYMA, 0000
CARMINE CICALESE, 0000
*SHANNON S. CLABURN, 0000
*EDDIE W. CLARK, 0000
ERVIN B. CLARK, JR., 0000
JOEL J. CLARK, 0000
PATRICK A. CLARK, 0000
*RICHARD A. CLARK, 0000
*WILLIAM R. CLARK, 0000
KEVIN R. CLARKE, JR., 0000
*MARTIN C. CLAUSEN, 0000
*RANDY T. CLEMENTS, 0000
*PHILIP B. CLEMMONS, 0000
*BRUCE B. CLINGMAN, 0000
ROGER L. CLOUTIER, JR., 0000
DAVID C. COCHRAN, 0000
MARK R. COFFIN, 0000
*MARK H. COGBURN, 0000
*JONATHAN M. COHEN, 0000
*ALFONSO COLBOURNE, 0000
WILLIAM E. COLE, 0000
*ERNEST C. COLEMAN, 0000
*DENNIS T. COMER, 0000
JAMES J. CONNELLY, 0000
JAY R. CONNORS, 0000
*KEVIN M. CONROY, 0000
BESHARA J. CONSTANTINE, JR., 0000
*CHRISTOPHER D. CONWAY, 0000
GREGORY J. COOK, 0000
*JAMES D. COOK, 0000
*PETER D. COOK, 0000
*THOMAS S. COOK, 0000
JOHN D. COOKSEY, 0000
KEVIN D. COONEY, 0000
CURT S. COOPER, 0000
PAUL J. COOPER, 0000
*KENNETH D. COPELAND, 0000
*PAUL COPELAND, 0000
*DAMON J. CORBETT, 0000
MARK T. CORBETT, 0000
SHARI L. CORBETT, 0000
*PHILIP CORBO, 0000
*THOMAS L. CORE, 0000
*ANTHONY P. CORNETT, 0000
*ROOSEVELT H. CORPENING, 0000
*GUY T. COSENTINO, 0000
STEPHEN M. COSTABLE, 0000
*CONSTANTINE H. COSTAS, 0000
ANDRE M. COTAROBLES, 0000
*SCOTT R. COULTER, 0000
ALEX G. COVERT, 0000
*TORRIS D. COWAN, 0000
*BRUCE E. COX, 0000
DOUGLAS A. COX, 0000
JOSEPH M. COX III, 0000
*REGINALD T. COX, 0000
SCOTT A. COY, 0000
DAVID W. CRABTREE, 0000
*JAMES E. CRAIG, 0000
*ROBERT S. CRAIG, 0000
MARK A. CRAVENS, 0000
*EDUARDO J. CRAWFORD, 0000
ROBERT B. CREVELING, 0000
*NEIL P. CRIBB, 0000
JOHN R. CRINO, 0000
DOUGLAS C. CRISSMAN, 0000
RICHARD E. CROGAN II, 0000
*IVETTE R. CROSBY, 0000
*JOHN W. CROSS, 0000
*CLIFFORD P. CROW, 0000
ALVIN F. CROWDER III, 0000
*DAVID M. CROY, 0000
DAVID B. CRUM, 0000
*BRIAN P. CUMMINGS, 0000
*JOHN L. CUNTZ, 0000
DARRYL G. CURETON, 0000
TODD M. CURRIE, 0000
JOHN T. CURRIER, 0000

*WILLIAM T. CUSSINS, 0000
SCOT H. CUTHBERTSON, 0000
TODD A. CYRIL, 0000
EDWARD J. DAES, JR., 0000
*DEBRA D. DANIELS, 0000
*PAUL R. DANIELS, 0000
BENTON A. DANNER, 0000
ROGER R. DANSEREAU, 0000
*GERALD P. DANUSSI, 0000
*CARL R. DARNALL, 0000
CLAYTON M. DAUGHTRY, 0000
CLIFF A. DAUS, 0000
*JOHN C. DAVIDSON, 0000
ARCHIE P. DAVIS III, 0000
*CHARLES M. DAVIS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. DAVIS, 0000
JAMES V. DAVIS, 0000
*KENT D. DAVIS, 0000
*LEONEAL DAVIS, JR., 0000
*MELVIN A. DAVIS, 0000
*MICHAEL W. DAVIS, 0000
ROBERT B. DAVIS, 0000
THOMAS E. DAVIS, 0000
*WILLIE L. DAVIS, 0000
*DENNIS D. DAWSON, 0000
*SAMUEL R. DAWSON, 0000
BRANT V. DAYLEY, 0000
*KENNETH L. DEAL, JR., 0000
ROGER A. DEAN, 0000
*RICHARD V. DEBRAY, 0000
BRYAN D. DECOSTER, 0000
*DONALD E. DEGIDIO, JR., 0000
PAUL B. DEGIRONIMO, 0000
CHRISTOPHER DELAROSA, 0000
*TIMOTHY R. DELASS, 0000
DANIEL P. DELEO, 0000
*DAVID R. DELFAVERO, 0000
*JOHN T. DELOACH, 0000
*SERAFI DELOSANTOS, 0000
*PAUL R. DENNIS, 0000
*FREDERICK R. DENNISON, 0000
*RANDY W. DENNY, 0000
*GREGORY P. DEWITT, 0000
ROBERT P. DICKERSON, 0000
*DAVID A. DIEHL, 0000
*MICHAEL A. DILLARD, 0000
ANDREW J. DIMARCO, 0000
JOSEPH P. DIMINICK, 0000
RICHARD B. DIX, 0000
*PATRICK K. DIXON, 0000
*DAVID H. DODSON, 0000
ROBERT J. DONAHUE, JR., 0000
GERALD O. DORROH, JR., 0000
*DARRELL M. DORSETT, 0000
*MARSHALL K. DOUGHERTY, JR., 0000
RICHARD J. DOW, 0000
*CODY D. DOWELL, 0000
*JIMMY E. DOWNS, 0000
*MARK D. DRABECKI, 0000
*JOHN P. DRAGO, 0000
*JOSEPH P. DRAGO, 0000
*MARIA R. DREW, 0000
*CARL A. DROZD, 0000
*JON R. DRUSHAL, 0000
*CHRIS A. DUDLEY, 0000
DAVID A. DUFFY, 0000
*FREDERICK B. DUGAN, 0000
JAMES C. DUGAN, 0000
*WILLIAM P. DUGGAN, 0000
*MICHAEL R. DULANEY, 0000
*PAUL C. DULCHINOS, 0000
*STEPHEN F. DUNHAM, 0000
KEVIN R. DUNLOP, 0000
MICHAEL C. DUNN, 0000
DWIGHT L. DUQUESNAY, 0000
RANDY D. DURIAN, 0000
DARIK D. DVORSHAK, 0000
*ALAN E. DYE, 0000
*LEVERN EADY, 0000
*KENNETH M. EARLS, 0000
BRIAN W. EBERT, 0000
WAYNE A. ECCLES, JR., 0000
JOHN O. EDBORG, 0000
CHARLES E. EDGE, 0000
*JIMMY D. EDINGER, 0000
MARK L. EDMONDS, 0000
SONYA H. EDMONDS, 0000
SCOTT L. EFFLANDT, 0000
*JAMES A. EGAN, 0000
*SHANNON L. EGGER, 0000
DAWN M. EISERT, 0000
MICHAEL S. EIXENBERGER, 0000
*CHARLES J. EKVALL, JR., 0000
JEFFREY G. ELLIOTT, 0000
STACY M. ELLIOTT, 0000
*RICKY L. ELLISON, 0000
*TERRY R. ELMORE, 0000
HARRIS EMMONS III, 0000
LEE H. ENLOE III, 0000
ERICH ERKER, 0000
*JEFFREY K. ERRON, 0000
*ROBERT D. ERVIN, 0000
GARY D. ESPINAS, 0000
MANUEL V. ESPINOSA, 0000
ROBERT G. ESTEY, 0000
DALLAS L. EUBANKS, 0000
*BEATRICE M. EVANS, 0000
*BILL L. EVANS, 0000
*CHARLES M. EVANS, 0000
DANIEL E. EVANS, 0000
SAN L. EVANS, 0000
*KENNETH C. EVENSEN, 0000
BARRY C. EZELL, 0000
LUIS A. FAJARDO, 0000
ROBERT H. FANCHER, JR., 0000
*LISA J. FANELLI, 0000
*DAVID C. FARLOW, 0000
DENNIS A. FARMER, JR., 0000
MARK F. FASSL, 0000
TIMOTHY W. FATH, 0000
TIMOTHY L. FAULKNER, 0000
DAVID M. FEE, 0000
*SEAN P. FEELEY, 0000
KELLY N. FEHRENBACH, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER R. FELCHLIN, 0000
ROBERT R. FELDMAN, 0000
ANITA M. FELICE, 0000
*JOSEPH R. FELICIANO, 0000
JOSEPH H. FELTER III, 0000
JOHN J. FENCSAK, 0000
RICHARD M. FENOLI, 0000
BRYAN P. FENTON, 0000
JOHN G. FERRARI, 0000
MICHAEL J. FERRONE, 0000
*MARK T. FETTER, 0000
KIMBERLY FIELD, 0000
*DOUGLAS M. FIELDS, 0000
*CARLOS A. FIGUEROA, 0000
DANIEL A. FINLEY, 0000
*MICHAEL J. FINNEGAN, 0000
*JAMES M. FISCUS, 0000
THOMAS S. FISHER, 0000
TIMOTHY W. FISHER, 0000
TIMOTHY E. FITZGERALD, 0000
KEITH A. FITZPATRICK, 0000
NEIL E. FITZPATRICK, 0000
*PAUL M. FITZPATRICK, 0000
STEVEN L. FIXLER, 0000
*RONALD F. FIZER, 0000
MICHAEL A. FLEETWOOD, 0000
*ROBERT E. FLETCHER, 0000
*MARC A. FLICKER, 0000
ALBERT L. FLOOD III, 0000
*JAMES O. FLY, JR., 0000
MATTHEW C. FLY, 0000
*FRANCIS D. FLYNN, 0000
THOMAS P. FLYNN, 0000
DANA J. FOLEY III, 0000
*ROBERT F. FOLEY, 0000
*ROMAN J. FONTES, 0000
SCOTT A. FORSYTHE, 0000
ALFRED L. FORTEZZO III, 0000
CARL E. FOSSA, JR., 0000
*MICHAEL S. FOSTER, 0000
STEPHANIE L. FOSTER, 0000
*TERRY L. FOSTER, 0000
CHRISTINE A. FOX, 0000
*CURTIS R. FOX, 0000
WILLIAM I. FOX III, 0000
*ROBERT J. FOY, JR., 0000
*GARY W. FRANKLIN, 0000
*GEORGE M. FRASER, 0000
EDWIN L. FREDERICK III, 0000
GEORGE L. FREDRICK, 0000
CHARLES L. FREEMAN, JR., 0000
NATHAN P. FREIER, 0000
MARK A. FREITAG, 0000
*LEE A. FRETWELL, 0000
JEANNETTE J. FRIEDLAND, 0000
SHAWN D. FRITZ, 0000
MALCOLM B. FROST, 0000
*KURT A. FRULLA, 0000
KYLE T. FUGATE, 0000
*STANLEY P. FUGATE, 0000
WILLIAM S. FULLER, 0000
REGINALD FULLWOOD, JR., 0000
BARRY A. GAERTNER, 0000
CARLOS J. GAINER, 0000
*JOSEPH N. GAINES, 0000
WILLIAM J. GALBRAITH, 0000
*HOLVIN GALINDO, 0000
*EDWARD R. GALLOWITZ, 0000
JOSEPH J. GANDARA, 0000
*JOSEPH GARAPOLA, 0000
*DANIEL R. GARCIA, 0000
JOSEPH G. GARCIA, 0000
*ROBERT L. GARDNER, 0000
*JOHN B. GARLAND, 0000
RONALD J. GARNER, 0000
KENNETH C. GARRETT, 0000
CABOT N. GATLIN, 0000
MARK GATTO, 0000
*MICHAEL J. GAWKINS, 0000
WILLIAM K. GAYLER, 0000
ROBERT B. GEDDIS, 0000
*AARON L. GEDULDIG, 0000
SCOTT M. GEIGER, 0000
*PETER T. GENOVA, 0000
*EARL F. GENTILE, 0000
*JAMES A. GENTILE, 0000
*BRIAN D. GEORGE, 0000
RANDY A. GEORGE, 0000
MICHAEL GERICKE, 0000
*MARIA R. GERVAIS, 0000
BERTRAND A. GES, 0000
*CHARLES C. GIBSON, 0000
*KAREN H. GIBSON, 0000
*PETER A. GIBSON, 0000
JOHN L. GIFFORD, 0000
*WILLIAM T. GILLESPIE, JR., 0000
*RONALD D. GILLIAM, 0000
ANGELA M. GIORDANO, 0000
*MAURICE E. GISSENDANNER, 0000
*CARL L. GITCHELL, 0000
JAMES A. GLACKIN, 0000
DIANE M. GLASSMEYER, 0000
GEORGE A. GLAZE, 0000
*NATHANIEL R. GLOVER, 0000
MATTHEW P. GLUNZ, 0000
*JEFFERY G. GLYNN, 0000
*KEITH M. GOGAS, 0000
*MORRIS T. GOINS, 0000
*TIMOTHY P. GOLDFISH, 0000
*GONZALO GONZALEZ, 0000
GREGORY M. GOODE, 0000
*MICHAEL GOODMAN, 0000
VELMA W. GORDON, 0000
BRUCE J. GORSKI, 0000
THOMAS J. GOSS, 0000
MICHAEL J. GOULD, 0000
MICHAEL S. GRAESE, 0000
JOHN M. GRAHAM, JR., 0000
*TIMOTHEUS A. GRAHAM, 0000
*BRADLEY K. GRAMBO, 0000
STACY A. GRAMS, 0000
NANCY J. GRANDY, 0000
*DEWEY A. GRANGER, 0000
*STEPHEN J. GRANSBACK, 0000
TIMOTHY S. GRANT, 0000
HOWARD L. GRAY, 0000
*JOHN A. GRAY, 0000
*ROBERT W. GRAY, 0000
HARDEE GREEN, 0000
LAYBAN M. GREEN, 0000
*RONALD L. GREEN, 0000
*WILLIAM J. GREGG, JR., 0000
*KEVIN A. GREGORY, 0000
ALFRED J. GREIN, 0000
*WAYNE C. GRIEME, JR., 0000
*DANIEL T. GRIFFIN, 0000
GENE E. GRIFFIN, JR., 0000
SONIA I. GRIFFIN, 0000
MICHAEL W. GRIFFITH, 0000
ROBERT W. GRIFFITH, JR., 0000
*JONNY G. GRIGORIAN, 0000
ROBERT E. GRIGSBY, 0000
*DAVID K. GRIMM, 0000
*STEPHAN B. GRINSTEAD, 0000
*DAVID W. GROB, 0000
*ALBERT L. GRUBBS, 0000
*THOMAS J. GUARNACCIA, 0000
BRUCE H. GUGGENBERGER, 0000
*TODD H. GUGGISBERG, 0000
MATTHEW J. GULBRANSON, 0000
ERIK O. GUNHUS, 0000
*DIXON M. GUNTHER, 0000
GEORGE A. GUTHRIDGE III, 0000
*DONG C. HA, 0000
*JOSEPH L. HAACK, 0000
*TRES HAASE, 0000
*MICHAEL S. HAGGARD, 0000
*DENISE D. HAGGERTY, 0000
*MACK D. HAGIN, 0000
MARK O. HAGUE, 0000
JOHN D. HALL, 0000
*JOHNNY HALL, JR., 0000
KATRINA D. HALL, 0000
*LAWRENCE T. HALL, JR., 0000
*STAN K. HALL, 0000
*JAMES G. HALLINAN, 0000
LINWOOD Q. HAM, JR., 0000
*JOHN D. HAMILTON, 0000
SAMUEL H. HAMMOND III, 0000
DAVID M. HAMMONS, 0000
RUSSELL J. HAMPSEY, 0000
DEBORAH L. HANAGAN, 0000
*DAMON A. HANCHEY, 0000
MICHAEL G. HANCOCK, 0000
DAVID L. HANKEL, 0000
RONALD K. HANN, JR., 0000
*JOHN N. HANSEN, 0000
*PATRICK L. HARDING, 0000
*MICHAEL J. HARDY, 0000
*SAMMIE L. HARGROVE, 0000
COYT D. HARGUS, 0000
*VICTOR M. HARMON, 0000
ROBERT A. HARNEY, JR., 0000
VICTOR R. HARPER, 0000
JOSEPH P. HARRINGTON, 0000
*BERNARD F. HARRIS, JR., 0000
CHARLES E. HARRIS III, 0000
*CHARLES P. HARRIS, 0000
*DARRELL E. HARRIS, 0000
*ERIC P. HARRIS, 0000
*PATRICK O. HARRIS, 0000
SCOTT A. HARRIS, 0000
VICTOR A. HARRIS, 0000
*JEFFREY S. HARRISON, 0000
GEORGE J. HART, 0000
*RICHARD K. HART, 0000
*MICHAEL J. HARTIG, 0000
*BARRY L. HARTLEY, 0000
DOUGLAS D. HARTMAN, 0000
*ERIC M. HARTMAN, 0000
HERMANN G. HASKEN III, 0000
*MARK D. HASTY, 0000
*NICHOLAS P. HATCH, 0000
STEVEN T. HAYDEN, 0000
*BRIAN M. HAYES, 0000
ANGELA D. HAYNES, 0000
*ANGELA N. HAYNES, 0000
*JAMES L. HAYNSWORTH, 0000
MICHAEL S. HEALY, 0000
*WILLIE V. HEARNE, 0000
*ROBERT D. HEATH, 0000
*CHARLES C. HEATHERLY, 0000
JON P. HEIDT, 0000
*DONALD M. HEILIG, JR., 0000
*DEAN D. HEITKAMP, 0000
*AUSTIN W. HENDERSON, 0000
BENJAMIN E. HENDERSON, 0000
*JOSEPH P. HENDERSON, 0000
*JEFFREY L. HENDREN, 0000
HEATHER G. HENDRICKSON, 0000
*ROBERT E. HENSTRAND, 0000
ANDREW R. HEPPELMANN, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER V. HERNDON, 0000
ROBERT B. HERNDON, 0000
*STEPHEN E. HERRING, JR., 0000
*COLLEEN J. HERRMANN, 0000
*HORST P. HERTING, 0000

*JAMES D. HESS, 0000
*BRENDA L. HICKEY, 0000
*MARK A. HICKS, 0000
THOMAS E. HIEBERT, 0000
*MICHAEL C. HIGGINS, 0000
*SEAN W. HIGGINS, 0000
*PAUL M. HILL, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER P. HIMSL, 0000
*JON M. HINCHCLIFFE, 0000
*ADAM R. HINSDALE, 0000
HAROLD M. HINTON, JR., 0000
*JUSTIN A. HIRNIAK, 0000
*MARK R. HIRSCHINGER, 0000
KEITH A. HIRSCHMAN, 0000
*ROBERT T. HIXON, 0000
MARK H. HLADKY, 0000
*MYRON R. HNATCZUK, 0000
CHRISTOPHER H. HOBART, 0000
*RICHARD G. HOBSON, 0000
*KURT C. HOCH, 0000
BARRY W. HOFFMAN, 0000
ROY G. HOFFMAN, 0000
*SCOTT J. HOFFMANN, 0000
*ANDREW J. HOGAN, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER J. HOGUET, 0000
*RICHARD J. HOLDREN, 0000
*FRANCIS L. HOLINATY, 0000
MARTIN J. HOLLAND, 0000
WILLIAM HOLLINGSWORTH, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER S. HOLLY, 0000
*RALPH A. HOLSTEIN, 0000
*CHARLIE P. HOLT, JR., 0000
SAMUEL C. HOMSY, 0000
MARK C. HOROHO, 0000
RICHARD D. HORSLEY, 0000
FREDRICK D. HOSKINS, 0000
*PAUL S. HOSSENLOPP, 0000
*SEAN HOTALING, 0000
SAMUEL C. HOUSTON, JR., 0000
*WILLIAM L. HOWARD, JR., 0000
JOHN P. HOWELL, 0000
JENNIFER M. HOYLE, 0000
*MICHAEL W. HUBNER, 0000
TODD M. HUDERLE, 0000
AUDREY D. HUDGINS, 0000
DANNY HUDSON, 0000
EVAN A. HUELFER, 0000
FERNANDO M. HUERTA, 0000
*GEORGE D. HUGGINS, 0000
GERALD W. HUGHES, 0000
*JEFFREY A. HUGHES, 0000
*ROBERT S. HUGHES, 0000
WILLIAM B. HUGHES, 0000
ROBERT L. HULSLANDER, 0000
*SCOTT F. HUME, 0000
ROBERT J. HUNT, JR., 0000
*GILBERT G. HURON, 0000
CLAYTON M. HUTMACHER, 0000
MARC B. HUTSON, 0000
*JAMES E. HUTTON, 0000
JOHN A. HYATT, 0000
*CHARLES F. HYDE, 0000
MICHAEL P. HYNES, 0000
MICHAEL A. IACOBUCCI, 0000
JAMES T. IACOCCA, 0000
*ROBERT D. IBARRA, 0000
*DAVID S. IMHOF, 0000
MICHELE A. IMIOLA, 0000
*SEBASTIAN O. INGRAM, 0000
DOUGLAS L. INGROS, 0000
*CHARLES P. IPPOLITO, 0000
*MICHAEL E. IRATCABAL, 0000
*JOSEPH M. IRBY, 0000
*HARRY A. IVARIE, 0000
*AUBIN M. JACK, 0000
*CURTIS D. JACKSON, 0000
MARK M. JACKSON, 0000
RODERIC C. JACKSON, 0000
SCOTT D. JACKSON, 0000
DAVID L. JAMES, 0000
*KORYA J. JAMES, 0000
*THOMAS P. JAMESON, 0000
TERRY J. JAMISON, JR., 0000
ALAN L. JANS, 0000
MICHAEL J. JANSER, 0000
*CLAY C. JANSSEN, 0000
ROBERT R. JARRETT II, 0000
BOBBY F. JARVIS, JR., 0000
ROBERT A. JARVIS, 0000
KARL A. JEHLE, 0000
*BERNARD L. JENE, 0000
*BRUCE D. JENKINS, 0000
SEAN M. JENKINS, 0000
MARIA M. JENSEN, 0000
*STEPHEN E. JESELINK, 0000
FREDERICK H. JESSEN, 0000
JOHN H. JESSUP, 0000
*PHOEBE A. JETER, 0000
RAMON JIMENEZ, 0000
MICHAEL R. JOHNS, 0000
*ANGELO W. JOHNSON, 0000
*BERNARD JOHNSON, 0000
*DARRELL W. JOHNSON, 0000
DARRYL H. JOHNSON, 0000
DAVID G. JOHNSON, 0000
*GREGORY A. JOHNSON, 0000
JAMES G. JOHNSON, 0000
MICHAEL J. JOHNSON, 0000
MICHAEL W. JOHNSON, 0000
*PHILLIP M. JOHNSON, JR., 0000
RONALD M. JOHNSON, 0000
*ROSSIE D. JOHNSON, 0000
GARY W. JOHNSTON, 0000
*JOHNNY J. JOHNSTON, 0000
*ROBERT J. JOHNSTON, 0000
*CATHERINE A. JONES, 0000
*CRAIG W. JONES, 0000
*DARVIN H. JONES, 0000
DAVID S. JONES, 0000
DEISY JONES, 0000
*JAYME M. JONES, 0000
*JERRY C. JONES, 0000
*JOHN K. JONES, 0000
KIM L. JONES, 0000
PATRICIA A. JONES, 0000
ROBERT S. JONES, 0000
RONALD D. JONES, 0000
ALGIE M. JORDAN III, 0000
*KAREN Z. JORDAN, 0000
*RODNEY E. JORDAN, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER A. JOSLIN, 0000
*TIMOTHY F. JUERGENS, 0000
KEITH L. JUNE, 0000
JAMES B. JUSTICE III, 0000
FREDRIC E. KAEHLER, 0000
RICHARD G. KAISER, 0000
ROBERT E. KAISER, 0000
*ARTHUR A. KANDARIAN, 0000
GREGORY P. KANDT, 0000
*HARRY F. KANE, 0000
*RICHARD M. KANNEY, 0000
MARK A. KARASZ, 0000
*THOMAS J. KARDOS, 0000
*PAUL J. KARNAZE, 0000
*CHRIS L. KARSTENS, 0000
MATTHEW C. KAUFMAN, 0000
*PHILLIP G. KAUFMANN, 0000
MICHAEL H. KAUTZ, 0000
RALPH L. KAUZLARICH, 0000
HEIDI M. KAVANAUGH, 0000
JAMES A. KEARSE, 0000
*JACK L. KEATON, JR., 0000
TODD A. KECK, 0000
*JOHN D. KEITH, 0000
*MICHAEL J. KELEHER, 0000
MATTHEW S. KELLEY, 0000
STEVEN W. KELLY II, 0000
ILEAN K. KELTZ, 0000
*RICHARD B. KEMPF, 0000
CHRISTOPHER KENDZIERA, 0000
*STEPHEN J. KEPPLER, 0000
ROGER D. KERN, 0000
DAVID V. KETTER, 0000
STEPHEN M. KIDWELL, 0000
JEFFREY W. KILGO, 0000
MITCHELL L. KILGO, 0000
GARY W. KING, 0000
JOHN S. KING, 0000
JOHN W. KING II, 0000
*STEVEN A. KING, 0000
*PATRICK J. KIRK, 0000
*JACQUELINE B. KIRKENDOLL, 0000
RONALD KIRKLIN, 0000
ROBERT R. KISER, 0000
RYAN B. KIVETT, 0000
RICHARD P. KLEIN, 0000
*SHAWN M. KLIEGL, 0000
*AIMEE L. KLIMOWICZ, 0000
JAMES C. KLOTZ, 0000
EVERETT D. KNAPP, JR., 0000
LENNY J. KNESS, 0000
*CARL C. KNICKERBOCKER, 0000
*ANDY F. KNIGHTS, 0000
TAMMY L. KNOTT, 0000
HAROLD M. KNUDSEN, 0000
MICHAEL E. KNUTSON, 0000
*PAUL E. KNUTSON, 0000
*PERRY J. KOCHELL, 0000
*KERRY M. KOEHLER, 0000
*LANCE R. KOENIG, 0000
*KEITH D. KOESTER, 0000
*GARY M. KOLB, 0000
CHRISTOPHER D. KOLENDA, 0000
JOHN M. KOLESSAR, 0000
DAVID P. KOMAR, 0000
AIMEE L. KOMINIAK, 0000
*JOHN F. KOPE, 0000
JOHN E. KORETKE, 0000
TERRY D. KORTY, 0000
*GARY J. KOTOUCH, 0000
*STEVEN R. KRAMER, 0000
*DEAN A. KRATZENBERG, 0000
FRED T. KRAWCHUK, JR., 0000
*MARK A. KROMER, 0000
HENRY U. KRON, 0000
KENNETH M. KRUMM, 0000
*SCOTT P. KUBICA, 0000
DALE C. KUEHL, 0000
*JEFFREY D. KULMAYER, 0000
*THOMAS G. KUNK, 0000
JOHN G. KUNKLE, 0000
MICHAEL E. KURILLA, 0000
*GARY L. LAASE, 0000
TRESE A. LACAMERA, 0000
KEITH D. LADD, 0000
*JAMES A. LAFFEY, 0000
CHARLES P. LAKIN, 0000
RUSSELL J. LAMARRE, 0000
SAMUEL E. LAMB, 0000
STEVE E. LAMBERT, 0000
*JAMES D. LAMPTON, 0000
*SHIRLEY J. LANCASTER, 0000
*KEVIN A. LANDY, 0000
*EDWARD J. LANE, 0000
*KARLA O. LANGLAND, 0000
CLEMENT J. LANIEWSKI, 0000
DONALD A. LANNOM, 0000
BRIAN L. LANTZ, 0000
*THOMAS R. LANTZY, 0000
EUGENE R. LANZILLO, JR., 0000
EDWARD C. LARSEN, 0000
*ROBERT S. LARSEN, 0000
GREGORY P. LARSON, 0000
*ROBERT L. LARSON, 0000
RORIK W. LARSON, 0000
STEPHEN R. LASSE, 0000
RICHARD E. LAUBER, 0000
GREGORY D. LAUTNER, 0000
*SANDRA R. LAVENDER, 0000
*FRANCIS J. LAWLER, 0000
*JEFFREY LAWRENCE, 0000
JOHN P. LAWSON, 0000
MICHAEL L. LAYRISSON, 0000
*JOSEPH K. LAYTON, 0000
ROBERT E. LAZZELL II, 0000
WILLIAM J. LEADY, JR., 0000
JAMES P. LEARY, 0000
*EDWARD C. LEDFORD, 0000
PETER J. LEE, 0000
ADAM J. LEGG, 0000
ROBERT J. LEHMAN, 0000
LARRY D. LEHRMAN, JR., 0000
CHAD G. LEMAY, 0000
JOHN LEMONDES, JR., 0000
LARRY R. LENKEIT, 0000
NICOLAS G. LESHOCK, 0000
TIMOTHY A. LETOUZEL, 0000
*MICHAEL S. LEWIS, 0000
*QUINTON A. LEWIS, 0000
BOBBI J. LEYES, 0000
SAMUEL M. LIGO, 0000
ROBERT C. LING, 0000
GARY W. LINHART, 0000
*ROBERT E. LINK, JR., 0000
MANFRED L. LITTLE II, 0000
*RUSSELL M. LIVINGSTON, 0000
*DIANA E. LIZOTTE, 0000
RUSSELL L. LLOYD, 0000
THOMAS W. LLOYD, 0000
EDWARD D. LOEWEN, 0000
SCOTT J. LOFREDDO, 0000
*ROBERT C. LOGSDON, 0000
*DWIGHT LOMAX, 0000
ANDRES A. LOPEZ, 0000
*JAMES C. LORD, 0000
JAMES J. LOVE, 0000
LOIS J. LOVE, 0000
*RICARDO M. LOVE, 0000
JAMES B. LOWERY III, 0000
JAMES R. LOY II, 0000
*JAMES E. LUCAS, 0000
PAUL A. LUCEY, JR., 0000
*JAMES A. LUCK, 0000
*MARY K. LUDDY, 0000
DAVID J. LUDERS, 0000
*MICHEL J. LUGO, 0000
MARK W. LUKENS, 0000
*GEORGE A. LUMPKINS, 0000
*CHARLES H. LUNATI, 0000
MARK J. LUNDTVEDT, 0000
*ANNIESTINE D. LUNDY, 0000
VIET X. LUONG, 0000
BRIAN M. LYNCH, 0000
*DAVID L. LYNCH, 0000
JOHN M. LYNCH, JR., 0000
ANDREW J. MACDONALD, 0000
*JOHN M. MACHESNEY, 0000
*KERRY J. MACINTYRE, 0000
DAVID A. MACK, 0000
KEVIN S. MACWATTERS, 0000
LAWRENCE H. MADKINS III, 0000
THEODORE L. MAGUDER III, 0000
*JIMMIE C. MAHANA, 0000
PATRICK J. MAHANEY, JR., 0000
RICHARD A. MAJANCSIK, 0000
DAVID W. MAJOR, 0000
*DOUGLAS J. MALAN, 0000
*KEVIN M. MALEY, 0000
*ROBERT J. MALLETT, 0000
SHAWN P. MALONE, 0000
ROY C. MANAUIS, 0000
STEPHEN G. MANDES, 0000
JOHNATHAN E. MANKEL, 0000
MICHAEL D. MANN, 0000
*JOEL B. MANNING, 0000
*KEVIN B. MARCUS, 0000
ROBERT L. MARION, 0000
MATTHEW W. MARKEL, 0000
*GWEN C. MARSHALL, 0000
SHAWN B. MARSHALL, 0000
TIMOTHY J. MARSHALL, 0000
*EDWARD J. MARTIN, 0000
JEFFREY R. MARTINDALE, 0000
*MICHAEL R. MARX, 0000
SCOTT W. MARYOTT, 0000
KEITH J. MASBACK, 0000
*CLAUDIA L. MASON, 0000
ELMER R. MASON, 0000
GLEN A. MASSET, 0000
DOUGLAS V. MASTRIANO, 0000
SHELLY R. MATAUTIA, 0000
MICHAEL E. MATHES, 0000
PATRICK E. MATHES, 0000
PATRICK E. MATLOCK, 0000
*MATTHEW D. MATTER, 0000
GEORGE N. MATTHEWS, 0000
*JOHN A. MAUK, 0000
*JOHN C. MAUS, 0000
*DOUGLAS C. MCALLISTER, 0000
*GAYLON L. MCALPINE, 0000
*DAVID J. MCCARTHY, 0000
*ANITA MCCARTHY-MCGEE, 0000
*FRANK MCCLARY, 0000
GARRY W. MCCLENDON, 0000
*GREGORY R. MCCLINTON, 0000
JAMES N. MCCLOSKEY, 0000
JUQITA D. MCCLURE, 0000
*DOUGLAS F. MCCOLLUM, 0000
CALVIN R. MCCOMMONS, 0000
ANDREW J. MCCONACHIE, 0000
JIMMY L. MCCONICO, 0000

*QUINTON W. MCCORVEY, 0000
MICHAEL V. MCCREA, 0000
*THERAID A. MCCREE, 0000
OAKLAND MCCULLOCH, 0000
*JARVIS B. MCCURDY, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. MCCURRY, 0000
*RICHARD F. MCCUSKER, 0000
*JOHN J. MCDANIEL, 0000
*RONNIE K. MCDANIEL, 0000
KENNETH W. MCDORMAN, 0000
ROBERT C. MCDOWELL, 0000
DAN MCELROY, 0000
*MICHAEL K. MCFARLAND, 0000
*THOMAS B. MCGEACHY, 0000
*EDWARD G. MCGINLEY, 0000
SHAWN P. MCGINLEY, 0000
MICHAEL L. MCGINN, 0000
MICHAEL J. MCGUIRE, 0000
*PAUL A. MCINNIS, 0000
*CHRIS E. MCINTOSH, 0000
KIRK E. MCINTOSH, 0000
*TIMOTHY A. MCKERNAN, 0000
ROBERT M. MCKINLEY, JR., 0000
JOHN E. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
STEPHEN T. MCMILLAN, 0000
CHARLES L. MCMURTREY, 0000
*JAMES T. MCNAIR, 0000
MARK A. MCNAIR, 0000
*CORNELL MCNEAL, 0000
KEVIN L. MCNEIL, 0000
MICHAEL D. MCNETT, 0000
*JOHN H. MCPHAUL, JR., 0000
CHAD B. MCREE, 0000
ARIE J. MCSHERRY, 0000
*WADE L. MCVEY, 0000
PHILLIP A. MEAD, 0000
*KEITH R. MEEKER, 0000
JAMES R. MEISINGER, 0000
*JOSHUA MELENDEZ, 0000
JOSEPH M. MELICHER, 0000
BRIAN J. MENNES, 0000
*EDWIN D. MERCADO, 0000
*TIMOTHY D. MEREDITH, 0000
TODD A. MESSITT, 0000
WILLIAM P. METHENY III, 0000
RONALD J. METTERNICH, 0000
*GREG E. METZGAR, 0000
JEROME C. MEYER, 0000
THOMAS H. MEYER, 0000
TOM J. MEYER, 0000
DREW R. MEYEROWICH, 0000
*TERRY P. MICHAELS, 0000
*LYMUS MIDDLETON, JR., 0000
STEPHEN A. MIDDLETON, 0000
MARK F. MIGALEDDI, 0000
*JOHN S. MIKOS, 0000
BLAINE I. MILLER, 0000
CHRIS E. MILLER, 0000
*FRANK R. MILLER, JR., 0000
*GEORGE B. MILLER, 0000
MICHAEL D. MILLER, 0000
RONNIE M. MILLER, 0000
TODD D. MILLER, 0000
FRANK H. MILLERD II, 0000
*MICHAEL H. MILLICKS, 0000
*STEVEN F. MILLNER, 0000
SCOTT S. MILLS, 0000
*PATRICK D. MINER, 0000
JAMES J. MINGUS, 0000
MICHAEL W. MINOR, 0000
THOMAS MINTZER, 0000
*MARK D. MIRAGE, 0000
*DANIEL S. MISHKET, 0000
*EDDIE L. MITCHELL, 0000
*JAMES C. MITCHELL, 0000
*LESLIE MITCHELL, 0000
MARK E. MITCHELL, 0000
*MICHAEL D. MITCHELL, 0000
*RICARDO J. MITCHELL, 0000
TIMOTHY D. MITCHELL, JR., 0000
*DONALD R. MOBLEY, 0000
*JEFFERY B. MOBLEY, 0000
JOHN H. MOELLERING, JR., 0000
THOMAS J. MOFFATT, 0000
DONNA E. MOHNEY, 0000
*TONY L. MOLES, 0000
*PETER C. MOLIN, 0000
WILLIAM H. MOLLER, 0000
KIMBERLEY J. MONDONEDO, 0000
EDWARD M. MONK, 0000
BRUCE J. MONTGOMERY, 0000
DORIS P. MONTGOMERY, 0000
*AARON D. MOORE, 0000
MICHAEL C. MOORE, 0000
*THOMAS F. MOORE, 0000
*DENNIS M. MORAN, JR., 0000
JEFFREY D. MORENO, 0000
PETER J. MORET, 0000
*ANDREW M. MORKUNAS, 0000
MICHAEL J. MORONEY, 0000
*RODNEY S. MORRIS, 0000
*TODD B. MORRIS, 0000
*WILLIAM E. MORRIS, 0000
DAVID W. MORRISON, 0000
*ROBERT D. MORSCHAUSER, 0000
*NANCY L. MORSE, 0000
*EDGBERT L. MORTON, 0000
MARK A. MOSER, 0000
TIMOTHY E. MOUL, 0000
DAVID M. MOUNT, 0000
*WILLIAM B. MOWERY, 0000
FRANK MUGGEO, 0000
*ROBERT M. MUNDELL, 0000
RUTH A. MURFF, 0000
MICHAEL T. MURPHY, 0000
*KEITH E. MUSCHALEK, 0000
RICHARD C. MUSCHEK, 0000
ALFREDO J. MYCUE, 0000
STEPHEN C. MYERS, 0000
JOSEPH R. NAGEL, 0000
PETER F. NAJERA, 0000
BOBBIE K. NAPIER, 0000
*DAVID W. NAPIER, 0000
PATRICK M. NEAL, 0000
*TAYLOR S. NEELY, 0000
TROY L. NELLANS, 0000
JOHN J. NELSON, 0000
JOSEPH A. NELSON, 0000
MICHAEL E. NERSTHEIMER, 0000
LISA J. NESTAVAL, 0000
MIRT S. NEVILL III, 0000
*DAVID J. NEWBERRY, 0000
*CRAIG M. NEWMAN, 0000
*NICOLA J. NEWMAN, 0000
*WILLIAM C. NEWMAN, 0000
TIMOTHY E. NEWSOME, 0000
KEITH R. NICOLETTI, 0000
RICHARD J. NIEBERDING, JR., 0000
*MALCOM E. NIGHTINGALE, 0000
MARKO J. NIKITUK, 0000
*LARRY K. NODINE, 0000
*MICHAEL J. NOEHL, 0000
*ERIK A. NORDBERG, 0000
JOHN G. NORRIS, 0000
JOHN E. NOVALIS II, 0000
RICKY J. NUSSIO, 0000
JAMES M. OBRIEN, 0000
*CHAD W. OCHS, 0000
LAUREL D. O'CONNOR, 0000
STEPHEN A. O'DELL, 0000
*CHARMONIA D. ODOM, 0000
DANIEL J. OH, 0000
*MICHAEL K. OHARA, 0000
CARL J. OHLSON, 0000
*MARK OLEKSIAK, 0000
STANLEY J. OLENGINSKI, 0000
*ANTHONY W. OLIVER, 0000
CHARLES J. OLSEN, 0000
*BRIAN C. OLSON, 0000
GREGORY A. OLSON, 0000
JOHN E. OMALLEY, 0000
JEFFREY K. OPPERMAN, 0000
KEITH R. ORAGE, 0000
PATRICK T. OREGAN, 0000
TERENCE M. ORMSBY, 0000
TIMOTHY W. ORNER, 0000
*ANDRES ORTEGON, 0000
*FELIX ORTIZ, 0000
JERSON A. ORTIZ, 0000
*LOUIS ORTIZ, JR., 0000
*ORLANDO W. ORTIZ, 0000
*TYLER C. OSENBAUGH, 0000
*ALAN D. OSTERMILLER, 0000
*MARK E. OVERBERG, 0000
*RODGER R. OWEN, 0000
*CLEMENTINE OWENS, 0000
*DARRYL A. OWENS, 0000
*WADE A. OWENS, 0000
CATHERINE E. PACE, 0000
*JOSEPH H. PACE, 0000
*PHILIP F. PACE, 0000
*GREGORY W. PACKER, SR, 0000
LISA B. PADDOCK, 0000
BRIAN R. PAGE, 0000
DANIEL D. PAGE, 0000
*YEONGSIK PAK, 0000
*ARTHUR F. PALAGANAS, 0000
*EMILY S. PALMER, 0000
STEVEN R. PALMER, 0000
*ALFRED A. PANTANO, JR., 0000
*PETER F. PANZERI, JR., 0000
PAUL M. PAOLOZZI, 0000
CHRIS P. PAPAIOANNOU, 0000
LUTHER A. PAPENFUS, 0000
*RICHARD A. PAQUETTE, 0000
*MICHAEL A. PARK, 0000
*DENNIS M. PARKER, 0000
ERIK N. PARKER, 0000
GREGORY M. PARRISH, 0000
*SAMUEL G. PARRISH, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER R. PARSONS, 0000
EDWIN E. PASCUA, 0000
*MADONEL R. PASCUAL, 0000
*RALPH PATE, JR., 0000
*RUSSEL A. PATISHNOCK, 0000
KIMBRA K. PATTERSON, 0000
MARK C. PATTERSON, 0000
COURTNEY W. PAUL, 0000
WILLIAM R. PEACOCK, 0000
GARY E. PEARCY, 0000
BARRETT K. PEAVIE, 0000
SAMUEL N. PEFFERS, 0000
ROBERT W. PEGG III, 0000
*MICHAEL D. PEMRICK, 0000
CLINTON R. PENDERGAST, 0000
JOHN W. PERFETTI, 0000
*KEITH M. PERKINS, 0000
DAVID R. PERSHING, 0000
*ALAN G. PERSONIUS, 0000
AXA S. PERWICH, 0000
*COBY M. PETERSEN, 0000
*JAY L. PETERSON, 0000
KENNETH M. PETERSON, 0000
*ROBERT W. PETERSON, 0000
*CECIL R. PETTIT, JR., 0000
*CHARLES A. PFAFF, 0000
DONALD V. PHILLIPS, 0000
JAMES W. PHILLIPS, 0000
DANIAL D. PICK, 0000
*JAMES C. PIETSCH, 0000
MARK J. PINCOSKI, 0000
KURT J. PINKERTON, 0000
BRADLEY W. PIPPIN, 0000
HENRY H. PITTMAN, 0000
DONALD J. PLANTE, 0000
*JOHN R. PLATT, 0000
*MICHAEL J. PLUMMER, 0000
JOHN L. POLLOCK, 0000
*JOSEPH K. POPE, 0000
*THOMAS P. POPLAWSKI, 0000
ANDREW P. POPPAS, 0000
MARK E. POWELL, 0000
*SCOTT W. POWER, 0000
TIMOTHY W. POWERS, 0000
*GORDON D. PRESTON, 0000
*JOHN E. PRICE, 0000
*BRIAN L. PRINCE, 0000
EDWARD G. PRUETT, 0000
SAMUEL H. PRUGH, 0000
*STEVEN W. PTAK, 0000
MARK T. PUHALLA, 0000
TODD A. PUHRMANN, 0000
SCOTT A. PULFORD, 0000
*FREDERICK A. PUTHOFF, 0000
MICHAEL D. PYOTT, 0000
DAVID E. QUICHOCHO, 0000
MARUE R. QUICK, 0000
TIMOTHY W. QUILLIN, 0000
MATTHEW S. QUINN, 0000
*ROBERT E. QUINN, 0000
WENDEL N. QUON, 0000
BRIAN W. RAFTERY, 0000
SCOTT A. RAINEY, 0000
*CHARLES F. RAITHEL, 0000
JAMES A. RANKIN, 0000
LISA J. RANKINS, 0000
TODD R. RATLIFF, 0000
RANDY W. READSHAW, 0000
*PERRY D. REARICK, 0000
BRANSON P. RECTOR, 0000
MICHAEL T. RECTOR, 0000
JAMES D. REDWINE, 0000
MICHAEL J. REDWINE, 0000
*KIETH W. REED, 0000
STEPHEN S. REED, 0000
LYDIA V. REEVES, 0000
MICHAEL A. REGALADO, 0000
DAVID M. REGAN, 0000
MICHAEL C. REGAN, 0000
*VERNIE L. REICHLING, JR., 0000
ALFRED E. RENZI, JR., 0000
MICHAEL J. REPETSKI, 0000
ERNEST J. RESCHKE, 0000
CRAIG L. RETTIE, 0000
MARTIN B. REUTEBUCH, 0000
*JOAN M. REYNOLDS, 0000
*JOHN C. REYNOLDS, 0000
*JUDD E. REYNOLDS, 0000
*SCOTT T. RHODA, 0000
*JON A. RICE, 0000
KENNETH E. RICE, 0000
MARK A. RICE, 0000
*BARRY S. RICHARDS, 0000
*JAMES F. RICHTER, 0000
*JEFFREY W. RIDENOUR, 0000
KENT R. RIDEOUT, 0000
*RANDALL J. RIDINGS, 0000
EDWARD F. RIEHLE, 0000
ALFONSO RIERA, 0000
EDWARD R. RIETSCHA, 0000
DAVID W. RIGGINS, 0000
*WILLIAM S. RIGGS, 0000
*FREDERICK A. RIKER, 0000
*DONALD D. RILEY, 0000
JOHN M. RILEY, 0000
*PATRICIA M. RIMBEY, 0000
*RONALD J. RISPOLI, JR., 0000
*NATHANIEL RIVERS, 0000
*WILLIAM J. RIVETT, 0000
*DONALD L. RIXIE, 0000
*ROBERT K. RIZZO, 0000
DOUGLAS C. ROBBINS, 0000
*TODD C. ROBBINS, 0000
*DIANNA ROBERSON, 0000
ALICE R. ROBERTS, 0000
*ERIC R. ROBERTS, 0000
DANIEL S. ROBERTSON, 0000
*MECCA M. ROBINSON, 0000
*WENDY M. RODNEY, 0000
*MARK L. RODWELL, 0000
RODNEY L. ROEDERER, 0000
STEVEN J. ROEMHILDT, 0000
*BRIAN L. ROGERS, 0000
EMMITT W. ROGERS, 0000
DAVID J. ROHALL, 0000
*GWENDOLYN S. ROLAND, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. ROLLINS, 0000
KENNETH A. ROMAINE, JR., 0000
*STEVEN M. ROSCOE, 0000
*MARTIN E. ROSE, JR., 0000
MICHAEL W. ROSE, 0000
*MICHAEL P. ROSEBERRY, 0000
DAWN M. ROSS, 0000
*DONALD M. ROSS, 0000
THOMAS J. ROTH, 0000
MICHAEL J. ROUNDS, 0000
PAUL D. ROUNSAVILLE, 0000
*REBECCA A. ROUSE, 0000
EDWARD V. ROWE, 0000
MARTIN D. ROWE, 0000
*BETH C. ROWLEY, 0000
*KENNETH M. ROYALTY, 0000
KENNETH T. ROYAR, 0000
SCOTT E. RUBITSKY, 0000
*JODY RUCKER, 0000
CHRISTIAN E. RUSH, 0000
DANIEL S. RUSIN, 0000
DONNA E. RUTTEN, 0000
*PHILIP A. SABATINO, 0000
JAMES E. SAENZ, 0000
SAMUEL J. SALADA, 0000

*RICKEY L. SALLEE, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER W. SALLESE, 0000
*GREGORY J. SALOMON, 0000
JOSEPH V. SAMEK, 0000
*ROBERTA K. SAMUELS, 0000
*SCOTT E. SANBORN, 0000
*JOSEPH A. SANCHEZ, 0000
*MICHAEL A. SANCHEZ, 0000
*KELLY J. SANDIFER, 0000
NEFTALI E. SANTIAGO, 0000
*REINALDO SANTIAGO, 0000
MICHAEL C. SANTOS, 0000
*TONY J. SARVER, 0000
JEFFREY T. SAUER, 0000
*JOHN C. SAUER, 0000
JEFFREY D. SAUNDERS, 0000
OLIVER S. SAUNDERS, 0000
KATHERINE A. SCANLON, 0000
CRAIG P. SCHAEFER, 0000
*ROBERT L. SCHAEFER, 0000
*STANLEY F. SCHALL, JR., 0000
*KATHY L. SCHERER, 0000
RONALD A. SCHIER, 0000
*JEFFERY R. SCHILLING, 0000
KATHERINE P. SCHLIMM, 0000
KLAUS D. SCHMIDT, 0000
*ANTHONY J. SCHMITZ, 0000
TIMOTHY R. SCHMOYER, 0000
*DAVID E. SCHOOLCRAFT, 0000
DENNIS L. SCHRECENGAST, 0000
*ALLAN J. SCHROEDER, 0000
*MICHAEL J. SCHROEDER, 0000
*RICHARD H. SCHULZ, 0000
*JEFFREY D. SCHUTTER, 0000
KARL O. SCHWARTZ, 0000
*MARK C. SCHWARTZ, 0000
THOMAS L. SCHWARTZ, 0000
*STEVEN A. SCIONEAUX, 0000
BRADLEY B. SCOFIELD, 0000
*DAVID C. SCOFIELD, 0000
*CASEY P. SCOTT, 0000
KELVIN K. SCOTT, 0000
*SEAN M. SCOTT, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. SEACORD, 0000
LOWELL A. SEAL, 0000
DAVID M. SEARS, 0000
JOHN J. SEBASTYN, 0000
TIMOTHY M. SEBENICK, 0000
ALAN SEISE, 0000
*THEODORE SELLERS, JR., 0000
*KIRK E. SESSIN, 0000
ANNE P. SHANKS, 0000
JOSEPH C. SHANNON, 0000
*ARLENA SHARPE, 0000
*JOSEPH T. SHAVER, 0000
*DARRYL S. SHAW, 0000
SIMUEL SHAW III, 0000
*DANIEL R. SHEA, 0000
MICHAEL L. SHENK, 0000
JOSEPH P. SHEVLIN, 0000
*IVAN B. SHIDLOVSKY, 0000
*ROBERT G. SHIRLEY, 0000
WILSON A. SHOFFNER, JR., 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. SHOTTS, 0000
THOMAS L. SHREVE, 0000
*ROGER L. SHUCK, 0000
*DEAN P. SHULTIS, 0000
RONALD L. SHULTIS, JR., 0000
VAL A. SIEGFRIED, 0000
REGINALD L. SIKES, JR., 0000
*DANIEL L. SILVERNALE, 0000
JANET A. SIMMONS, 0000
*EUGENE SIMON, 0000
*KEVIN W. SIMPSON, 0000
*JOHN F. SINGLETON, 0000
*JONATHAN D. SIRMON, 0000
RALPH A. SKEBA, 0000
GREGG A. SKIBICKI, 0000
WILLIAM C. SLADE, 0000
*KARL E. SLAUGHENHAUPT, 0000
JOE K. SLEDD, 0000
*DAVID A. SLUSSER, 0000
*ANNETTE M. SMALLS, 0000
JEFFREY S. SMIDT, 0000
DAVID R. SMITH, 0000
IRVING SMITH III, 0000
JEFFREY B. SMITH, 0000
JOHN M. SMITH III, 0000
*JOSEPH K. SMITH, 0000
*MARK P. SMITH, 0000
*RANDY L. SMITH, 0000
*TIMOTHY C. SMITH, 0000
*TROY A. SMITH, 0000
*STEVEN E. SMYTH, 0000
DANIEL R. SMYTHE, 0000
ROSS W. SNARE III, 0000
*BRIAN S. SNEDDON, 0000
BRUCE K. SNEED, 0000
*MICHAEL W. SNOW, 0000
BRADFORD L. SNOWDEN, 0000
DAVID A. SNYDER, 0000
KELLY J. SNYDER, 0000
ROBERT A. SNYDER, JR., 0000
EDWARD J. SOBIESK, 0000
*STEPHEN C. SOBOTTA, 0000
DONALD G. SOHN, 0000
ROBERT J. SOLLOHUB, 0000
TIMOTHY B. SOLMS, 0000
CHERYL Y. SOLOMON, 0000
NORMAN E. SOLOMON, 0000
BRUCE V. SONES, 0000
BRYNDOL A. SONES, 0000
*PATRICK A. SOOS, 0000
WILLIAM T. SORRELLS, 0000
EUGENIO SOTO, 0000
BENJAMIN A. SPEARS, 0000
ARTHUR E. SPENARD, 0000
*THOMAS F. SPENCER, 0000
*PATRICK M. SPIELMANN, 0000
*JEFFREY L. SPONSLER, 0000
MATTHIAS A. SPRUILL IV, 0000
WILLIAM M. STACEY, 0000
HEYWARD STACKHOUSE, 0000
*RONALD STAFFORD, 0000
MARK R. STAMMER, 0000
*DAVID W. STANDRIDGE, 0000
MARK E. STANLEY, 0000
TYRON D. STANLEY, 0000
ALBERT J. STAROSTANKO, 0000
ANNELIESE M. STEELE, 0000
RICHARD G. STEELE, 0000
*LEONARD T. STEINER, JR., 0000
TROY A. STEPHENSON, 0000
*MATTHEW A. STERN, 0000
DAVID J. STEVENS, 0000
DALE B. STEWART, 0000
DONALD F. STEWART, 0000
ROY E. STEWART, 0000
WAYNE P. STILWELL, 0000
*TOD A. STIMPSON, 0000
*RUSSELL E. STINGER, 0000
GREGORY K. STINSON, 0000
DAVID S. STOREY, 0000
*ANGELA K. STOWMAN, 0000
MARK A. STRONG, 0000
DAVID M. STROUD, 0000
*GREGORY O. SUDMAN, 0000
*EUGENE R. SULLIVAN, 0000
JOHN P. SULLIVAN, 0000
*KENNETH M. SULLIVAN, 0000
LESLIE J. SULLIVAN, 0000
*MARK S. SULLIVAN, 0000
*ROBERT V. SUSKIE, JR., 0000
KENNETH D. SWANSON, 0000
*JOHN M. SWARTZ, 0000
*KINA B. SWAYNEY, 0000
*ERIC D. SWEENEY, 0000
*ROBERT H. SWEIGART, 0000
MICHAEL W. SWINEY, 0000
*PETER J. TAFT, 0000
JASON T. TANAKA, 0000
*PATRICK J. TAPEN, 0000
*RICK A. TARASIEWICZ, 0000
BURKE A. TARBLE, 0000
MICHAEL J. TARSA, 0000
*KEVIN W. TATE, 0000
WADE S. TATE, 0000
BRADLEY S. TAYLOR, 0000
*IVERY J. TAYLOR, 0000
*JOSEPH M. TAYLOR, 0000
KIRK D. TAYLOR, 0000
*MARK C. TAYLOR, 0000
*TROY E. TECHAU, 0000
*ROY D. TEMPLIN, 0000
JAMES M. TENNANT, 0000
JEROME P. TERRY, 0000
MICHAEL D. THEODOSS, 0000
*WILLIAM O. THEWES, 0000
*DENNIS THIES, 0000
*STEPHEN H. THOLANDER, 0000
BRYAN R. THOM, 0000
*BRANDON T. THOMAS, 0000
*ERIC THOMAS, 0000
GREGORY M. THOMAS, 0000
*JOHN C. THOMAS, 0000
*SIDNEY R. THOMAS, 0000
*STEVEN G. THOMAS, 0000
*TIMOTHY R. THOMAS, 0000
*WAYNE L. THOMAS, 0000
*DWAYNE D. THOMPSON, 0000
VESEN L. THOMPSON, 0000
*BERNADINE I. THOMSON, 0000
*DOUGLAS W. THOMSON, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER B. THRASH, 0000
*PATRICK E. TILQUE, 0000
*ROBERT TIMM, 0000
*EVELYN TIRADO, 0000
VALEN S. TISDALE, 0000
TIMOTHY J. TODARO, 0000
MICHAEL A. TODD, 0000
*DAVID W. TOHN, 0000
*JAMES P. TOOMEY, 0000
MARK A. TORCH, 0000
*DANIEL N. TORRES, 0000
EVELYN M. TORRES, 0000
*RAFAEL TORRES, JR., 0000
ANNETTE L. TORRISI, 0000
JULIANA L. TOUMAJAN, 0000
STEPHEN A. TOUMAJAN, 0000
*KATHY A. TOWERS, 0000
ROBERT N. TOWNSEND, 0000
RICHARD M. TOY, 0000
PETER T. TREBOTTE, JR., 0000
MANUEL C. TREVINO, 0000
*SANTO L. TRICARICO, 0000
STEPHANIE E. TROCHAK, 0000
*THOMAS J. TROSSEN, 0000
*CARL R. TROUT, 0000
PHILLIP M. TRUED, 0000
BRYAN P. TRUESDELL, 0000
CARL L. TUCKER, 0000
STEVEN L. TUCKER, 0000
*DARRYL J. TUMBLESON, 0000
*LEROY L. TUNNAGE, 0000
*EDWARD P. TUNSTALL, 0000
ERIC C. TURNER, 0000
JAMES L. TURNER, 0000
KEVEN TURNER, 0000
MICHAEL E. TURNER, 0000
*ANDREY M. TYMNIAK, 0000
*DARLENE M. URQUHART, 0000
ROSENDO VALENTIN, 0000
MATTHEW J. VANDERFELTZ, 0000
*KURT P. VANDERSTEEN, 0000
MICHAEL C. VANDEVELDE, 0000
*CHARLES H. VANHEUSEN, 0000
*DANIEL L. VANNUCCI, 0000
*BRIAN F. VAUGHN, 0000
*ANTONIO J. VAZQUEZ, 0000
JOHN M. VENHAUS, 0000
*RANDAL R. VICKERS, 0000
JEFFREY J. VIEIRA, 0000
DAVID R. VIENS, 0000
*ALBERT J. VISCONTI, 0000
JOHN T. VOGEL, 0000
VICTORIA L. VOGEL, 0000
JEFFREY R. VOIGT, 0000
CHRISTINE J. VOISINETBENDER, 0000
*PHILLIP D. VONHOLTZ, 0000
JEFFREY E. VUONO, 0000
DAVID G. WADE, 0000
*ROBERT P. WADE, 0000
*WILLIAM T. WADSWORTH, JR., 0000
MARTIN S. WAGNER, 0000
*MARK D. WALD, 0000
*DAVID L. WALDEN, 0000
CARLOS L. WALKER, JR., 0000
*MICHAEL D. WALKER, 0000
*TIMOTHY C. WALL, 0000
CHERIE S. WALLACE, 0000
*KENZIE WALLACE, 0000
*TERRANCE D. WALLACE, 0000
*JOHN C. WALLER, 0000
*DENISE A. WALLS, 0000
DANIEL R. WALRATH, 0000
KENNETH E. WALRAVEN, 0000
TIMOTHY W. WALROD, 0000
*DALE E. WALSH, 0000
*MICHAEL T. WALSH, 0000
*FREDERICK K. WALTER, 0000
ROBERT B. WALTER, 0000
TIMOTHY C. WALTER, 0000
MARK L. WALTERS, 0000
WAYNE M. WALTERS, 0000
*DESMOND D. WALTON, 0000
MARVIN R. WALWORTH, JR., 0000
WILLIAM J. WANOVICH, 0000
KAREN K. WARD, 0000
KELLY J. WARD, 0000
LAWRENCE J. WARK, 0000
*LLOYD R. WASHINGTON, 0000
*THOMAS U. WASHINGTON, 0000
*TIMOTHY B. WASHINGTON, 0000
*JOHN C. WATERS, 0000
MARK V. WATKINS, 0000
*DENORRIS L. WATSON, 0000
JOSEPH D. WAWRO, 0000
*JERRY J. WAYNICK, 0000
BRENT N. WEAVER, 0000
JOHN M. WEBB, 0000
*MICHAEL J. WEBB, 0000
*AARON A. WEBSTER, 0000
ALLAN L. WEBSTER, 0000
*GORDON D. WEED, 0000
*COLIN A. WEEKS, 0000
JOHN F. WEGENHOFT IV, 0000
RUSSELL A. WEIR, 0000
THOMAS M. WEISZ, 0000
ROBERT M. WELLBORN, 0000
FREDERICK P. WELLMAN, 0000
THOMAS W. WELLS, 0000
*LESLEY W. WELSH, 0000
*FRANKLIN L. WENZEL, 0000
BRAD L. WESTERGREN, 0000
JACQUELINE K. WESTOVER, 0000
JAMES P. WETZEL, 0000
CATHERINE M. WHALEN, 0000
TIMOTHY J. WHALEN, 0000
*BOOKER T. WHEELER, 0000
GEORGE W. WHEELOCK, 0000
DAVID R. WHIDDON, 0000
DAVID O. WHITAKER, 0000
*JAMES R. WHITAKER, 0000
BENJAMIN M. WHITE, 0000
*HERBERT B. WHITE, JR., 0000
*JAMES P. WHITE, 0000
*WESLEY B. WHITE, 0000
*JO A. WHITEHILL, 0000
*GREGORY J. WHOLEAN, 0000
*STEVEN C. WIEGERS, 0000
*DAVID B. WIERSMA, 0000
RALPH M. WILCOX, 0000
DAVID L. WILCOXON, 0000
DANNY A. WILEY, 0000
*BOBBIE L. WILLIAMS, SR, 0000
*EDWARD A. WILLIAMS, 0000
*JOHN C. WILLIAMS, 0000
JULIAN R. WILLIAMS, 0000
MICHAEL S. WILLIAMS, 0000
*PATRICK W. WILLIAMS, 0000
PAUL V. WILLIAMS, 0000
*RONALD J. WILLIAMS, 0000
*VANCE C. WILLIAMS, 0000
*KENNETH D. WILLIS, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER S. WILSON, 0000
DARRELL T. WILSON, 0000
LAUREN B. WILSON, 0000
JAMES O. WINBUSH, JR., 0000
STEVEN P. WINTERFELD, 0000
*JEFFREY J. WINTERS, 0000
MARK E. WISECARVER, 0000
*JONATHAN B. WITHINGTON, 0000
*DONALD M. WIX, JR., 0000
TODD R. WOLF, 0000
JAMES J. WOLFF, 0000
*JOHN S. WOMACK, 0000
ROGER M. WOOD, 0000
WILLIAM H. WOODS, 0000
JOEL A. WOODWARD, 0000
DAVID J. WRAY, 0000
*MICHELE J. WREGGELSWORTH, 0000

*STEPHEN C. WREN, 0000
*TIMOTHY R. WULFF, 0000
SHAUN T. WURZBACH, 0000
*BRUCE T. WYDICK, 0000
*JOSEPH J. YAKAWICH, 0000
THOMAS J. YANOSCHIK, 0000
BETTY J. YARBROUGH, 0000
MARC G. YATES, 0000
JOSEPH M. YOSWA, 0000
GARETH S. YOUNG, 0000
GEORGE R. YOUNG II, 0000
ROLLIN J. YOUNG, 0000
*LAWRENCE T. ZABEN, JR., 0000
FRANK ZACHAR, 0000
*STEPHEN M. ZACHAR, 0000
GUY M. ZERO, 0000
JOHN R. ZSIDO, 0000
VERONICA S. ZSIDO, 0000
*MARIA T. ZUMWALT, 0000
*TIMOTHY L. ZUMWALT, 0000
X0000
*X0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 12203:

To be captain

LAWRENCE E. ADLER, 0000
DAPHNE G. ALBRIGHT, 0000
TERRENCE L. ALLEMANG, 0000
BRYAN S. APPLE, 0000
BONNIE E. ASHCOM, 0000
THOMAS K. BADGER, 0000
WILLIAM R. BAKER, JR., 0000
THOMAS Q. BAKKE, 0000
KEVIN K. BALL, 0000
JEAN M. BENNETT, 0000
CAMILLA A. BICKNELL, 0000
DAVID L. BLACK, 0000
ROBERT F. BLOOM, 0000
LAURENCE H. BOGGELN, 0000
SHEILA S. BRACKETT, 0000
KATHERINE M.W. BRADLEY, 0000
JOHN T. BRAUN, 0000
RICHARD R. BRIGHT, JR., 0000
THOMAS R. BRODERICK, 0000
GERARD D. BROWN, 0000
JAMES T. BROWN, JR., 0000
WILLIAM E. BROWN, 0000
WILLIAM J. BUCKINGHAM, 0000
WILLIAM R. BURGE, 0000
WILLIAM L. BURT, 0000
JESSE D. CANNON, JR., 0000
LANCE C. CANTOR, 0000
STEVEN CHALFIN, 0000
ENRIQUE G. CHANG, 0000
CAROLINE E. CIOTTI, 0000
HUBERT V. COLLINS, JR., 0000
ANTHONY M. CONTI, 0000
KEVIN P. COOK, 0000
SUSAN A. CUDDY, 0000
PETER C. CUSHING, 0000
MARY J. DAACK, 0000
DAVID B. DANZER, 0000
DONEL L. DAVIDSON, 0000
MARY V. DECICCO, 0000
NEIL D. DEMAREE, 0000
THOMAS J. DEMAY, 0000
JOAN E. DENDINGER, 0000
JOHNNA L. DETTIS, 0000
PATRICIA S. DONOVAN, 0000
JAMES P. DORMAN, 0000
JAMES L. DOSS, 0000
LINDA M. DUNN, 0000
MARY L. EADY, 0000
JOHN H. EDMUNDS, 0000
BARBARA G. EILERS, 0000
RAYMOND P. ENGLISH, 0000
NANCY F. ERICKSEN, 0000
RICARDO B. EUSEBIO, 0000
JOHN A. FAIST, 0000
MARK J. FITZMAURICE, 0000
TIMOTHY T. FLYNN, 0000
STEVEN S. FOSTER, 0000
THOMAS M. FRESHWATER, 0000
PETER F. FROST, 0000
DANIEL P. FRY, 0000
DARRELL R. GALLOWAY, 0000
ALBERT GARCIA, III, 0000
RICHARD H. GETTYS, JR., 0000
JEROLD A. GODDARD, 0000
ROBERT J. GOLDBERG, 0000
KATHY S. GOOKIN, 0000
JENNIFER L. GORMAN, 0000
PAUL A. GRAY, JR., 0000
JUDITH K. GREENE, 0000
LEE H. GRISHMAN, 0000
DAVID A. GROFF, 0000
EDWARD G. GUMMER, 0000
LAWRENCE P. HADDOCK, JR., 0000
EVELYN B. HALL, 0000
ELLEN F. HALTER, 0000
TIMOTHY P. HANNON, 0000
RUSSELL H. HARRIS, 0000
BEATRICE E. HARROLD, 0000
GREGORY J. HEISE, 0000
BOLIVAR P. HERDOIZA, 0000
GORDON R. HILL, 0000
THOMAS F. HILTON, 0000
JOHN P. HODGES, 0000
SALLIE B. HOLLOWAY, 0000
JOHN J.J. HOM, 0000
DIANE C. HOWARD, 0000
LAWRENCE HSIA, 0000
MICHAEL J. HUGHEY, 0000
LAWRENCE J. HUWE, 0000
SCOTT W. IMRAY, 0000
BRIAN S. ISHAM, 0000
LETITIA M. JACKSON, 0000
DANIEL M. JACOBS, 0000
THOMAS G. JACOBS, 0000
DAVID W. JAMESON, 0000
MARY K. JANCZEWSKI, 0000
MARK E. JOLIVETTE, 0000
JUDITH N. JONES, 0000
JUDITH J. KAYSER, 0000
JERRY R. KELLEY, 0000
SALEEM A. KHAN, 0000
CURRAN N.E. KIESEL, 0000
JOHN M. KILLEY, 0000
ALVIN H. KLASSEN, 0000
MARGARET A. KNAPPENBERGER, 0000
DOUGLAS J. KOUPASH, 0000
JOANNE L. KRAMER, 0000
DONNA I. KREFT, 0000
ANN LABORDE, 0000
JAMES V. LACEY, 0000
GARY A. LASHAM, 0000
ANITA M. LEBLANC, 0000
VINCENT L. LEIBELL III, 0000
PETER B. LETARTE, 0000
PETER LIASHEK, JR., 0000
ROGER D. LINN, 0000
WALTER H. LOVELADY, 0000
MILTON K. LOW, 0000
OSCAR E. LUJAN, 0000
EUGENE LUNDY, 0000
DOUGALD C. MACGILLIVRAY, 0000
WILLIAM E. MANROD III, 0000
HOWARD W. MARKER, 0000
STEVEN C. MARTINKA, 0000
LAURA A. MCCLAY, 0000
EDDIE MCCORVEY, JR., 0000
TERRI C. MCDONALDGREEN, 0000
JAMES V. MCGARRY, 0000
CAMERON C. MCKEE, 0000
MARGARET M. MCKIBBEN, 0000
DAVID M. MCQUISTON, 0000
JOHN G. METZ, JR., 0000
JACKIE R. MILLER, 0000
ROBERT C. MILLER, 0000
WILLIAM E. MINAMYER, 0000
RONALD L. MINTON, 0000
THEODORE J. MONACO, 0000
LARRY C. MOORER, 0000
STEPHEN G. MORALES, 0000
ROBERTA L. MORIARTY, 0000
RONALD E. MYERS, 0000
CLARICE A. NASH, 0000
NEAL H. NELSON, JR., 0000
RALPH A. NELSON, 0000
DALE C. NEWTON, 0000
VINCENT L. NZINGA, 0000
WILLIAM Y. OH, 0000
GLENN M. OKIHIRO, 0000
TIMOTHY L. ORTEL, 0000
ROBIN E. OSBORN, 0000
STANLEY A. OSTAPSKI, 0000
BRIAN P. O'SULLIVAN, 0000
JOHN P. OUDSHOORN, 0000
KIRK D. PAGEL, 0000
DOROTHY B. PALER, 0000
ROBERT C. PATTON, 0000
IVAN Y. PEACOCK, 0000
WENDY N. PELHAN, 0000
RICHARD E. PELTZ, 0000
THOMAS R. PERKERSON, 0000
JAMES M. PETERS, 0000
WHITTON M. POTAMPA, 0000
DONALD M. PRIMLEY, 0000
JOHN B. RAFF, 0000
TERRY P. RAST, 0000
JAMES A. RAWLINS, 0000
DORIS A. REID, 0000
CRAIG W. RENCH, 0000
EILEEN C. RILEY, 0000
ELISABETH J. RUSHING, 0000
NORMAN A. RYAN, 0000
GREGORY M. SARACCO, 0000
ROBERT M. SAVAGE, 0000
NORMAN W. SCHLEIF, JR., 0000
LARRY J. SCHNEIDER, 0000
MARK R. SCHWEER, 0000
DAVID L. SEALS, 0000
JOSELYN C. SENTER, 0000
MARTIN C. SEREMET, 0000
THOMAS P. SHEEHAN, 0000
JOHN E. SHIELDS, JR., 0000
WAYNE S. SHIMIZU, 0000
ERNEST L. SIMMS, 0000
DAVID A. SMITH, 0000
MARY K. SMITH, 0000
SUSAN L. SMITH, 0000
WALTER L. SMITH, JR., 0000
RAYMOND D. SNOWDEN, 0000
LEE L. SORENSON, 0000
ELSIE M. SPENCER, 0000
LANA M. SPETHMAN, 0000
LARRY W. STARR, 0000
SALVATOR M. STEFULA, 0000
JOHN N. STENSLAND, 0000
DANIEL K. STEPHENSON, 0000
JOSEPH D. STINSON, 0000
RICHARD A. SUMMA, 0000
JEFFREY M. SWALCHICK, 0000
CYNTHIA D. SWEENEY, 0000
STEVEN M. TALSON, 0000
FRANK L. TEZAK, 0000
LUCIE A. D. THOMAS, 0000
NANCY E. TJEPKEMA, 0000
JOAN W. TRELEASE, 0000
KEVIN M. TURMAN, 0000
ANTHONY P. VARBONCOUER, 0000
PAUL F. VARNIS, 0000
NANCY J. VONTERSCH, 0000
JAMES R. VROOM, 0000
JAMES M. WARDEN, 0000
KRISTINE D. WARNER, 0000
MARY L. WASSEL, 0000
ANNE M. WEATHERFORD, 0000
DONNA J. WEHE, 0000
MICHAEL J. WENDLING, 0000
JONATHAN M. WHITFIELD, 0000
MONROE C. WHITMAN III, 0000
HARRIS E. WILLIAMS, 0000
ISAAC R. WILLIAMSON, 0000
PETER WOLFF, 0000
DAVID R. WOODARD, 0000
ROGER L. WORTHAM, 0000
JOHN D. YOUNG, 0000
MICHAEL S. ZIEBELMAN, 0000
THOMAS A. ZIMMERMAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 624 AND 531:

To be major

*ARNOLD K. ABANGAN, 0000
*ROBERT K. ABERNATHY, 0000
EMIL E. ABRAHAM, 0000
WILLIAM P. ACKER, JR., 0000
CHRISTOPHER F. ACKERSON, 0000
TIMOTHY A. ADAM, 0000
JOHN P. ADAMO, 0000
LEO C. ADAMS, 0000
*SAMUEL G. ADAMS, 0000
*SAMUEL M. ADAMS, 0000
STEVEN G. ADAMS, 0000
THOMAS A. ADAMS, 0000
RONALD L. ADDICOTT, 0000
WILLIAM C. ADELMANN, 0000
BONNIE NIEBAUER ADKINS, 0000
JANE A. ADKISON, 0000
*DAVID S. ADLER, 0000
FERNANDO AGUILAR, 0000
MICHAEL T. AHERN, 0000
DAVID J. AIROLA, 0000
KEITH A. ALBRECHT, 0000
*CLIFFORD H. ALBRITTON, 0000
DAVID J. ALCORN, 0000
GARY E. ALDRICH, 0000
GARY A. ALEXANDER, 0000
TY G. ALEXANDER, 0000
WILLIAM S. ALEXANDER, 0000
THOMAS J. ALICATA III, 0000
CARL D. ALLEN, 0000
DAVID R. ALLEN, 0000
MELVIN E. ALLEN, 0000
PATRICK R. ALLEN, 0000
RANDY S. ALLEN, 0000
RUFUS D. ALLEN, JR., 0000
WILEY V. ALLGOOD, 0000
KENNETH ALLISON, 0000
*RICHARD J. ALLISON, 0000
ELIZABETH O. ALMEIDA, 0000
RUSSELL R. ALSTON, 0000
ROBERT W. ALTON, 0000
ANTHONY L. AMADEO, 0000
DAVID J. AMDAHL, 0000
THOMAS G. AMELUXEN, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER T. AMEND, 0000
JOHNNIE AMES, 0000
WILLIAM J. AMES, 0000
*BRIAN L. AMMERMAN, 0000
FRANK L. AMODEO, 0000
BRIAN D. AMOS, 0000
CLAYTON M. ANDERSEN, 0000
JAMES L. ANDERSEN, 0000
KENNETH E. ANDERSEN, 0000
BRENT A. ANDERSON, 0000
DAVID M. ANDERSON, 0000
GEORGE J. ANDERSON, 0000
*MARK W. ANDERSON, 0000
REID R. ANDERSON, 0000
*STEVEN A. ANDERSON, 0000
STEVEN N. ANDRASZ, 0000
CRAIG A. ANDREAS, 0000
JANET A. ANDREPONT, 0000
KAREN D. ANGELL, 0000
MELISSA J. APPLEGATE, 0000
SALVADOR ARANGO, II, 0000
*MICHAEL C. ARAUJO, 0000
MARK A. ARBOGAST, 0000
TIMOTHY J. ARCH, 0000
DIANE M. ARCHAMBAULT, 0000
JOHN L. ARMANTROUT, 0000
THOMAS R. ARMIAK, 0000
ERIC R. ARMSTRONG, 0000
MERRILL F. ARMSTRONG, 0000
PRESTON F. ARNOLD, 0000
EDWARD A. ARRINGTON, 0000
WILLIAM H. ARRINGTON, III, 0000
BRENT F. ASAY, 0000
MITCHELL B. ASHMORE, 0000
ROBERT T. ATKINS, 0000
DONALD L. ATKINSON, 0000
*JAMES R. AUCLAIR, 0000
JANET C. AUGUSTINE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. AUSTIN, 0000
*DIERDRA L. AUSTIN, 0000
BENJAMIN L. AUTEN, 0000
LAWRENCE M. AVERBECK, 0000
DAVID P. AVERY, 0000
*JOHN F. AX, 0000
PETER D. AXELSON, 0000

THOMAS L. AYERS, 0000
JAY C. BACHHUBER, 0000
FREDERICK C. BACON, 0000
DANIEL T. BAGLEY, 0000
WALTER S. BAGWELL, 0000
PETER C. BAHM, 0000
THOMAS M. BAILEY, 0000
DAVID W. BAKER, 0000
ROBERT P. BAKER, 0000
SANFORD H. BALKAN, 0000
CALVIN D. BALL, 0000
THOMAS P. BALL III, 0000
LLOYD A. BALLARD, 0000
MARTIN P. BALUS, 0000
BRIAN J. BANKERT, 0000
BRYAN E. BANNACH, 0000
BRENT L. BARBER, 0000
ELLEN T. BARBER, 0000
STEVEN F. BARBOUR, 0000
JAMES E. BARGER, 0000
IRWIN A. BARNARD, 0000
*BRADFORD R. BARNETT, 0000
EDWARD C. BARON, 0000
MICHAEL A. BARRETT, 0000
KENNETH J. BATCZARK, 0000
SUMMER E. BARTCZAK, 0000
CORY G. BARTHOLOMEW, 0000
RICHARD C. BARTON, 0000
RICHARD M. BASAK, 0000
*ALISON M. BASINGER, 0000
HOWARD A. BASS, 0000
LORI M. BASS, 0000
VANCE C. BATEMAN, 0000
*SONNIE G. BATES, 0000
JEFFREY L. BATTIN, 0000
KENNETH J. BAUER, 0000
TERENCE P. BAUGH, 0000
CATHERINE A. BAUM, 0000
JOSEPH T. BEACH, 0000
VERONICA Y. BEAGAN, 0000
T.W. BEAGLE, JR., 0000
JOSEPH V. BEALKOWSKI, 0000
DEBRA F. BEAN, 0000
MARTIN B. BEARD, 0000
JAMES B. BEARDEN, 0000
DAVID M. BEASLEY, 0000
LLOYD W. BEASLEY, 0000
CLYDE G. BEATTIE, 0000
DENNIS T. BEATTY, 0000
SETH BEAUBIEN, 0000
ARTHUR F. BEAUCHAMP, 0000
JOHN R. BEAULIEU, 0000
KENT R. BECK, 0000
DAVID B. BECKHAM, 0000
NICKY L. BECKWITH, 0000
WILLIAM P. BEDESEM, 0000
TODD P. BEER, 0000
MARK T. BEIERLE, 0000
JAMES J. BEISSNER, 0000
RICHARD W. BELK, 0000
ANDREW E. BELKO, 0000
DAVID E. BELL, 0000
JOSEPH P. BELL, JR., 0000
RICHARD L. BELL, 0000
LYLE A. BELLEQUE, 0000
JOSEPH A. BELLI, 0000
DONALD F. BELLINGHAUSEN, 0000
ERIC A. BELLOWS, 0000
RONALD A. BELYAN, 0000
ERNESTO V. BENAVIDES, 0000
GARY D. BENEDETTO, 0000
FRANK K. BENJAMIN, 0000
JOHN T. BENJAMIN, 0000
BETTY J. BENNETT, 0000
LOUIS J. BENOIT, 0000
ROBERT A. BENTALL, 0000
WILLIAM G. BENTE, 0000
DAVID W. BENTLEY, 0000
MARK R. BENZ, 0000
JEFF M. BERGER, 0000
PAMELA A. BERGESON, 0000
KIRK J. BERGGREN, 0000
*ANDERS P. BERG,AMM, 0000
*JOHN R. BERNIER, 0000
JAMES C. BERRES, 0000
JUAN R. BERRIOSVAZQUEZ, 0000
BRIAN D. BERRY, 0000
RICARDO J. BERUVIDES, 0000
JOSEPH J. BESSELMAN III, 0000
WERNER BEYER, JR. 0000
SUSHIL R. BHATT, 0000
PAUL E. BIANCHI, 0000
MERVIN W. BIERMAN, 0000
MARY E. BIGGS, 0000
GEORGE W. BIRSIC IV, 0000
JEB S. BISHOP, 0000
SCOTT C. BISHOP, 0000
WILLIAM W. BISHOP, JR., 0000
DANIEL O. BLACK, 0000
*KEVIN J. BLACK, 0000
ROBERT C. BLACK, 0000
ROBERT E. BLACKINGTON, 0000
*STEVEN G. BLACKWELL, 0000
JAMES E. BLACKWOOD, 0000
JAMES N. BLAIR, 0000
*ROBERT J. BLAIR II, 0000
JEFFREY A. BLANK, 0000
*MARVIN D. BLANKENSHIP, 0000
ANTHONY L. BLAYLOCK, 0000
KELLY G. BLEDSOE, 0000
*JON M. BLUE, 0000
SCOTT C. BLUM, 0000
*KEITH R. BOADWAY, 0000
KENNETH G. BOCK, 0000
JOHN V. BODE II, 0000
*STEVEN V. BOHON, 0000
JAMES T. BOLLES, 0000
RICKY G. BOLLINGER, 0000
DARREN R. BOND, 0000
JOSEPH M. BOND, 0000
JAMES M. BONN, 0000
GARY J. BONTLY, 0000
*ALLEN D. BOOZER, 0000
JOHN C. BORDNER, 0000
JEFFREY EUGENE BORG, 0000
*JAMES M. BORGREN, 0000
LAURENCE C. BOSTROM, 0000
STACY M. BOUDREAUX, 0000
SCOTT C. BOWEN, 0000
*VICTORIA L. BOWENS, 0000
LARRY D. BOWERS, 0000
JOHN A. BOWES, JR., 0000
*LESTER K. BOYKIN, JR., 0000
BRYAM M. BOYLES, 0000
*WALTER C. BRACEWELL, 0000
*GERALD S. BRADSHAW, JR., 0000
*ROBERT M. BRAGG, JR., 0000
GARY W. BRANDSTROM, 0000
RONALD G. BRANSFORD, 0000
JOHN R. BRAUN, 0000
MARTIN C. BRAUN, 0000
SCOTT B. BRAUNER, 0000
RANDY S. BRAWLEY, 0000
MICHAEL G. BREAKEY, 0000
BRENT F. BREIDENTHAL, 0000
DENNIS J. BREMSER, 0000
HUGH P. BRENNAN, 0000
KENNETH C. BRENNEMAN, 0000
DAVID S. BRENTON, 0000
KEVIN N. BREWER, 0000
MICHAEL T. BREWER, 0000
LORI L. BRIDEL, 0000
GORDON D. BRIDGER, 0000
KAREN M. BRIDGES, 0000
MICHAEL W. BRINGOLD, 0000
GREGORY J. BROARDT, 0000
EDWARD W. BROCKHAUS, 0000
LEX BROCKINGTON, 0000
WILLIAM K. BROGAN, JR., 0000
PETER J. BROLL, 0000
KEVIN D. BROOKS, 0000
ROBERT T. BROOKS, JR., 0000
STEVEN J. BROOKS, 0000
TODD A. BROOKS, 0000
*PETER R. BROTHERTON, 0000
*JOSEPH E. BROUILLARD, 0000
JAMES W. BROUSE, 0000
RANDY P. BROUSSARD, 0000
*DAVID W. BROWN, 0000
DOUGLAS M. BROWN, 0000
EUGENE A. BROWN, JR., 0000
JAMES M. BROWN II, 0000
*LAWRENCE M. BROWN, 0000
MARK A. BROWN, 0000
MARK ANTHONY BROWN, 0000
ROBERT B. BROWN, 0000
RUSS J. BROWN, 0000
SAMUEL J. BROWN, 0000
SAMUEL BROWN, JR., 0000
STANLEY L. BROWN, 0000
STEVE BROWN, 0000
WILLIAM C. BROWN, 0000
DON E. BROYLES, 0000
ROBERT B. BRUMLEY II, 0000
ALFRED E. BRUNER, 0000
RICHARD G. BRYAN, JR., 0000
JOHN P. BRYANT IV, 0000
RONALD M. BRYANT, JR., 0000
SCOTT W. BRYANT, 0000
KENRYU M. BRYSON, 0000
STEVEN D. BUCHANAN, 0000
DAVID T. BUCKMAN, 0000
MARK C. BUERKLE, 0000
ANITA C. BULLOCK, 0000
*KENNETH R. BUMANN, 0000
GEORGE R. BUMILLER, 0000
WILLIAM M. BUMPUS, 0000
LAURA L. BUNKER, 0000
JOHN A. BURATOWSKI, 0000
JAMES G. BURCH, 0000
KENNETH C. BURCH, 0000
*BONNIE R. BURCKEL, 0000
GARY L. BURG, 0000
BRIAN T. BURGER, 0000
THORNTON W. BURGESS, 0000
EDWIN I. BURKHART, 0000
SANDRA A. BURKMAN, 0000
LESLIE C. BURNS, 0000
JAMES A. BURTON, 0000
*RICHARD A. BURTON, 0000
ROBERT H. BURTON, 0000
WILLIAM E. BURTON, JR., 0000
MARK P. BURWELL, 0000
VICKI S. BUSCHUR, 0000
RICHARD J. BUTLER, 0000
JOHN B. BYRD, 0000
JOHN V. BYRD, 0000
TRAVIS C. BYROM, 0000
RAYMOND J. CABALLERO, 0000
JOHN V. CABIGAS, 0000
CRIAG D. CADY, 0000
*GARRY S. CAGLE, 0000
GREGORY B. CAICEDO, 0000
TIMONTHY TY CALDERWOOD, 0000
JAMES A. CALDWELL, JR., 0000
SCOTT R. CALISTI, 0000
DANIEL L. CALKINS, 0000
JOSEPH A. CALLAN, 0000
*JAMES E. CALNAN, 0000
GEORGE L. CALTABELLOTTA, 0000
PHILIP M. CALVANO, 0000
CRAIG P. CAMPBELL, 0000
GORDON S. CAMPBELL, 0000
ROBERT C. CAMPBELL, JR., 0000
TROY D. CAMPBELL, 0000
WAYNE A. CANIPE, 0000
MARK W. CANTRELL, 0000
*FELIX A. CAPALUNGAN, 0000
JOHN T. CAPPELLO, 0000
JAMES C. CARDINAL, 0000
ROBERT D. CARDY, JR., 0000
BRIAN W. CARLISLE, 0000
ANDREW R. CARLSON, 0000
TOBY L. CARLYON, 0000
DAVID S. CARPENTER, 0000
DOUGLAS I. CARPENTER, 0000
KENNETH S. CARPENTER, 0000
PATRICIA M. CARPENTER, 0000
ROBERT T. CARPENTER, JR., 0000
*RICHARD L. CARPER, 0000
DAVID J. CARRELL, 0000
JEFFREY L. CARROLL, 0000
MARK T. CARROLL, 0000
MICHAEL J. CARROLL, 0000
*ULISES CARTAYA, 0000
AARON G. CARTER, 0000
JOHN A. CARTER, 0000
RICKY E. CARTER, 0000
CLARK R. CARVALHO, 0000
TIMOTHY S. CASHDOLLAR, 0000
JAMES P. CASHIN, 0000
WILLIAM A. CASTILLO, 0000
RICHARD M. CASTO, 0000
SUSAN M. CASTRO, 0000
RICHARD R. CASTROP, 0000
GREG M. CAYON, 0000
ARDIS G. CECIL, 0000
DEBORAH A. CHAMBERLAIN, 0000
VICTOR R. CHAMBERS, 0000
*DONALD S. CHAMPION, 0000
RICHARD W. CHANCELLOR, 0000
MICHAEL J. CHANDLER, 0000
*ANDREW S. CHANG, 0000
DAVID A. CHAPMAN, 0000
THOMAS N. CHEATHAM, 0000
PHILIPPE D. CHECHOWITZ, 0000
*JOHN T. CHENEY, 0000
BRIAN K. CHESHER, 0000
BRUCE C. CHESLEY, 0000
*ROBERT J. CHESTNUT, 0000
MAXWELL M. CHI, 0000
THOMAS J. CHIAVACCI, 0000
CATHERINE M. CHIN, 0000
MICHAEL T. CHIPLEY, 0000
UK CHONG, 0000
GREGORY M. CHRIST, 0000
KEL O. CHRISTIANSON, 0000
MARK A. CHRISTOFFERSON, 0000
PATRICK W. CHRISTOPHERSON, 0000
GREGORY A. CHURCH, 0000
DAVID P. CIENSKI, 0000
SCOTT A. CILLEY, 0000
STEVEN E. CLAPP, 0000
*AARON J. CLARK, 0000
*DAVID CLARK, 0000
DENNIS P. CLARK, 0000
GREGORY C. CLARK, 0000
JOSEPH M. CLARK, 0000
KAREN S. CLARK, 0000
MICHAEL P. CLARK, 0000
ROBERT W. CLARK, 0000
STEPHEN A. CLARK, 0000
*WILLARD W. CLARK, 0000
PAUL CLARKE, 0000
ROBERT S. CLARKE, 0000
JON E. CLAUNCH, 0000
SCOTT M. CLAWSON, 0000
ALISON E. CLAY, 0000
BYRON K. CLAY, 0000
JAMES J. CLAY, 0000
CAROL L. CLEMENTS, 0000
TED B. CLEMENTS, JR., 0000
JOSEPH G. CLEMONS, 0000
GEOFFREY CLEVELAND, 0000
SARAH B. CLIATT, 0000
MARK E. CLINE, 0000
*RICHARD A. CLINE, 0000
NEAL A. CLINEHENS, 0000
JERRY R. COATS, 0000
LAVANSON C. COFFEY III, 0000
MICHAEL F. COLACO, 0000
JOHN E. COLLETTA, 0000
DOUGLAS E. COLLINS, 0000
PETER J. COLLINS, 0000
JOHN M. COLOMBI, 0000
FELIX R. COLONNIEVES, 0000
DOUGLAS E. COMBS, 0000
JAMES P. COMBS, 0000
MICHAEL A. COMSTOCK, 0000
CHRISTOPHER CONAWAY, 0000
*DAVID A. CONGER, 0000
EVELYNE M. TRAUB CONLON, 0000
ANDREW D. CONN, 0000
DAVID H. CONN, 0000
CORVIN J. CONNOLLY, 0000
KEVIN D. CONRAD, 0000
STANLEY K. CONTRADES, 0000
CHRISTOPHER D. COOK, 0000
CHRISTOPHER W. COOK, 0000
*KAREN L. COOK, 0000
LOY C. COOK, 0000
VIRGIL H. COOK, JR., 0000
DAVID LYNN COOPER, 0000
DEANNA L. COOPER, 0000
GLYNN A. COOPER, 0000
GLEN F. COPELAND, JR., 0000
TODD M. COPLEY, 0000
WILLIAM P. CORCORAN, 0000
TOBY L. COREY, 0000
KENNETH A. CORGAN, 0000
DAVID B. CORKUM, 0000

ALLEN B. CORNELIUS II, 0000
STAN CORNELIUS, 0000
DAVID L. COSS, 0000
DALE L. COTHREN, 0000
ANTHONY J. COTTON, 0000
CLEM C. COUNTESS, 0000
DAVID A. COURCHENE, 0000
ANDREW R. COX, 0000
AUGUSTUS G. COX, 0000
LAWRENCE J. COX, 0000
MICHAEL R. COX, 0000
CLAY P. CRAWFORD, 0000
DUANE T. CREAMER, 0000
BRIAN J. CREELMAN, 0000
TY R. CRESAP, 0000
*JEFFREY T. CREWE, 0000
JAMES M. CRISSEY, 0000
MICHAEL T. CROCKER, 0000
DAVID J. CROW, 0000
MARK J. CROWDER, 0000
MICHAEL G. CULJAK, 0000
CHARLES S. CULLEN, 0000
ZENA M. CULP, 0000
WILLIAM H. CUMLER, 0000
SEAN M. CUNNEEN, 0000
GREGORY D. CUNNINGHAM, 0000
THOMAS W. CURBYLUCIER, 0000
GREGORY S. CURRY, 0000
CHESTER R. CURTIS, JR., 0000
TODD E. CUSICK, 0000
RUSSELL N. CUTTING, 0000
CHARLES H. CYNAMON, 0000
RICHARD E. CZYZEWSKI, 0000
ROBERT J. DAGUE, 0000
FRANK R. DALDINE, 0000
WILLIAM J. DALONZO, 0000
SCOTT A. DALRYMPLE, 0000
PAUL S. DALY, JR., 0000
DELEE M. DANKENBRING, 0000
CHARLES A. DANLEY, 0000
ROBERT L. DAUGHERTY, JR., 0000
SHERRILL K. DAUGHERTY, 0000
*JAMES G. DAVENPORT, 0000
KIM L. DAVEY, 0000
PETER F. DAVEY, 0000
TERENCE A. DAVEY, 0000
*RODNEY B. DAVIDSON, 0000
RICARDO C. DAVILA, 0000
BRIAN P. DAVIS, 0000
CHARLES E. DAVIS III, 0000
CHARLES R. DAVIS, 0000
CLYDE W. DAVIS, 0000
JEFFREY A. DAVIS, 0000
JOHN H. DAVIS, 0000
PERRY LORI A. DAVIS, 0000
RANDY J. DAVIS, 0000
STEPHEN S. DAVIS, 0000
JOHANN H. DAVISSON, 0000
*BRIAN C. DAWSON, 0000
CARLTON D. DAWSON, 0000
KENNETH D. DAWSON, 0000
GREGORY P. DAY, 0000
ERNESTO DE LA CANTERA, 0000
ENRIQUE DE LA GARZA, 0000
SCOTT E. DEAKIN, 0000
PATRICK K. DEAN, 0000
THOMAS A. DEAN III, 0000
TINA M. DEANGELIS, 0000
DAVID S. DEARY, 0000
GARY L. DEATON, 0000
TIMOTHY L. DEAVER, 0000
CYNTHIA A. DECARLO, 0000
KEVIN W. DECKER, 0000
JON CHASE DECLERCK, 0000
JEFFREY D. DEEM, 0000
MARK P. DEGROODT, 0000
LAWRENCE R. DEIST, 0000
SCOTT E. DEITZ, 0000
CARL T. DEKEMPER, 0000
*RONALD A. DELAP, 0000
ANTHONY J. DELGENIS, 0000
ROBERT DELLASALA, 0000
ROGER A. DELLINGER, 0000
DAVID F. DEMARTINO, 0000
EDWARD B. DENHOLM, 0000
*DONNA L. DENMAN, 0000
JOHN P. DENN, 0000
DAVID R. DENNING, 0000
STERLING P. DEPEW, 0000
MARK R. DETCHEVERRY, 0000
DEBORAH A. DETERMAN, 0000
STEWART L. DEVILBISS, 0000
PHILIP R. DEVOE, 0000
WADE F. DEWEY, 0000
JOHN P. DEWINE, 0000
JOHN R. DEWSNAP, 0000
CRAIG D. DEZERN, 0000
*MICHAEL J. DEZZUTTO, 0000
KEVEN B. DIAMOND, 0000
VICTOR J. DIAZ, JR., 0000
MARK J. DIBBEN, 0000
*DONALD A. DICKERSON, 0000
TIMOTHY H. DIEMER, 0000
WILLIAM G. DIESSNER, 0000
JOSEPH M. DIETZ, 0000
STEVEN C. DIETZIUS, 0000
MARK A. DILL, 0000
MARK W. DILLON, 0000
DANNY R. DIMAGGIO, 0000
LOUIS J. DIMODUGNO, 0000
ROBERT A. DISTAOLO, 0000
WILLIAM A. DODD, 0000
BERNARD DODSON, JR., 0000
BRIAN M. DODSON, 0000
JOHN L. DOLAN, 0000
KENNETH B. DOMENICK, 0000
ROBERT B. DONEHOWER, 0000
*MICHAEL R. DONLEY, 0000
TIMOTHY S. DONOHUE, 0000
PATRICK H. DONOVAN, 0000
BRIAN P. DORAN, 0000
RICHARD M. DORAN, 0000
PAUL E. DORCEY, 0000
STEVEN N. DORFMAN, 0000
JOHN W. DORRIS, 0000
MARK R. DOTSON, 0000
*DAVID D. DOUGHERTY, 0000
MICHAEL M. DOUGHTY, 0000
CHARLES A. DOUGLASS, 0000
KATHLENE R. DOWDY, 0000
EDWARD A. DOWGWILLO, 0000
GERARD P. DOWNEY, 0000
MARK A. DOWNS, 0000
KEVIN H. DOYLE, 0000
CARL D. DRAKE, 0000
REED C. DRAKE, 0000
BERT L. DREHER, 0000
DEBORAH Y. DRENTH, 0000
JEFFREY J. DRUESSEL, 0000
EMMETT W. DRUMHELLER, JR., 0000
ROCCO J. DRYFKA, 0000
DARRELL A. DUBOSE, 0000
JOHN A. DUCHARME, JR., 0000
ROSS A. DUDLEY, 0000
TRENT O. DUDLEY, 0000
WILLIAM R. DUDLEY, 0000
JOHN C. DUFFEK, 0000
PATRICK D. DUGAS, 0000
TODD M. DUGO, 0000
JASON C. DULANEY, 0000
JOHN K. DUNLEVY, 0000
JEFFERSON S. DUNN, 0000
PATRICK A. DUNN, 0000
MICHAEL S. DUPERIER, 0000
DUVIDELLE A. DURIEUX, 0000
LARRY J. DUVALL, 0000
BRIAN M. DWYER, 0000
JAMES C. DYGERT, 0000
KARL E. EAGER, 0000
KENNETH L. ECHTERNACHT, JR., 0000
NORMAN L. ECKERT, 0000
STEPHEN D. ECKHART, 0000
*RICHARD J. EDGE, JR., 0000
THOMAS F. EDMAN, 0000
MICHAEL D. EDWARDS, 0000
*ROBERT G. EDWARDS, 0000
STEPHEN G. EDWARDS, 0000
FRANK EFFRECE, JR., 0000
MATTHEW E. EGGERT, 0000
SANDRA M. EISENHUT, 0000
*MICHEL P. ELLERTBECK, 0000
DEBORAH A. ELLIOT, 0000
BRUCE A. ELLIS, JR., 0000
*JANON D. ELLIS, 0000
GLENN C. ELY, 0000
RALPH W. EMERSON, III, 0000
CHARLES D. ENGEL, 0000
JOSEPH M. ENGLE, 0000
HAROLD W. ENNULAT, 0000
SAMUEL H. EPPERSON, JR., 0000
GREGORY J. ERICKSEN, 0000
TROY M. ERWIN, 0000
WILLIAM P. ERZEN, 0000
SIDNEY J. ESKRIDGE, 0000
MICHAEL A. ESQUIBEL, 0000
GREGORY A. ESSES, 0000
RICHARD A. ETEN, 0000
DAVID R. EVANS, 0000
ROBERT D. EVANS, 0000
KRAIG A. EVENSON, 0000
JASON G. EVGENIDES, 0000
FREDERICK L. FAHLBUSCH, 0000
LAWRENCE FAHY, 0000
TODD J. FALKENSTEIN, 0000
FREDERICK W. FALLMAN, III, 0000
*STEVEN W. FALLS, 0000
ROBERT J. FALVEY, 0000
HARLAN B. FANGMEYER, 0000
FRANKLIN J. FANNING, 0000
MICHAEL A. FANTINI, 0000
CHARLES S. FARMER, 0000
MICHAEL R. FARRAR, 0000
JENNIFER W. FARRELLY, 0000
RESE E. FARRISH, JR., 0000
TAMMY E. FARROW, 0000
MARK T. FAVETTI, 0000
JOSEPH G. FAWCETT, 0000
PAUL E. FEATHER, 0000
VINCENT J. FECK, 0000
*MICHAEL J. FELDHAKE, 0000
RICHARD D. FELLOWS, JR., 0000
MATTHEW R. FENTON, II, 0000
MICHAEL C. FERGUSON, 0000
TIMOTHY D. FERGUSON, 0000
RALPH D. FERO, 0000
BARBARA A. FERRA, 0000
GLENN P. FETTER, 0000
*BRUCE E. FIELDS, 0000
FRANCES H. FIGA, 0000
TOD R. FINGAL, 0000
WILLIAM R. FINGAR, 0000
STEPHEN A. FINNEY, 0000
MICHAEL T. FINNICUM, 0000
JAMES D. FISHER, 0000
KEVIN J. FITCH, 0000
ROBERT P. FITZGERALD, 0000
TERESA L. FITZPATRICK, 0000
SHAWN R. FLEMING, 0000
WALTER C. FLINT, 0000
MATTHEW W. FLOOD, 0000
JOHN J. FODEN, III, 0000
LOUIS A. FOEHRKOLB, 0000
DEBRA A. FOGLE, 0000
ELDRED J. FOLSE, 0000
JOHN E. FOREHAND. 0000
KEVIN L. FORMOLO, 0000
TIMOTHY A. FORSYTHE, 0000
GARY G. FOSTER, 0000
*DAVID L. FOULKE, 0000
*LAWRENCE O. FOUNTAIN, 0000
JEROME M. FOWLER, 0000
JOSEPH W. A. FOX, 0000
PRENTICE N. FOX, 0000
MATTHEW J. FRANDSEN, 0000
JEFFREY E. FRANKHOUSER, 0000
*AARON D. FRANKLAND, 0000
ROBERT E. FRANKLIN, 0000
ANTHONY C. FRANZEL, 0000
BRIAN S. FRATUS, 0000
THOMAS A. FREESE, 0000
THOMAS FRENCH, 0000
GEORGE P. FULLER, IV, 0000
MARJORIE A. FULLER, 0000
*JON A. FULLERTON, 0000
ROY J. FULLERTON, JR., 0000
BARBARA E. FURYKOLSON, 0000
JOHN S. FUSS, 0000
*JOSEPH R. FUTCH, 0000
GLENN C. FYFE, 0000
GARY GAGLIARDI, 0000
MARK P. GAGNON, 0000
JOSEPH M. GAINES, 0000
KENNETH A. GAINES, 0000
JUAN GALINDEZ, 0000
KEVIN P. GALLAGHER, 0000
PATRICK J. GALLOGLY, 0000
CHARLETON P. GALLOWAY, 0000
BRADLEY H. GALLUP, 0000
JULIO C. GAMEZ, 0000
RUFUS M. GANT, III, 0000
MICHAEL E. GANTT, 0000
ANTHONY J. GARCIA, 0000
HANS, GARCIA, 0000
DANIEL C. GARD, 0000
VON A. GARDINER, 0000
JOHN D. GAREY, 0000
DAVID R. GARRETT, 0000
GREGORY GARRETT, 0000
*AMADEO B. GARZA, 0000
JAMES M. GATHRIGHT, 0000
ROBERT F. GATHRIGHT, 0000
LAWRENCE M. GATTI, 0000
FRED W. GAUDLIP, 0000
WILLIAM L. GAUGHT, 0000
MICHAEL W. GAULT, 0000
JOSEPH L. GAUTHIER, JR., 0000
AMANDO E. GAVINO, 0000
*DEWEY M. GAY, 0000
ROSE M. GAY, 0000
MARTIN R. GEARHART, 0000
GREGORY A.S. GECOWETS, 0000
FRANCIS J. GEISER III, 0000
MICHAEL D. GENDRON, 0000
DAVID E. GENEVISH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. GENTRY, 0000
JOHN M. GENTRY, 0000
KERRY M. GENTRY, 0000
SCOTT E. GEORGE, 0000
MARK J. GERKEN, 0000
BRIAN T. GEROVAC, 0000
CHARLES S. GERSTENECKER, 0000
GLEN S. GESE, 0000
PETER L. GETTS, 0000
DAVID MARTIN GIACHETTI, 0000
*ANDREW S. GIACONIA, 0000
JULIA A. GIBBONS, 0000
REX O. GIBSON, 0000
JON F. GIESE, 0000
SAMPSON GILBERT, 0000
ROBERT N. GILCHRIST, 0000
GREGORY P. GILETTI, 0000
JENNINGS F. GILLEM, 0000
*DAVID T. GILLEN, 0000
DAVID L. GILLESPIE, 0000
ANDREW T. GILROY, 0000
*COLIN L. GIPP, 0000
TERENCE J. GIVEN, 0000
KATHI S. GIVENS, 0000
KEITH M. GIVENS, 0000
ROBERT P. GIVENS, 0000
ALAN R. GLADFELTER, 0000
AMANDA W. GLADNEY, 0000
THOMAS L. GLARDON, 0000
DAVID G. GLASGOW, JR., 0000
JOHN A. GLAZE, 0000
MATTHEW P. GLENN, 0000
MICHAEL P. GLUNK, 0000
ALAN C. GNANN, 0000
PATRICK E. GODFREY, 0000
GARY K. GODWIN, 0000
DANIEL V. GOERES, 0000
LEAH F. GOERKE, 0000
ROBERT V. GOERKE, 0000
BRAD A. GOLDBERG, 0000
NORTHAN F. GOLDEN, 0000
WILLIAM D. GOLDEN, 0000
BRUCE A. GOLDSTEIN, 0000
ROBERT J. GONZALES, JR., 0000
ANGEL D. GONZALEZ, 0000
JEFFREY L. GOODALL, 0000
PAULA A. GOODE, 0000
MARK R. GOODELL, 0000
PATRICK A. GOODMAN, 0000
RONALD R. GOODWIN, 0000
DAVID J. GOOL, 0000
MICHAEL L. GOOLSBY, 0000
FRANK W. GORHAU, JR., 0000
NANCY A. GORMAN, 0000
ANNE L. GORNEY, 0000
LA VERN GOSHEN, 0000
MICHAEL F. GOSNELL, 0000

KENNETH A. GOTSKI, 0000
KEVIN A. GRADT, 0000
ALICIA G. GRAHAM, 0000
FREDERICK W. GRAHAM III, 0000
ROBERT P. GRAHAM, JR., 0000
*WILLIAM E. GRAHAM, 0000
CHARLES D. GRAHN, 0000
JAMES E. GRANDY, 0000
BRUCE A. GRANT, 0000
DOUGLAS D. GRAVES, 0000
*JOHN W. GRAVITT, 0000
MARK A. GRAY, 0000
SHIRLEY D. GRAY, 0000
STEVEN G. GRAY, 0000
DOMINIC P. GRAZIOLI, 0000
CURTIS L. GREEN, 0000
STEPHEN W. GREEN, 0000
STEVEN A. GREENE, 0000
BRUCE D. GREENWALD, 0000
CRAIG R. GREENWOOD, 0000
THOMAS M. GREETAN, 0000
DOUGLAS E. GREGORY, JR., 0000
*MARK T. GREIF, 0000
MICHAEL S. GRENKE, 0000
KENNETH C. GRIER, 0000
*THOMAS C. GREISBAUM, 0000
*DENNIS D. GRIFFIN, 0000
THOMAS A. GRIFFIN, 0000
JAMES L. GRIFFITH, 0000
KEVIN H. GRILL, 0000
DARRYLE J. GRIMES, 0000
REBECCA P. GROOVER, 0000
LUKE G. GROSSMAN, 0000
HERBERT J. GROVER III, 0000
BERNARD J. GRUBER, 0000
*THOMAS L. GRUND, JR., 0000
*VINCENT J. GRZESIAK, 0000
DAREN S. GULBRANSEN, 0000
ROBERT B. GURNER, 0000
DANEIL P. GUSS, 0000
JEFFREY H. GUSTAFSON, 0000
STEPHEN V. GUSTAFSON, 0000
PHILLIP W. GUY, 0000
PAUL G. HAAR, 0000
WILLIAM D. HACK, 0000
TODD C. HACKETT, 0000
DAVID E. HAFER, JR., 0000
AARON F. HAGMAIER, 0000
GEORGE D. HAGY, 0000
SCOTT A. HAINES, 0000
CHARLES H. HAINLINE, 0000
MICHAEL T. HALBIG, 0000
KENNETH P. HALE, 0000
MARK A. HALE, 0000
ZOE M. HALE, 0000
*DOUGLAS E. HALL, 0000
PATRICK J. HALLORAN, 0000
DOUGLAS M. HALSELL, 0000
DONALD L. HAMELIN, JR., 0000
GEORGE P. HAMILTON, 0000
JAMES D. HAMILTON, 0000
TERRY R. HAMILTON, 0000
AMY A. HAMMOND, 0000
JAMES R. HAMPSHIRE, 0000
DANIEL J. HAMPTON, 0000
WILLIAM E. HAMPTON, 0000
DAVID W. HANAK, 0000
DAVID T. HANAWAY, 0000
TIMOTHY HANCOCK, 0000
THOMAS O. HANFORD, 0000
ELIGAH HANKS, 0000
BRIAN J. HANLEY, 0000
JAMES F. HANLON, 0000
WILLIAM C. HANNA, 0000
JOHN J. HANNAH, 0000
TIMOTHY S. HANNUS, 0000
DARREN H. HARA, 0000
JENNIFER M. HARALSON, 0000
MICHAEL A. HARBISON, 0000
*STEVEN D. HARBOUR, 0000
SCOTT R. HARBULA, 0000
CRAIG A. HARDIN, 0000
JAMES W. HARDIN, 0000
GENE L. HARDING, 0000
ROBERT E. HARDWICK, 0000
BRUCE E. HARDY, 0000
*MICHAEL D. HARDY, 0000
JEFFREY W. HARING, 0000
DOUGLAS M. HARLOW, 0000
TODD P. HARMER, 0000
RICHARD P. HARRINGTON, 0000
*DOUGLAS D. HARRIS, 0000
JOHN N. HARRIS, 0000
MARK C. HARRIS, 0000
ROBERT A. HARRIS, 0000
TIMOTHY J. HARRIS, 0000
*WILLIAM C. HARRIS, 0000
STEVEN B. HARRISON, 0000
MICHAEL D. HARSH, 0000
ANDREW E. HART, 0000
SCOTT A. HARTFORD, 0000
DANIEL J. HARTIGAN, 0000
TIM D. HARTJE, 0000
JEFFREY W. HARTLEY, 0000
THOMAS A. HARTUNG, 0000
JAMES P. HARVEY, 0000
WINIFORD L. HARVEY, 0000
*KENNETH R. HATCHER, 0000
DAVID C. HATHAWAY, 0000
DARYL J. HAUCK, 0000
SCOTT D. HAUGAN, 0000
PHIL M. HAUN, 0000
DANIEL J. HAUSAUER, 0000
WALTER E. HAUSSNER, 0000
DOUGLAS L. HAVEN, 0000
DEAN W. HAVILAND, 0000
*JOEL F. HAWKLEY, 0000
KIM D. HAWTHORNE, 0000
TIMOTHY D. HAX, 0000
WAYNE H. HAYES, 0000
MICHAEL D. HAYS, 0000
RICHARD J. HAZDRA, 0000
DEIRDRE HEALEY, 0000
*TIMOTHY R. HEBEL, 0000
GLENN H. HECHT, 0000
*WILLIAM R. HECKER, 0000
SCOT T. HECKMAN, 0000
CLYDE R. HEDDINGS, 0000
MICHAEL L. HEIDT, 0000
GERROLD G. HEIKKINEN, 0000
*TODD E. HEINLE, 0000
SHARON A. HEISE, 0000
DAVID G. HELFRICH, 0000
BRUCE T. HELLEN, 0000
*MARTIN B. HELLER, 0000
ALFRED G. HELM, 0000
JAY B. HELMING, 0000
*PAUL J. HELT, 0000
*CHARLES HELWIG III, 0000
GARY W. HENDERSON, 0000
JAMES P. HENDRICKS, 0000
MASAO HENDRIX, 0000
LINA V. HENNEMAN, 0000
JOHN R. HENNESSEY, 0000
ROBERT J. HENNING, 0000
JOEL K. HENNINGS, 0000
JEFFREY S. HENRY, 0000
LISA L. HENRYHAMILTON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. HENSON, 0000
JOHN D. HENSON, 0000
MARK A. HERING, 0000
SCOTT M. HERRICK, 0000
DONALD M. HERRING, 0000
JAMES W. HERRON, 0000
DAVID L. HESS, 0000
ROBERT W. HESS, JR., 0000
NORMAN B. HETZEL, 0000
BRYAN L. HEVERLY, 0000
KATHLEEN M. HEVERLY, 0000
BRIAN P. HEYNE, 0000
PHILIP L. HEZELTINE, 0000
DANIEL P. HICKEY, 0000
JAMES T. HICKS, 0000
DAVID S. HIDINGER, 0000
THOMAS H. HILDERBRANDT, 0000
PETER J. HILL, 0000
SCOTT WILLIAM HILL, 0000
GEOFFREY H. HILLS, 0000
JONATHAN C. HINES, 0000
WARREN D. HINES, 0000
ANTHONY G. HINGLE, 0000
ANTHONY K. HINSON, 0000
MICHAEL W. HINTON, 0000
MICHAEL P. HINZ, 0000
*ERSKINE D. HIOTT, 0000
*JACK H. HIRRLINGER, JR., 0000
STEVEN T. HISS, 0000
ROBERT J. HOCK, 0000
JACQUELINE R. HODGE, 0000
LAVERN A. HOECHERL, JR., 0000
PETER D. HOFELICH, 0000
PATRICIA D. HOFFMAN, 0000
ANTHONY J. HOGAN, 0000
JAMES J. HOGAN, 0000
TIMOTHY D. HOGAN, 0000
JAMES M. HOGGE, 0000
ROBERT S. HOLBA, 0000
BENNY D. HOLBROOK, 0000
WILLIAM P. HOLCOMB, 0000
ERIC J. HOLDAWAY, 0000
JONATHAN A. HOLDAWAY, 0000
LEWIS L. HOLDEN, JR., 0000
WILLIAM G. HOLDEN, 0000
LINDA T. HOLIEN, 0000
EDGAR M. HOLLANDSWORTH, 0000
PATRICK R. HOLLRAH, 0000
DENISE M. HOLLYWOOD, 0000
ELIZABETH J. HOLMES, 0000
STAN L. HOLMES, 0000
NANCY G. HOLT, 0000
JEFFREY L. HOOD, 0000
GHEVOND, HOOKASSIAN, 0000
PHILLIP W. HOOVER, 0000
STEVEN L. HOPKINS, 0000
ANDREW M. HORTON, 0000
DAVID L. HOSLEY, JR., 0000
MARK F. HOSTETTER, 0000
KEVIN R. HOUDEK, 0000
*GERALD L. HOUNCHELL, 0000
RICKEY L. HOUSTON, 0000
RANDALL B. HOWARD, 0000
BRIAN H. HOWELL, 0000
MICHAEL K. HOWELL, 0000
SCOTT J. HOWER, 0000
JOSEPH G. HRUSKA, 0000
KENNETH R. HUBBARD, 0000
DONALD L. HUDSON, 0000
MICHAEL J. HUEBSCH, 0000
PAUL E. HUFFMAN, 0000
PETER W. HUGGINS, 0000
*RONALD C. HUGGINS, JR., 0000
ANTHONY W. HUGHES, 0000
MICHAEL P. HUGHES, 0000
STEVE D. HUGHES, 0000
HAROLD HUGULEY III, 0000
JAY P. HUMELBAUGH, 0000
DOUGLAS W. HUMERICK, 0000
ERIC N. HUMMER, 0000
KERI S. HUMPHREYCLINARD, 0000
ALICE N. HUNGER, 0000
JORJI R. HUNNICUTT, 0000
JOSEPH HUNT, 0000
JAMES C. HUNTER, 0000
STERLING E. HUNTER, 0000
JOSEPH A. HUNTINGTON, 0000
JEFFREY L. HUPY, 0000
JOHN T. HURD, 0000
WARREN H. HURST, JR., 0000
MICHAEL T. HUSAR, 0000
SHERYL L. HUTCHISON, 0000
MARK T. HUTHMACHER, 0000
KENNETH J. HYATT, 0000
CHARLES K. HYDE, 0000
*JOE G. HYDE, 0000
WILLIAM M. IBINSON, 0000
WINTHROP C. IDLE, 0000
PETER W. INGENLOFF, 0000
DAVID P. INGERSON, 0000
TIMOTHY M. INGLE, 0000
ANDREW D. INGRAM, 0000
PAIGE E. INSCOE, 0000
SHELLY K. ION, 0000
DAVID M. IRVIN, 0000
BILLY J. C. IRWIN, 0000
ANN L. ISAACS, 0000
WALTER L. ISENHOUR, 0000
JAMES J. ISHERWOOD, 0000
GORDON D. ISSLER, 0000
PETER J. IVERSEN, 0000
*LLOYD W. JACK, 0000
DEE J. JACKSON, 0000
KEITH A. JACKSON, 0000
*MICHIEL D. JACKSON, 0000
ROBERT E. JACOBSON, 0000
JOSEPH R. JACYNO, 0000
STEPHEN J. JAECQUES, 0000
*PETER JAHNS, 0000
*BYRON L. JAMES, 0000
CHARLES L. JAMES, JR., 0000
DOUGLAS E. JAMES, 0000
GARY M. JAMES, 0000
JONATHAN E. JAMES, 0000
*STEWART W. JAMES, 0000
THOMAS J. JAMES, 0000
AUSTIN D. JAMESON, 0000
ROBERT A. JAMESON, JR., 0000
GEORGE A JANSEN, JR., 0000
MICHAEL F. JANZEN, 0000
MARK K. JARRATT, 0000
*JOHN A. JAY, 0000
JAMES D. JEFFERS, 0000
*KALEN K. JEFFERS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER B. JELLA, 0000
MARILYN H. JENKINS, 0000
*DAVID J. JENNISON, 0000
KEVIN J. JENS, 0000
JOHN H. JERONIMUS, 0000
GREGORY A. JERRELL, 0000
THOMAS W. JETT, 0000
NATHAN L. JEWELL, 0000
DARRYL E. JOHNSON, 0000
DAVID K. JOHNSON, 0000
DAVID S. JOHNSON, 0000
*ERIC T. JOHNSON, 0000
JANICE R. JOHNSON, 0000
JEFFREY C. JOHNSON, 0000
JERRY L.JOHNSON, 0000
LEIF C. JOHNSON, 0000
LOREN J. JOHNSON, 0000
RAY S. JOHNSON, JR., 0000
RENEE M. JOHNSON, 0000
RICHARD C. JOHNSON, 0000
ROBERT E. JOHNSON, 0000
ROBINN O. JOHNSON, 0000
ROGER G. JOHNSON, 0000
NICHOLAS G. JOHNSTON, 0000
DAVID W. JOLLEY, 0000
WESLEY R. JOLLY, 0000
ANDREW H. JONES, 0000
CHARLES D. JONES, 0000
CHARLES M. JONES, 0000
DAVID E. JONES, 0000
DAVID W. JONES, 0000
GARY A. JONES, 0000
*KEITH R. JONES, 0000
ROBIN G. JONES, 0000
SOREN K. JONES, 0000
STEPHEN D. JONES, 0000
THOMAS C. JONES, 0000
BRIAN T. JORDAN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. JORDAN, 0000
JODI S. JORDAN, 0000
JONATHAN D. JORDAN, 0000
WILLIAM G. JORDAN, JR., 0000
BARBARA J. JORGENSEN, 0000
JEFFREY J. JORGENSEN, 0000
CHAISTOPHER A. JOSEPH, JR., 0000
EDWARD L. JOSLIN, 0000
VINCENT T. JOVENE, JR., 0000
JAMES A. JOYCE, 0000
THOMAS C. JOYCE, 0000
DIMASALANG F. JUNIO, 0000
JOHN H. KAFER, 0000
KEVIN L. KALLSEN, 0000
CHRIS J. KAMPSEN, 0000
PATRICK KANE, 0000
SHIV K. KAPOOR, 0000
ALEXANDER P. KARIBIAN, 0000
DAVID A. KASBERG, 0000
WESTLEY C. KASPER, 0000
STEPHEN A. KATZ, 0000
STEVEN M. KAUFFMANN, 0000
DEREK B. KAUFMAN, 0000
ROBERT H. KAUFMAN, 0000
KARL A. KAUFMANN, 0000
DUANE J. KAUTMANN, 0000
*ILIAS E. KAVOURGIAS, 0000
DANIEL S. KAYE, 0000
RONALD G. KEARNS, 0000
*JOHN W. KEFFER, 0000

*MARTIN E. KEILLOR, 0000
WARREN L. KEITHLEY, JR., 0000
REGINA E. KELKER, 0000
MATTHEW L. KELL, 0000
CHARLES K. KELLEY, 0000
BOBBY E. KELLOGG, JR., 0000
BRIAN T. KELLY, 0000
MARK D. KELLY, 0000
PATRICK J. KELLY, 0000
DUDLEY J. KELSEY, 0000
NATHANIEL A. KELSEY, 0000
MARTIN T. KENDRICK, 0000
CRAIG F. KENNEDY, 0000
DAVID M. KENNEDY, 0000
BRADFORD P. KENNEY, 0000
JAMES E. KENT, 0000
STEVEN D. KEPHART, 0000
LOREN F. KESTING, 0000
MOHAMMED A. KHAN, JR., 0000
JAMES P. KIEHN, 0000
*RONALD J. KIEKLAK, JR., 0000
WESLEY J. KIEL, 0000
*MICHAEL KIFER, 0000
KEVIN J. KILB, 0000
BRIAN M. KILLOUGH, 0000
STEVEN A. KIMBALL, 0000
PAUL E. KIMBLE, 0000
GREGORY S. KIMBRELL, 0000
MICHAEL R. KIMM, 0000
*PETER A. KIND, 0000
WILLIAM D. KINDER, 0000
JEFFREY D. KINDLEY, 0000
CURTIS S. KINDRED, 0000
*KIMBERLY J. KING, 0000
KYLE S. KINGSFORD, 0000
DONALD J. KINLIN II, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. KINNAN, 0000
JAMES A. KIRK, JR., 0000
KENNETH M. KIRK, 0000
KURT JAY KITTI, 0000
PETER H. KLAVIK, 0000
GARY R. KLETT, 0000
MICHAEL K. KLINKMANN, 0000
RICHARD H. KLODNICKI, 0000
MICHAEL T. KLOENNE, 0000
ROBERT M. KNAPP, 0000
BRETT W. KNAUB, 0000
CLETE W. KNAUB, 0000
KEVIN E. KNAUSS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER G. KNEHANS, 0000
CRAIG J. KNIERIM, 0000
MICHAEL T. KNIGHT, 0000
*JOHN B. KNOWLES, 0000
DANIEL G. KNOX, 0000
MICHAEL L. KNUDSON, 0000
STEVEN V. KNUTSON, 0000
KORINA L. KOBYLARZ, 0000
THOMAS J. KOBYLARZ, 0000
MARK P. KOCH, 0000
ROBERT M. KOEHLER, 0000
*STEVEN J. KOENEKER, 0000
PAUL J. KOLODZIEJSKI, 0000
MARK S. KOOPMAN, 0000
KENNETH K. KOPKO, 0000
KENTON C. KORAN, 0000
KENNETH L. KORPAK, 0000
PATRICK J. KOSTRZEWA, 0000
*BILL KOUKOURIKOS, 0000
DAVID L. KOVACH, 0000
JEFFREY L. KOZYRA, 0000
JOHN W., KRAFT, JR., 0000
GEORGE J. KRAKIE, 0000
PETER A. KRAWCZYK, 0000
KEITH R. KREEGER, 0000
CHRISTINE M. KREISELMEIER, 0000
JOHN C. KRESS, 0000
NEAL F. KRINGEL, 0000
OLGA M. KRIPNER, 0000
MICHAEL J. KUCHTA, 0000
STEVEN T. KUENNEN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. KUGEL, 0000
GARRY L. KUHN, 0000
KYLE W. KUHN, 0000
MARK L. KUNZ, 0000
RUSSELL D. KURTZ, 0000
ALLEN E. LACEY, 0000
BURNETT F. LACHANCE, 0000
STEPHEN M. LADE, 0000
PETER A. LADEN, 0000
ANDREW E. LAGER, 0000
ERIC M. LAGIER, 0000
MICHAEL L. LAKOS, 0000
STEPHEN T. LAMBERT, 0000
GEORGE H. LAMONT, 0000
BILLY R. LANGFORD, 0000
JAMES C. LANGFORD II, 0000
STEPHEN A. LANGFORD, 0000
DONALD R. LANGILLE, 0000
RANDEL K. LANGLOSS, 0000
TROY V. LANIER, 0000
JOEL D. LAPLANTE, 0000
BENNETT K. LARSON, 0000
DAVID N. LARSON, 0000
EDWIN R. LARSON, 0000
ERIK S. LARSON, 0000
JON A. LARVICK, 0000
DAVID L. LASALLE, 0000
SCOTT A. LAUSMAN, 0000
STEVEN G. LAVOYE, 0000
*ANTHONY B. LAW, 0000
PAUL D. LAW, 0000
STEVEN B. LAWLOR, 0000
WILLIAM C. LAWSON, JR., 0000
DAVID J. LAYFIELD, 0000
TIMOTHY J. LEA, 0000
RAYMOND D. LEADBETTER, 0000
KIRK A. LEAR, 0000
TERRENCE A. LEARY, 0000
WILLIAM G. LEARY III, 0000
JONATHAN G. LEATHERS, 0000
GARY J. LEAVY, 0000
DAVID J. LEDUM, 0000
ALAN R. LEE, 0000
JONI R. LEE, 0000
KEITH E. LEE, 0000
*LUCY LEE, 0000
PETER A. LEE, 0000
RICKEY A. LEE, 0000
ROBERT R. LEE, 0000
JAMES M. LEFAVOR, 0000
ANTONE L. LEFEVRE, 0000
DAVID R. LEHOSIT, 0000
*MICHAEL E. LEIGHTON, 0000
ERIC L. LEININGER, 0000
BARRY P. LEISTER, 0000
SCOTT P. LEMAY, 0000
THERESA L. LENGENFELDER, 0000
NICHOLAS C. LENTO, 0000
ROBERT A. LEONARD, 0000
JOHN J. LERCH, 0000
MICHAEL J. LESINSKI, 0000
MARCUS R. LESSEUR, 0000
ANDREW W. LESTER, 0000
ROBERT M. LETOURNEAU, 0000
*JAMES S. LEWIS, 0000
MILA D. LIETZKE, 0000
KIMBERLY A. LIMCANGCO, 0000
MARK J. LINDHORST, 0000
JEFFERY R. LINSKENS, 0000
ROBERT S. LIPPERT, 0000
STEVEN M. LIPSCOMB, 0000
LAURIE J. LISEC, 0000
STEPHEN W. LISKA, 0000
LARRY L. LITTRELL, 0000
ROBERT A. LITTRELL, 0000
BRIAN J. LLOYD, 0000
RICKY J. LOCASTRO, 0000
PHIL LOCKLEAR, 0000
JON T. LOCKWOOD, 0000
MICHAEL F. LOGRANDE, 0000
CLAYTON LOHN, 0000
JAMES W. LONG, 0000
*JANNETTE T. LOOTENS, 0000
PATRICK A. LOPARDI, 0000
JOHN A. LOPES, 0000
LUKE A. LORANG, 0000
JEFFREY B. LORENS, 0000
ERIC C. LORRAINE, 0000
*GEORGE E. LOUGHRAN, 0000
*JOHN C. LOUGHREY, 0000
MARTIN E. LOVATO, JR., 0000
RICKY A. LOVE, 0000
JOSEPH R. LOVELACE, 0000
*STEVEN L. LOVER, 0000
THOMAS J. LOWRY, 0000
*DANIEL S. LUCE, 0000
TIMOTHY R. LUCE, 0000
*MICHAEL J. LUCIER, 0000
*PATRICK P. LUDFORD, 0000
DAVID A. LUJAN, 0000
ROBERT L. LUKAVICH, 0000
JAMES P. LUKE, 0000
KYLE C. LUNDBERG, 0000
MICHAEL R. LUNN, 0000
GREGG A. LUNSFORD, 0000
STEVEN R. LUSK, 0000
JEFFREY E. LUTES, 0000
*ALLISON G. LYNCH, 0000
MICHAEL S. LYNCH, 0000
DAVID F. LYNN, 0000
*BRENT T. LYON, 0000
*DENNIS R. LYON, 0000
BOBBY J. LYONS, JR., 0000
ROBERT E. LYONS, 0000
WILLIAM A. LYONS, 0000
DAVID J. MACARTHUR II, 0000
STEELE R. MACFARLANE, 0000
JACQUELINE M. MACH, 0000
JEAN MACINTYRE, 0000
RICHARD P. MACKEEN, 0000
LEONARD D. MACKIE, 0000
MARTIN L. MACNABB, 0000
STEVEN A. MACUT, 0000
*BRUCE A. MADDOX, 0000
DAVID D. MADDOX, 0000
STEVEN W. MADSON, 0000
JAMES A. MAESTAS, 0000
CRAIG A. MAHAN, 0000
DAVID H. MAHARREY, JR., 0000
MICHAEL K. MAJOR, 0000
TERRENCE W. MAKI, JR., 0000
DENNIS J. MALFER, JR., 0000
*DOMINIC V. MALLAMO, 0000
DONALD P. MALONEY, 0000
VITO MANENTE, 0000
ROBERT L. MANESS, 0000
VICTOR J. MANGES, 0000
THOMAS J. MANGNER, 0000
DANIEL J. MANGUM, 0000
STEVEN S. MANLEY, 0000
SCOTT E. MANNING, 0000
STEPHEN L. MANSPEAKER, 0000
*TIMOTHY H. MARBURGER, 0000
*DAVID H. MARCHANT, 0000
ANTHONY J. MARCHESANO, 0000
*BRAD G. MARCUM, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. MARDIS, 0000
JAMES RALEY MAREK, 0000
MICHAEL J. MARES, 0000
KURT M. MARISA, 0000
CHRISTINE R. MARKWARDT, 0000
*DAVID L. MARLIN, 0000
MICHAEL P. MARTEL, 0000
GLENN D. MARTIN, 0000
JOHN M. MARTIN, 0000
LARRY D. MARTIN, 0000
PETER J. MARTIN, 0000
ROBBIE D. MARTIN, 0000
RONALD K. MARTIN, 0000
SCOTT D. MARTIN, 0000
WALTER D. MARTIN, 0000
DENNIS B. MARTINEZ, 0000
JOE A. MARTINEZ II, 0000
GREGORY S. MARZOLF, 0000
PHILLIP J. MASCIOLA, 0000
BRETT S. MASON, 0000
JOHN T. MASSEE, 0000
RUSSELL F. MATHERS, 0000
STUART K. MATHEW, 0000
KARL S. MATHIAS, 0000
STEPHEN M. MATSON, 0000
LINDA K. MATTHEWS, 0000
ROBERT J. MATTHEWS, 0000
JOHN W. MATTISON, 0000
CHARLES C. MAU, 0000
FRED C. MAUGHAN, 0000
*BRIAN A. MAVES, 0000
SCOTT G. MAW, 0000
*CHARLES D. MAXWELL, 0000
JEFFREY W. MAXWELL, 0000
DANIEL K. MAY, 0000
STEVEN A. MAYER, 0000
*SIDNEY F. MAYEUX, 0000
KIRK M. MAYS, 0000
THOMAS J. MAZAIKA, 0000
*RICHARD S. MC ALISTER, 0000
LEE G. MC ANGUS, 0000
TIMOTHY S. MC ARTHUR, 0000
CHRISTOPHER B. MC CAMMANT, 0000
DAMIAN J. MC CARTHY, 0000
DANIEL H. MC CARTHY, 0000
*MICHAEL J. MC CARTHY, 0000
EDWARD A. MC CARTY, 0000
JOHN D. MC CAULEY, 0000
MARK A. MC CAULEY, 0000
ROBYN L. MC CAULEY, 0000
*THOMAS I. MC CLAIN, 0000
SCOTT D. MC CLEAN, 0000
BRIAN A. MC CLELLAN, 0000
GEOFFREY MC CLENDON, 0000
GEORGE W. MC CLENDON, 0000
VICKY L. MC CLENDON, 0000
BRUCE H. MC CLINTOCK, 0000
MARK A. MC CLURE, 0000
GARY L. MC COLLUM, 0000
*JESSICA M. MC CONNELL, 0000
GREGORY B. MC COOL, 0000
PATRICK E. MC CORMACK, 0000
BRADLEY K. MC COY, 0000
*GARY R. MC CRACKEN, 0000
PATRICK J. MC CREA, 0000
ROBERT T. MC CREADIE, 0000
BRIAN J. MC CULLOUGH, 0000
MICHAEL J. MC CULLOUGH, 0000
*TODD W. MC COLLOUGH, 0000
JEFFREY R. MC DANIELS, 0000
DENNIS P. MC DEVITT, JR., 0000
JOHN F. MC DEVITT, JR., 0000
JOHN B. MC DONALD, JR., 0000
MAURICE D MC DONALD, 0000
TIMOTHY S. MC DONALD, 0000
BRADLEY I. MC ELDERRY, 0000
KEVIN A. MC FADDEN, 0000
JOHN P. MC GARRITY, 0000
GARVIN A. MC GETTRICK, 0000
KENNETH A. MC GHEE, 0000
KEVIN P. MC GLAUGHLIN, 0000
EDWARD J. MC GOVERN, 0000
FRANCIS M. MC GUIGAN, 0000
STEVEN D. MC INTOSH, 0000
JAMES R. MC IRVIN, 0000
JOSEPH R. MC KAY, 0000
*JAMES K. MC KENZIE, 0000
FLOYD A. MC KINNEY, 0000
EDWARD L. MCKINZIE, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER C. MCLANE, 0000
*PAUL R. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
SCOTT L. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
JOHN S. MCLAURIN, JR., 0000
*FREDERICK K. MCMAHON, 0000
JAMES K. MCMAHON, 0000
BENJAMIN S. MCMULLEN, 0000
JOHN K. MCMULLEN, 0000
ROGER A. MCNEAL, 0000
ANDREW E. MCNEAR, 0000
MARY E. MCNEELY, 0000
*MARTIN P. MCNULTY, 0000
DONALD D. MCQUOWN, 0000
MARY E. MCRAE, 0000
MARTHA E. MCSALLY, 0000
STEVEN E. MCTIER, 0000
CARL G. MCVICKER, 0000
SHANNON P. MEADE, 0000
JOHN W. MEADOR, 0000
DOUGLAS P. MEAKER, 0000
CECIL A. MEDINA, 0000
MARK S. MEDVEC, 0000
*GREGORY M. MEEK, 0000
MARTHA A. MEEKER, 0000
RUSSEL J. MEGARGLE, 0000
MICHAEL R. MEIER, 0000
ERIC W. MEIERS, 0000
DOUGLAS A. MEIKLE, 0000
JAMES M. MEINTEL, 0000
STEPHEN P. MELROY, 0000
GARY P. MELUSEN, 0000
JOSE MENCHACA, JR., 0000
GEORGE T. MENKER, JR., 0000
RODNEY C. MERANDA, 0000
RICHARD T. MERCADO, 0000
DEBORAH A. MERCURIO, 0000

*KEVIN R. MERTENS, 0000
RICHARD A. METCALF, 0000
GREGORY W. MEUNIER, 0000
*DOUGLAS B. MEYER, 0000
JACK A. MEYER, JR., 0000
ROBERT C. MEYER, 0000
STEPHEN L. MEYER, 0000
DAVID A. MEYERS, 0000
GEORGE A. MEYERS, 0000
LEONARD MEYERS, 0000
*LINO M. MIANI, 0000
CHRISTOPHER MICELI, 0000
STEVEN B. MICHAEL, 0000
JOHN E. MICHEL, 0000
DAVID A. MICHELETTI, 0000
DARIN S. MIDDLETON, 0000
ROBERT E. MIGLIONICO, 0000
STEPHEN J. MIHALIK, 0000
DOUGLAS B. MILES, 0000
*BARRY G. MILLER, 0000
DANIEL J. MILLER, JR., 0000
DANIEL R. MILLER, 0000
DARREN L. MILLER, 0000
*DAVID A. MILLER, 0000
DAVID J. MILLER, 0000
DENNIS J. MILLER, 0000
EVAN M. MILLER, 0000
GREGORY L. MILLER, 0000
JOHN G. MILLER, 0000
*JOHN L. MILLER, 0000
KEITH E. MILLER, 0000
LAWRENCE M. MILLER, 0000
MARK B. MILLER, 0000
STACY L. MILLER, 0000
STUART W. MILLER, 0000
TIMOTHY M. MILLER, 0000
VINCENT B. MILLER, 0000
MICHAEL E. MILLIGAN, 0000
*DUANE A. MILLS, 0000
JOHN B. MILLS, 0000
DENNIS W. MILLSAP, 0000
*JOSEPH A. MINIOR, 0000
MICHAEL S. MINSHALL, 0000
*RAUL T. MIRELES, 0000
DAVID S. MIROLLI, 0000
SCOTT J. MISCHO, 0000
MICHAEL J. MISENHIMER, 0000
ANDREW MISKOVICH III, 0000
DARRYL G. MITCHELL, 0000
JAMES L. MITCHELL, 0000
JOHN L. MITCHELL, 0000
*JOHN R. MITCHELL, 0000
*MARIAMNE R. MITCHELL, 0000
ROBERT E. MITCHELL, 0000
KURT H. MITTMANN, 0000
DANIEL G. MIX, 0000
PETER H. MIYARES, 0000
THOMAS B. MIZELLE, 0000
DAVID B. MOBLEY, 0000
JOHN E. MOCHOWSKI, 0000
TERRY L. MOCK II, 0000
JAY D. MOHEIT, 0000
JEFFREY L. MOLER, 0000
ANDREW J. MOLNAR, 0000
JOHN F. MONAHAN, 0000
ROBERT E. MONROE, 0000
CARY W. MONTGOMERY, 0000
JAMES M. MONTGOMERY, 0000
JON B. MONTGOMERY, 0000
RONALD E. MONTGOMERY, 0000
WILLIAM L. MONTGOMERY, JR., 0000
CHRISTIAN E. MOORE, 0000
RONALD R. MOORE, 0000
EDWARD T. MOORE, 0000
JASON A. MOORE, 0000
RICHARD S. MOORE, 0000
WILLIAM L. MOORE, 0000
ESEQUIEL J. MORA, JR., 0000
ALBERTO MORENOBONET, 0000
CHERYL A. MORGAN, 0000
DAVID A. MORGAN, 0000
JEFFREY W. MORGAN, 0000
*ROBERT A. MORIARTY, 0000
*GUY H. MORLEY, JR., 0000
MICHAEL G. MORRIS, 0000
MICHAEL L. MORRIS, 0000
PATRICK C. MORRIS, 0000
TIMOTHY R. MORRIS, 0000
WILLIAM A. MORRIS, 0000
DARYL RAY MORRISON, 0000
DEBBY W. MORRISON, 0000
GARY G. MORRISON, 0000
MARSHALL T. MORRISON, 0000
DOUGLAS E. MORSE, 0000
SCOTT A. MORTON, 0000
WILLIAM R. MOSCHELLE, 0000
RANDY J. MOSER, 0000
ROBERT L. MOSES, 0000
JAY M. MOSLEY, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. MOSS, 0000
*JEFFREY A. MOSS, 0000
NORBERT A. MOTZ, 0000
SCOTT K. MUESSIG, 0000
ROBERT A. MULHERAN, 0000
KENNETH B. MULLIGAN, 0000
*MARY E.L. MULLIGAN, 0000
BRIAN J. MULLIN, 0000
COLLEEN R. MURPHY, 0000
RICHARD M. MURPHY, 0000
*THOMAS J. MURPHY, 0000
TIMOTHY J. MURPHY, 0000
KENNETH M. MURRAY, 0000
DOUGLAS B. MYERS, 0000
*KENNETH A. MYERS, 0000
*TODD A. NADING, 0000
GARY J. NANFITO, 0000
THOMAS C. NANKERVIS, 0000
TRACY J. NASH, 0000
DARREN I. NEAL, 0000
PAMELA J. NEAL, 0000
TODD W. NEAL, 0000
JAMES E. NEEDHAM, 0000
WILLIAM M. NEELY, 0000
ERIC L. NELSON, 0000
LARRY S. NELSON, 0000
*PAUL R. NELSON, 0000
THOMAS P. NELSON, 0000
WILLIAM J. NELSON, 0000
*JOHN R. NERI, 0000
RUSSELL A. NERO, JR., 0000
EDWARD J. NEVERA, 0000
RODNEY S. NEVILLE, 0000
JOHN D. NEWBERRY, 0000
JOHN NICASTRI, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER A. NICELY, 0000
CHERYL V. NICHOLAS, 0000
DONNA C. NICHOLAS, 0000
STEVEN J. NICHOLS, 0000
CARL W. NICHOLSON, 0000
PAUL A. NICHOLSON, 0000
DANIEL M. NICKERSON, 0000
TIMOTHY P. NICKERSON, 0000
MICHAEL G. NIGL, 0000
*RICHARD A. NOBBS, 0000
LOUIS J. NOLAN, 0000
DANIEL A. NOLLETTE, 0000
THOMAS J. NOON, 0000
DANIEL E. NORTON, 0000
MARCUS F. NOVAK, 0000
PAUL NOWOTNY, 0000
JAMES G. NUGENT, 0000
MARK E. NUNN, 0000
CHARLES P. NUSSMAN, 0000
BRET L. NYANDER, 0000
BRIAN E. OAKELEY, 0000
*RICHARD L. OARR, 0000
JOHN S. OATES, 0000
GARY W. OBERMEYER, 0000
THOMAS F. OBOYLE, 0000
PRESTON E. OBRAY, 0000
DOMINGO R. OCHOTORENA, 0000
BRIAN E. OCONNOR, 0000
ANTHONY J. ODEGARD, 0000
EARL B. ODOM III, 0000
ROGER E. OERTER, 0000
DONALD T. OESTERLE, JR., 0000
DAVID J. OLDER, 0000
STEVEN G. OLIVE, 0000
JERALD G. OLIVER, 0000
SAMUEL OLIVER, JR., 0000
LAURA L. OLSEN, 0000
*KIMBERLY A. OLSON, 0000
DAVID K. OMUNDSEN, 0000
*DAVID L. ONAN, 0000
EDWARD J. O'NEAL, JR., 0000
SEAN E. ONEAL, 0000
HOWARD L. ORBAN, 0000
BRIAN P. OREAR, 0000
VINCENT A. ORLANDO, III, 0000
TERRY M. ORNER, 0000
RONALD A. ORNSTEDT, 0000
*DONALD R. ORR, 0000
JONATHAN L. ORTEGA, 0000
CHRISTOPHER ORTIZ, 0000
JUAN C. ORTIZ, 0000
RONALD A. ORTIZ, 0000
DALE E. ORVEDAHL, 0000
DAWSON S. OSLUND, 0000
JAMES M. OUELLETTE, 0000
MICHAEL T. OUELLETTE, 0000
DAVID M. OUTLAW, 0000
JAMES L. OVERSTREET, 0000
JONATHAN H. OWENS, 0000
PATRICK J. OWENS, 0000
SABRINA T.S. OZISIK, 0000
DAVID J. PABST, 0000
POLLYANNA A. PADDEN, 0000
MICHAEL T. PANARISI, 0000
HENRY P. PANDES, 0000
MARK W. PAPEN, 0000
CHARLES H. PAPPAS, 0000
BRAD R. PARKER, 0000
GUY E. PARKER, 0000
RANDALL O. PARKER, 0000
STEVEN B. PARKER, 0000
*STEVEN E. PARKER, 0000
CHARLES S. PARKHURST, 0000
GEOFFREY S. PARKHURST, 0000
KELLY J. PARKINSON, 0000
*MICHAEL A. PARKS, 0000
ALAN T. PARMATER, 0000
RUSSELL R. PARR, 0000
GEORGE E. PARROTT, III, 0000
DAVID W. PARSONS, 0000
GREGORY D. PARSONS, 0000
JAMES R. PASSARO, 0000
CHARLES W. PATNAUDE, 0000
CHRIS B. PATTERSON, 0000
JOHN K. PATTERSON, 0000
RANDALL W. PATTERSON, 0000
RICHARD V. PATTERSON, 0000
MARC E. PATTI, 0000
CREG D. PAULK, 0000
JOHN A. PAULSON, 0000
JEFFREY B. PAXSON, 0000
JACK S. PAYNE, JR., 0000
*THOMAS G. PEA, II, 0000
DENNIS K. PEARSON, 0000
JOHN L. PECKO, 0000
DAVID R. PEDERSEN, 0000
JUDITH H. PEER, 0000
*PAMELA M. PEISTRUP, 0000
PATRICK A. PENLAND, 0000
WILLIAM D. PENN, 0000
VERNON L. PEPPERS, 0000
LEE J. PERA, 0000
RICKY D. PERALTA, 0000
JOAQUIN E. PEREDA, 0000
JOHN D. PEREZ, 0000
PETER J. PERINO III, 0000
DONALD E. PERKINS, JR., 0000
GERALD M. PERKINS, 0000
LEE ANN PERKINS, 0000
JOHN J. PERNOT, 0000
GREGORY PERRY, 0000
GAYLE C. PETERS, 0000
STEVEN F. PETERS, 0000
MICHAEL R. PETTY, 0000
VINH T. PHAN, 0000
ERIC M. HARRIS, 0000
GORDON D. PHILLIPS, 0000
KELLY L. PHILLIPS, 0000
LISA M. PHILLIPS, 0000
NEAL C. PHILLIPS, 0000
TODD R. PHILLIPS, 0000
BRYAN G. PHILLIPSON, 0000
ROBERT A. PICCERILLO, JR., 0000
DONALD D. PICKINPAUGH, 0000
*ERIC J. PIERCE, 0000
GEORGE M. PIERCE II, 0000
*LONNIE D. PIERCE, 0000
MARK W. PIERCE, 0000
TODD M. PIERGROSSI, 0000
*BRIAN C. PIERSON, 0000
MICHAEL D. PIETRYGA, 0000
JOHN S. PIGEON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. PIKE, 0000
WILLIAM B. PILCHER, JR., 0000
MICHAEL D. PILKENTON, 0000
MARC L. PINCINCE, 0000
JOSEPH M. PINCKNEY, JR., 0000
SAMUEL P. PINO, 0000
JOHN R. PIOLETTI, 0000
*ANTHONY C. PISO, 0000
KELLY M. PITTMAN, 0000
LEE T. PITTMAN, 0000
MICHELLE R. PLACE, 0000
JEFFREY M. PLATE, 0000
DEBORAH L. PLEASANT, 0000
MICHAEL T. PLEHN, 0000
JOHN M. PLETCHER, 0000
*RONALD L. PLOUCH, 0000
PRESTON M. PLOUS, 0000
THOMAS C. PLUMMER, 0000
NATHAN S. PLY, 0000
DOUGLAS R. PLYMALE, 0000
VAN L. POINDEXTER, JR., 0000
MARK A. POKORNY, 0000
HENRY W. POLCZER, 0000
JOHN M. POLHEMUS, 0000
JAMES D. POOLE, 0000
MICHAEL J. POOLE, 0000
PETER T. POPP, 0000
PATRICK E. POPPERT, 0000
TERRENCE G. POPRAVAK, 0000
ALVIN L. PORTER, 0000
*KEELY PORTER, 0000
SCOTT H. PORTER, 0000
THOMAS J. PORTERFIELD, 0000
BRUCE H. POSTEL, 0000
GARY L. POTTER, JR.,0000
TONY POUNDS, 0000
JOHN P. POWELL, 0000
STEVEN W. POWELL, 0000
JOSEPH E. POWERS, 0000
CHARLES B. POWLEY, 0000
DAVID S. PRATHER, 0000
AMANDA J. PREBLE, 0000
WILLIAM E. PRENOT, 0000
LESTER E. PRESTON, 0000
SHARON J. PRESZLER, 0000
*DONALD G. PRIAULX, 0000
BRADLEY W. PRICE, 0000
MARY C. PRICE, 0000
STEVEN A. PRICE, 0000
JEFFREY W. PRICHARD, 0000
RONALD R. PRINCE, 0000
JERRY W. PRITCHARD, 0000
ROBERT W. PROUHET, 0000
BRADFORD A. PROVENCAL, 0000
SCOTT A. PROVOST, 0000
PAASHKA E. PROWELL, 0000
GINA G. PRUETT, 0000
MARK D. PRUITT, 0000
MARTHA S. PRUITT, 0000
DAVID C. PTAK, 0000
MARK W. PUGH, 0000
MARTA L. PURVIS, 0000
JONATHAN R. PUTNEY, 0000
DAVID W. PUVOGEL, 0000
*ALAN R. PYBAS, 0000
JEFFREY M. QUINN, 0000
MARCUS J. QUINT, 0000
CARLOS B. QUINTANA, 0000
KEITH M. QUINTON, 0000
CARLOS W.W. QUITERIO, 0000
JOSEPHINE L. RACICOT, 0000
JAMES A. RADER, 0000
JAMES C. RAGSDALE, 0000
DONALD J. RAINES, 0000
RICHARD A. RAINES, 0000
RANDALL J. RAINS, 0000
GEORGE C. RAMEY, 0000
JEFFREY A. RAMMES, 0000
JULIANNE F. RAMSEY, 0000
MARGARET M. RANALLI, 0000
MARY A. RANDOUR, 0000
PAUL V. RASTAS, 0000
PATRICIA A. RATTERREE, 0000
GREGORY S. RAU, 0000
ROBERT O. RAU, JR., 0000

JAMES J. RAVELLA, 0000
THOMAS S. RAY, JR., 0000
VICTOR L. RAY, 0000
MARK J. REA, 0000
PAUL K. REAGAN, 0000
RONALD D. REAGAN, 0000
DAVID A. REARICK, 0000
DAPHNE E. RECHNER, 0000
DALE R. RECKLEY, 0000
*TIMOTHY D. REDDER, 0000
PHILIP J. REDING, 0000
MICHAEL D. REED, 0000
THOMAS G. REED, 0000
VICTORIA H. REED, 0000
*MARK R. REESE, 0000
ERIC N. REEVES, 0000
LOUISE S. REEVES, 0000
MARTIN N. REFF, 0000
DANIEL J. REGAN, JR., 0000
MICHAEL D. REGAN, 0000
JOHN R. REID, 0000
TODD J. REIDT, 0000
BRIAN J. REILLY, 0000
DANIEL L. REILLY, 0000
JIM G. REILY, JR., 0000
EMIL J. REIMAN, 0000
KENNETH A. REIMAN, 0000
MARK D. REINEKE, 0000
JAMES R. REITZEL, 0000
RICHARD REMINGTON, 0000
GARY O. RENFROW, 0000
STELLA R. RENNER, 0000
STANLEY M. RESNIK, 0000
GEORGE J. REYES, 0000
DOUGLAS R. REYNOLDS, 0000
*MICHAEL E. REYNOLDS, 0000
WAYNE M. REZZONICO, 0000
STEVEN A. RHUDE, 0000
HARVEY B. RICE, 0000
WILLIAM E. RICHARD, 0000
*JONATHAN M. RICHARDS, 0000
*JOSEPH A. RICHARDSON, 0000
RANDALL JAMES RICHERT, 0000
*TODD F. RICKABAUGH, 0000
ROBERT A. RICKERT, 0000
JACK R. RICKMAN, JR., 0000
ROBERT Q. RIDEOUT, 0000
DONALD H. RIDOLFI, JR., 0000
LARRY A. RIDOLFI, 0000
DAVID M. RIEL, 0000
HEINRICH K. RIEPING, JR., 0000
*VINCENT T. RIES, 0000
SHAWN P. RIFE, 0000
BRIAN S. RIGSBY, 0000
MICHAEL J. RIHA, 0000
GRAHAM W. RINEHART, 0000
EDWARD J. RINKE, 0000
EDWARD M. RIVERA, 0000
*MARK P. RIVERA, 0000
JOSE A. RIVERAGAUD, 0000
NEHEMIAH RIVERS, JR., 0000
KENNETH R. RIZER, 0000
DOYE P. ROBBINS, JR., 0000
JULIE M. ROBEL, 0000
LESLIE DIANE ROBERSON, 0000
ANTONY G. ROBERTIELLO, 0000
BLAKE A. ROBERTS, 0000
BRENDA K. ROBERTS, 0000
*RONALD K. ROBERTS, 0000
RUSSELL G. ROBERTS, 0000
BLAKE W. ROBERTSON, 0000
DWIGHT E. ROBERTSON, 0000
JAMES M. ROBERTSON, 0000
STEPHEN D. ROBERTSON, 0000
GARY J. ROBINETT, 0000
BOBBY L. ROBINSON II, 0000
STEVEN M. ROBINSON, 0000
TIMOTHY H. ROBINSON, 0000
LAWRENCE O. ROCHE, 0000
*KYLE E. ROCKETT, 0000
*KENNETH L. RODGERS, 0000
RICKEY S. RODGERS, 0000
ERNEST H. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
VICTOR M. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. ROEDER, 0000
DONNA M. ROGERS, 0000
MARILYN R. ROGERS, 0000
GENE W. ROLES, 0000
MARK C. ROMAN, 0000
*BARBARA A. ROMANO, 0000
JOSEPH L. ROMANO, III, 0000
SEBASTIAN ROMEO, 0000
JOHN R. ROMERO, 0000
*STEPHEN J. ROMOLO, 0000
HARRY M. RONSMAN, 0000
PETER B. ROOHR, 0000
GREGORY M. ROOT, 0000
DONALD G. ROSE, 0000
PAT A. ROSE, JR., 0000
SCOTT A. ROSE, 0000
ROBERT A. ROSENTHAL, 0000
KEITH P. ROSS, 0000
MARK S. ROSS, 0000
MICHAEL D. ROTHSTEIN, 0000
MATTHEW D. ROTONDARO, 0000
CHARLES R. ROUSE, 0000
CHARLES A. ROUTHIER, 0000
MARK E. ROVERSE, 0000
JESSIE J. ROWE, III, 0000
MARBEL C. ROY, 0000
TOMISLAV Z. RUBY, 0000
JOHN F. RUED, 0000
*JOHN D. RUEHLE, 0000
JASON R. RUESCH, 0000
PAUL L. RUMBAUGH, II, 0000
RANDOLPH W. RUSHWORTH, 0000
MICHAEL J. RUSNACK, 0000
DAVID M. RUSS, 0000
JOHN A. RUSS, 0000
*CLINTON L. RUSSELL, 0000
DOUGLAS D. RUSSELL, JR., 0000
EDWARD J. RUSSELL, 0000
JOHN S. RUSSELL, 0000
ROBERT L. RUSSELL, JR., 0000
SCOTT E. RUSSELL, 0000
MICHAEL D. RUSSO, 0000
LINDA B. RUTHERFORD, 0000
JAMES P. RYAN, 0000
JEFFREY A. RYAN, 0000
LON S. RYAN, 0000
PATRICK T. RYAN, 0000
MATTHEW D. RYERSE, 0000
MELVIN D. SACHS, 0000
JAMES B. SACKREITER, 0000
JOHN T. SACKS, 0000
SAMUEL R. SAGER, 0000
BRADLEY D. SAILER, 0000
CARMIA L. SALCEDO, 0000
CLAUDE E. SALCEDO, 0000
DAVID L. SALM, 0000
ERIC V. SALOMONSON, 0000
JOHN E. SALTZMAN, 0000
RICHARD P. SAMUELS, 0000
ROBERTO J. SANCHEZ, 0000
JOSE A. SANCHEZANDINO, 0000
CHRISTINE C. SANDERS, 0000
DAMIAN P. SANDHEINRICH, 0000
THOMAS R. SANDS, 0000
*RAYMOND SANTIAGO, 0000
EDWIN SANTOS, 0000
JOHN C. SASSE, 0000
NEIL T. SAUVE, 0000
DAVID E. SAVILLE, 0000
VINCENT SAVINO, 0000
*CASEY J.C. SAY, 0000
DION SCAGLIONE, 0000
LEIGH A. SCARBORO, 0000
*KENNETH A. SCARBOROUGH, 0000
ROBERT S. SCHAAB, 0000
MICHAEL K. SCHAEFFER, 0000
JOHN GEORGE SCHAEUFELE IV, 0000
MARK R. SCHAIBLE, 0000
*STANLEY M. SCHALCK, 0000
VALERIE L. SCHALK, 0000
LUKE J. SCHAUB, 0000
WALTER R. SCHENBERGER, JR., 0000
TIMOTHY J. SCHEPPER, 0000
BRADLY A. SCHERER, 0000
*DAVID J. SCHERMER, 0000
KENNETH T. SCHIESSL, 0000
TODD C. SCHIFF, 0000
RALPH G. SCHINDLER, 0000
MARK E. SCHLICHTE, 0000
LOIS J. SCHLOZ, 0000
RHONDA D. SCHLUMPBERGER, 0000
STEVEN J. SCHLUMPBERGER, 0000
CHARLES R. SCHMETZER, 0000
JOEL B. SCHMICK, 0000
ERIC W. SCHMIDT, 0000
*LOUIS D. SCHMIDT, 0000
*CURTIS L. SCHMUCKER, 0000
*CHARLES L. SCHNARR, 0000
*EDWARD F. SCHNAUBELT, 0000
KEVIN B. SCHNEIDER, 0000
*MARK L. SCHRADER, 0000
ROBERT H. SCHRINK, 0000
JAMES T. SCHUELER, JR., 0000
JOHN J. SCHULDHEISS, 0000
TERRY W. SCHULLER, 0000
*MARK SCHULTZ, 0000
RAY C. SCHULTZ, 0000
JIMMIE D. SCHUMAN, JR., 0000
DIANA K. SCHUMICK, 0000
GREGORY E. SCHWAB, 0000
ERIC L. SCHWALM, 0000
MARK D. SCHWALM, 0000
KAREN F. SCHWARTZ, 0000
STEPHEN R. SCHWARTZ, 0000
RICHARD P. SCHWING, 0000
LELAND G. SCIFERS, 0000
RICHARD W. SCOBEE, 0000
COERT C. SCOGGIN, 0000
RAYMOND D. SCOTT, 0000
TODD J. SCOTT, 0000
WINFIELD J. SCOTT, 0000
JOHN A. SCOTTO, 0000
WILLIAM R. SCRUITSKY, 0000
TIMOTHY M. SCULLY, 0000
LANE A. SEAHOLM, 0000
STEPHEN L. SEAMAN, 0000
MICHAEL J. SEAY, 0000
JOANNE B. SECHREST, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. SEDGWICK, 0000
PAUL F. SEELING, 0000
DALE E. SEIBER, 0000
JOEL SEIDBAND, 0000
JEFFREY D. SEINWILL, 0000
GREGORY S. SELLERS, 0000
MARK A. SELLERS, 0000
GREG A. SEMMEL, 0000
JOHN M. SEPANSKI, 0000
TODD J. SERRES, 0000
DAVID L. SETSER, 0000
THADDEUS P. SETTLEMIRE, 0000
*GREGORY T. SETTLES, 0000
DOUGLAS E. SEVIER, 0000
*DOUGLAS S. SEWALL, 0000
THEODORE D. SEYMOUR, 0000
DONALD L. SHAFFER, 0000
KEVIN F. SHANAHAN, 0000
TIMOTHY P. SHANKS, 0000
ANDRE G. SHAPPELL, 0000
FRANK K. SHARP, 0000
ROBERT W. SHARP, 0000
*CHRISTOPHER C. SHARPE, 0000
THOMAS J. SHARPY, 0000
JOHN S. SHATTUCK, 0000
MARK SHEEHAN, 0000
MICHAEL J. SHEEHAN, 0000
DAVID SHELIKOFF, 0000
THEODORE F. SHELTON, 0000
*DAVID E. SHEPARD, 0000
GREGORY W. SHEPPARD, 0000
RICHARD O. SHEPPARD, 0000
SCOTT F. SHERIDAN, 0000
WILLIAM A. SHERMAN, 0000
CHARLES B. SHERWIN, JR., 0000
PAUL SHEVLIN, 0000
LEE A. SHICK, 0000
CHARLES P. SHIFFLETT, 0000
KENT U.M. SHIN, 0000
BRUCE A. SHIPP, 0000
SCOT D. SHIVELY, 0000
KEITH B. SHOATES, 0000
JAMES A., SHOEMAKER II, 0000
STEPHAN F. SHOPE, 0000
KEVIN A. SHORB, 0000
ROBERT C. SHORES, 0000
CHARLES R. SHROUT, 0000
RUSTY E. SHUGHART, 0000
STEVEN R. SHULTZ, 0000
BRADFORD J. SHWEDO, 0000
JEFFREY R. SICK, 0000
JEFFREY A. SIEGEL, 0000
ROBERT M. SIEGLE, 0000
MARK E. SIGLER, 0000
*MICHAEL P. SIMMONS, 0000
RONALD W. SIMMONS, 0000
SCOTT W. SIMMONS, 0000
ANNE R. SIMMONS, 0000
*DANIEL J. SIMONSEN, 0000
MARK H. SIMPSON, 0000
GREGORY R. SIMS, 0000
JOHN T. SINGEL, 0000
ETHEL E. SINGLETON, 0000
*ROBERT S. SITTON, 0000
JOHN A. SKINNER, 0000
TIMOTHY D. SKINNER, 0000
STEPHEN J. SKOTTE, 0000
ROBERT S. SLOAN, 0000
*DAVID S. SLONE, 0000
JOSEPH E. SLUPSKI, 0000
TIMOTHY W. SMART, 0000
ANDREW J. SMITH, 0000
DARRYL M. SMITH, 0000
DAVID W. SMITH, 0000
DEWEY L. SMITH, JR., 0000
FRANK SMITH, 0000
FRED H. SMITH, 0000
GREGORY C. SMITH, 0000
JAMES K. SMITH, 0000
*JEFFREY G. SMITH, 0000
JEFFREY J. SMITH, 0000
KARI L. SMITH, 0000
KENNETH S. SMITH, 0000
*KEVIN D. SMITH, 0000
LEROY D. SMITH, 0000
MARK R. SMITH, 0000
MARVIN W. SMITH, JR., 0000
*MATTHEW A. SMITH, 0000
MICHAEL P. SMITH, 0000
MICHAEL S. SMITH, 0000
MICHAEL V. SMITH, 0000
RUSSELL E. SMITH, 0000
SCOTT F. SMITH, 0000
SHANE R. SMITH, 0000
STANIE R. SMITH, 0000
STEPHEN C. SMITH, 0000
TERRY V. SMITH, 0000
THOMAS K. SMITH, JR., 0000
TOMMY H. SMITH, 0000
*JAMES K. SNEDDON, 0000
MICHAEL C. SNEEDER, 0000
JEFFERY S. SNELL, 0000
SANDRA L. SNELLING, 0000
DANIEL R. SNY, 0000
*DAVID G. SNYDER, 0000
ROBERT A. SNYDER, 0000
JOHN SOARES, 0000
JOANNA J. SOBIESKI, 0000
JOSE R. SOLIS, JR., 0000
THEODORE A. SOMES, 0000
CHRIS A. SOSEBEE, 0000
DAVID A. SOUTHERLAND, 0000
WILLIAM L. SPARROW, 0000
JOHN W. SPECHT, 0000
JOSEPH S. SPECKHART, 0000
JOEL S. SPEIGHT, 0000
CHARLES F. SPENCER, JR., 0000
JEFFREY D. SPENCER, 0000
LANCE H. SPENCER, 0000
LESLEY D. SPRAKER, 0000
*SCOTT A. ST. AMAND, 0000
*JOEL T. STADE, 0000
MICHAEL ALLEN STAHR, 0000
CHARLES E. STAINER III, 0000
JIMMY B. STANDRIDGE, 0000
GREGORY S. STANLEY, 0000
THOMAS R. STANLEY, 0000
PETER STANZIANO, 0000
PAUL L. STARKEY, 0000
DAVID J. STEFFENS, 0000
TRACY A. STEINWAND, 0000
CHRISTOPHER V. STEPHENS, 0000
ROBERT L. STEPHENSON, 0000
JEAN M. STEPPE, 0000
KEVIN L. STEVENS, 0000
RANDY L. STEVENS, 0000
WILLIAM B. STEVENSON, IV, 0000
ERIC J. STEWARD, 0000
DAWN L. STEWART, 0000

ERIC J. STEWART, 0000
JAMES A. STEWART, 0000
JAMES M. STEWART, 0000
DOUGLAS R. STICKLE, 0000
GINGER L. STIGEN, 0000
JILL E. STIGLICH, 0000
HAROLD R. STILLINGS, 0000
GEORGE W. STILLMAN, 0000
DAVID R. STILWELL, 0000
MICHAEL J. STINSON, 0000
*ROGER D. STIRM, 0000
*MICHAEL E. STOCKSDALE, 0000
PATRICK D. STOCKTON, II, 0000
RICHARD C. STOCKTON, 0000
HOWARD J. STORR, 0000
KIRK J. STREITMATER, 0000
ARNOLD H. STRELAND, 0000
JOHN F. STRIBLING, 0000
ANTHONY STRICKLAND, 0000
RICKY D. STRICKLAND, 0000
RAYMOND J. STUERMER, 0000
JOAQUIN D. STUKES, 0000
PAUL D. STURMAN, 0000
JOSEPH A. SUBLOUSKY, 0000
*KERRY M. SULLIVAN, 0000
RICHARD S. SULLIVAN, 0000
SANDRA G. SULLIVAN, 0000
MICHAEL A. SULLY, 0000
*JAMES D. SUMMER, 0000
TIMOTHY H. SURABIAN, 0000
ANDREW H. SUZUKI, 0000
AARON L. SWANIER, 0000
DAVID E. SWANSON, 0000
PHILLIS J. SWANSON, 0000
ESTHER S. SWARTZ, 0000
STEPHEN M. SWARTZ, 0000
DANIEL L. SWAYNE, 0000
JOHN D. SWEENEY, 0000
JEFFREY R. SWEGEL, 0000
GLENN B. SWIFT, 0000
MICHAEL D. SWIFT, 0000
RAYMOND A. SWOGGER, 0000
STEVEN R. SYMONS, 0000
MICHAEL J. SYNORACKI, 0000
THOMAS S. SZVETECZ, 0000
TODD A. TABB, 0000
STEVEN J. TALLEY, 0000
MICHAEL A. TAMEZ, 0000
ROGER J. TANNER, 0000
STEVEN C. TANNER, 0000
KEVIN A. TARRANT, 0000
THOMAS L. TATE, 0000
ERNEST S. TAVARES, JR., 0000
DAVID J. TAYLOR, 0000
*DOUGLAS J. TAYLOR, 0000
JEANETTE E. TAYLOR, 0000
JOHN B. TAYLOR, 0000
MICHAEL K. TAYLOR, 0000
RUSSELL E. TAYLOR, 0000
WILLIAM J. TAYLOR, 0000
WILLIAM W. TAYLOR, 0000
DAVID L. TEEL, 0000
CRAIG J. TEFT, 0000
CARLOS R. TEJAS, 0000
DAVID T. TENLEN, 0000
JOHN G. TERINO, 0000
TERRY W. TERWEE, 0000
THOM H. TERWILLIGER, 0000
*DAVID H. THARP, 0000
MICHAEL L. THERIANOS, JR., 0000
KURT E. THIELEN, 0000
CHARLES B. THINGER, 0000
DAVID L. THIRTYACRE, 0000
CASSANDRA O. THOMAS, 0000
ELIZABETH F. THOMAS, 0000
EVAN C. THOMAS, 0000
GAYLORD Z. THOMAS, 0000
*JAMES P. THOMAS, 0000
SCOTT A. THOMAS, 0000
*TIMOTHY D. THOMAS, 0000
TIMOTHY M. THOMAS, 0000
WILLIAM L. THOMAS, JR., 0000
*ALBERT F. THOMPSON, 0000
CAROLYN Y. THOMPSON, 0000
IVAN G. THOMPSON, 0000
*JOHN W. THOMPSON, 0000
JOSEPH J. THOMPSON III, 0000
RANDAL S. THOMPSON, 0000
ROBERT T. THOMPSON, JR., 0000
RONALD E. THOMPSON, JR., 0000
THOMAS E. THOMPSON, 0000
*WILLIAM A. THOMPSON, 0000
DAVID A. THOMSON, 0000
ERIC M. THOMTON, 0000
JULIAN E. THRASH, 0000
PATRICK S. TIBBETTS, 0000
KEVIN B. TIBBS, 0000
MARK A. TIDWELL, 0000
JON B. TIGGES, 0000
JAMES S. TILLIE, 0000
ANTONIO W. TILLMAN, 0000
STEVEN R. TIMMONS, 0000
PAUL E. TINGLE, 0000
SCOTT G. TINGLEY, 0000
MARK T. TIPMONGKOL, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. TIPSWORD, 0000
NATHAN A. TITUS, 0000
THERESA P. TIZZARD, 0000
JOHN C. TOBIN, 0000
KEVIN L. TODD, 0000
DOUGLAS S. TOLBERT, 0000
NICK TOLIAS, 0000
RENEA L. TOLIVER, 0000
*SCOTT M. TONES, 0000
JOHN M. TONIOLLI, 0000
BRIAN W. TONNELL, 0000
JODINE K. TOOKE, 0000
CURTIS W. TOOKES, 0000
*THOMAS J. TOOMER, 0000
DONALD L. TOPP, 0000
*ROBERT J. TORICK, JR., 0000
TIMOTHY C. TORPEY, 0000
CAMERON W. TORRENS, 0000
JOSE L. TORRES, JR., 0000
*KEVIN TORRES, 0000
DANIEL R. TORWEIHE, 0000
*WILLIAM T. TOSTEN, 0000
KEVIN L. TOY, 0000
KHANH C. TRAN, 0000
TUAN V. TRAN, 0000
*PHILIP J. TRAVAGLIONE, 0000
STEPHEN F. TREMAIN, 0000
DAVID G. TRIBO, 0000
ARTHUR B. TRIGG, 0000
JEANNE OTTINGER TRIGO, 0000
EUGENE E. TRIZINSKY, 0000
SCOTT D. TROTTER, 0000
EVAN T. TROUT, 0000
MARK A. TRUDEAU, 0000
GEORGE R. TRUMBULL, 0000
VERA A. TU, 0000
DAVID J. TUBB, 0000
CHARLES D. TUCK, 0000
THOMAS W. TUCKER, 0000
WILLIAM S. TULLY, JR., 0000
*GREGORY L. TURES, 0000
*MICHAEL J. TURLEY, 0000
HAROLD J. TURNER, 0000
MANSON S. TURNER, 0000
MICHAEL E. TURNER, 0000
SCOTT M. TURNER, 0000
STUART L. TURNER, 0000
MICHAEL E. TURNIPSEED, 0000
DAVID E. TUTERAL, 0000
*ALAN K. TUTTLE, 0000
LINDA A. TYREE, 0000
ROGER T. TYREE, 0000
GREGORY R. UHL, 0000
RICHARD S. ULIANO, 0000
JON H. ULLMANN, 0000
JASON P. ULM, 0000
STERLING D. UNDERHILL, 0000
CARL F. UNHOLZ, JR., 0000
KARON L. BAGGETT UZZELL, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. VALDEZ, 0000
DARRIN M. VALHA, 0000
STEVEN C. VALLENARI, 0000
JACQUELINE D. OVOST VAN, 0000
FREDERICK W. VANCLEAVE, 0000
STEPHEN S. VANDERHOOF, 0000
DAVID G. VANDERVEER, JR., 0000
ROLAND K. VANDEVENTER, 0000
THOMAS F. VANDORPLE, 0000
GLEN D. VANHERCK, 0000
FRANK L. VANHORN, 0000
JAMES A. VANLOBENSELS, 0000
DONALD A. VANPATTEN, 0000
MARK G. VARAN, 0000
EDGAR M. VAUGHAN, 0000
JERRY L. VAUGHAN, JR., 0000
ROBERT M. VAUGHN, 0000
MICHAEL J. VAZQUEZ, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. VEAZIE, 0000
JAMES C. VECHERY, 0000
JULIE VERDURA, 0000
JANE M. VESPERMAN, 0000
HUGH S. VEST, 0000
DONALD V. VEVERKA, 0000
MARK K. VIDMAR, 0000
CARLOS J. VILELLA, 0000
*XAVIER C. VILLARREAL, 0000
ROGER M. VINCENT, 0000
JEFFERY ALLEN VINGER, 0000
ROBERT C. VIRAMONTES, 0000
MICHAEL D. VLK, 0000
GEORGE S. VOGEN, 0000
MICHAEL G. VOLLMUTH, 0000
WILLIAM T. VOLZ, 0000
JEFFREY S. VOORHEES, 0000
RICHARD M. VROEGINDEWEY, 0000
DANIEL J. WAGNER, JR., 0000
JEFFREY P. WAGNER, 0000
ROGER L. WAGNER, 0000
DAVID M. WAITE, 0000
JAMES DEVIN WALKER, 0000
LARRY S. WALKER, 0000
RICHARD W. WALKER, 0000
*STEVEN M. WALKER, 0000
MARY A. WALKERIRVIN, 0000
ROBERT J. WALLACE, 0000
SCOTT A. WALLACE, 0000
STEPHEN M. WALLER, 0000
ANDREAS W. WALSH, 0000
ANNA M. WALTERS, 0000
THOMAS A. WALTERS, 0000
CHRISTINA N. WALTON, 0000
*MICHAEL G. WAN, 0000
BRIAN R. WARANAUSKAS, 0000
KIRK R. WARBURTON, 0000
MARK A. WARD, 0000
MICHAEL J. WARD, 0000
MICHAEL R. WARD, 0000
TERRY WARD, 0000
TIMOTHY D. WARD, 0000
WILLIAM M. WARD, 0000
WILLIAM W. WARDEN, 0000
BARRY G. WARDLAW, 0000
JONATHAN C. WARREN, 0000
*PAUL R. WARREN, 0000
*BENJAMIN C. WASH, 0000
ESAU N. WATERS, 0000
PATRICK D. WATHEN, 0000
DARREL R. WATSEK, 0000
BRUCE A. WATSON, 0000
DANNY J. WATSON, 0000
ROBERT E. WATTS, 0000
BRUCE K. WAY, 0000
JOHN R. WEAVER II, 0000
ROBERT S. WEAVER, 0000
MICHAEL WEBB, JR., 0000
LINDSAY R. WEBER, 0000
MICHAEL R. WEEKS, 0000
HAROLD S. WEIMER, 0000
DAVID WEINTRAUB, 0000
ALISON M. WEIR, 0000
BARTHOLOMEW W. WEISS, 0000
DOUGLAS H. WELCH, 0000
DOUGLAS J. WELCH, 0000
PATRICK G. WELCH, 0000
STEVEN J. WELLER, 0000
*THOMAS M. WELLS, 0000
RANDALL J. WELP, 0000
JEFFREY S. WENBERG, 0000
DAVID L. WENIGER, 0000
CRAIG J. WERENSKJOLD, 0000
MERRY D. WERMUND, 0000
JAMES L. ROY WERTZ, 0000
HERBERT H. WESSELMAN, 0000
JAMES J. WESSLUND, 0000
HARRY F. WESTCOTT, 0000
JOHN K. WESTENHAVER, 0000
EVIN R. WESTEREN, 0000
RUSSELL J. WESTERGARD, 0000
ROGER H. WESTERMEYER, 0000
CHARLES J. WETTERER, 0000
ROBERT J. WETZEL, 0000
BENJAMIN WHAM II, 0000
BRENT A. WHARTON, 0000
*DUDLEY G. WHEELER, 0000
ELISE M. WHEELER, 0000
JEFFREY L. WHIDDON, 0000
DAVID W. WHISENAND, 0000
ANDRE P. WHISNANT, 0000
DAVID E. WHITACRE, 0000
ANDREW B. WHITE III, 0000
ANDREW W. WHITE, 0000
EARL R. WHITE JR., 0000
GARY A. WHITE, 0000
JOHN B. WHITE, 0000
BRADLEY S. WHITFIELD, 0000
CHET L. WHITLEY, 0000
*MARK S. WHITMIRE, 0000
STEVEN D. WHITNEY, 0000
*ALVIN S. WHITT, 0000
DAVID R. WHITT, 0000
EMILY A. WHITTAKER, 0000
JOHN D. WHITTENBERGER, 0000
*ROBERT E. WICKS, JR., 0000
ALAN J. WIEDER, 0000
DAVID P. WIEGAND, 0000
*PAUL A. WIESE, 0000
KENNETH B. WIGGINS, 0000
CHARLES M. WILBORN, 0000
RICHARD S. WILCOXEN, 0000
DENNIS B. WILDER JR., 0000
LESLIE K. WILFORD, 0000
JAMES M. WILKERSON, 0000
MICHAEL G. WILKINS, 0000
DAVID S. WILKINSON, 0000
*DAVID L. WILLARD, 0000
*RICHARD T. WILLETT, 0000
ALBERT C. WILLIAMS II, 0000
BRIAN H. WILLIAMS, 0000
CALVIN WILLIAMS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER D. WILLIAMS, 0000
CRAIG A. WILLIAMS, 0000
DONNA J. WILLIAMS, 0000
*HOWARD D. WILLIAMS, 0000
MATTHEW R. WILLIAMS, 0000
STEPHEN S. WILLIAMS, 0000
DOW A. WILLIAMSON, 0000
*MARK L. WILLIAMSON, 0000
WESTAL W. WILLOUGHBY, 0000
DAVID G. WILSEY, 0000
BRIAN C. WILSON, 0000
BRIAN D. WILSON, 0000
DARREN E. WILSON, 0000
KURT DANIEL WILSON, 0000
*PAUL D. WILSON, 0000
PETER L. WILSON, 0000
ROBERT L. WILSON, 0000
RUSSELL A. WILSON, 0000
STEVEN T. WILSON, 0000
THOMAS M. WILSON, 0000
GLENN R. WINKLER, 0000
JOHN C. WINN, 0000
STEPHEN E. WINN, 0000
CURTIS M. WINSTEAD, 0000
MICHALE F. WINTERS, 0000
ROBERT J. WINTERSTEEN, 0000
PHILIP L. WISE, 0000
JUDITH A. WISER, 0000
MARK A. WITHERSPOON, 0000
DANIEL T. WITT, 0000
KENNETH J. WITTE, 0000
JAMES R. WITTER, 0000
LATISHIE L. WODETZKI, 0000
TERRANCE J. WOHLFIEL, 0000
GARY M. WOLFE, 0000
PAMELA J. WOLOSZ, 0000
JEFFREY N. WOOD, 0000
YOLANDEA M. WOOD, 0000
*DOUGLAS P. WOODFORD, 0000
TROY R. WOODFORD, 0000
GREGORY S. WOODROW, 0000
MARSHALL S. WOODSON, 0000
DAVID P. WOOLLARD, 0000
CHRISTOPHER F. WRENN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. WRIGHT, 0000
DAVID A. WRIGHT, 0000
MICHAEL I. WRIGHT, 0000

PAUL W. WRIGHT, 0000
ROCKFORD B. WRIGHT, 0000
PHILIP A. WRINN, 0000
RICKY L. WYATT, 0000
DAVID R. YACHABACH, 0000
MICHAEL J. YAGUCHI, 0000
ERNEST K. YAMADA, 0000
HIROSHI T. YAMAGUCHI, 0000
*ROBERT T. YARBOROUGH, 0000
KEVIN D. YEOMANS, 0000
GEORGE W.P. YORK, 0000
PETER L. YORK, 0000
DARREN C. YOUNG, 0000
JACK W. YOUNG, 0000
EDWIN C. YOUNGSTROM, 0000
TODD M. ZACHARY, 0000
NOEL ZAMOT, 0000
GEORGE A. ZANIEWSKI, 0000
ANTHONY E. ZARBANO, 0000
KENNETH R. ZATYKO, 0000
FREDDIE D. ZAYAS, 0000
ANTHONY J. ZENT, 0000
JOHN J. ZENTNER, 0000
JOHN L. ZIEGLER, JR., 0000
*MARK A. ZILLI, 0000
CYNTHIA A. ZIMMERLE, 0000
LAWRENCE T. ZIRILLI, 0000
*MICHAEL E. ZOLLER, 0000
ANTHONY J. ZUCCO, 0000
ALAN W. ZWICK, 0000
DARREN L. ZWOLINSKI, 0000

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

R. NICHOLAS BURNS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GREECE.

KATHRYN WALT HALL, OF TEXAS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF AUSTRIA.

TOM MCDONALD, OF OHIO, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ZIMBABWE.

MARK ROBERT PARRIS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY.

EDWARD E. SHUMAKER, III, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

JEFFREY DAVIDOW, OF VIRGINIA
RUTH A. DAVIS, OF GEORGIA
PATRICK FRANCIS KENNEDY, OF ILLINOIS

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

VINCENT M. BATTLE, OF NEW YORK
ROBERT M. BEECROFT, OF MARYLAND
WILLIAM M. BELLAMY, OF CALIFORNIA
PETER EDWARD BERGIN, OF MARYLAND
JOHN WILLIAM BLANEY, OF CALIFORNIA
WILLIAM JOSEPH BURNS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JOHN CAMPBELL, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN A. COLLINS, JR., OF MARYLAND
JAMES B. CUNNINGHAM, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ROBERT SIDNEY DEUTSCH, OF VIRGINIA
CEDRIC E. DUMONT, M.D., OF MARYLAND
BARBARA J. GRIFFITHS, OF VIRGINIA
LINO GUTIERREZ, OF FLORIDA
BARBARA S. HARVEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PATRICK R. HAYES, OF MARYLAND
DONALD S. HAYS, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN C. HOLZMAN, OF HAWAII
SARAH R. HORSEY, OF CALIFORNIA
WILLIAM H. ITOH, OF NEW MEXICO
DANIEL A. JOHNSON, OF FLORIDA
DONALD C. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS
RICHARD H. JONES, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN F. KEANE, OF NEW YORK
MARISA R. LINO, OF OREGON
MICHAEL W. MARINE, OF CONNECTICUT
WILLIAM C. MC CAHILL, OF NEW JERSEY
WILLIAM DALE MONTGOMERY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JANET ELAINE MULES, M.D., OF WASHINGTON
JOHN M. O'KEEFE, OF MARYLAND
ROBERT C. REIS, JR., OF MISSOURI
EDWARD BRYAN SAMUEL, OF FLORIDA
THEODORE EUGENE STRICKLER, OF TEXAS
ROBERT J. SURPRISE, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN F. TEFFT, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT E. TYNES, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE, AS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

MICHAEL DONALD BELLOWS, OF IOWA
PETER WILLIAM BODDE, OF MARYLAND
MARTIN G. BRENNAN, OF CALIFORNIA
WAYNE JEFFREY BUSH, OF OREGON
PETER H. CHASE, OF WASHINGTON
PHILLIP T. CHICOLA, OF FLORIDA
LAURA A. CLERICI, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FRANK JOHN COULTER, JR., OF MARYLAND
CARYL M. COURTNEY, OF WEST VIRGINIA
ANNE E. DERSE, OF MARYLAND
MILTON K. DRUCKER, OF CONNECTICUT
DAVID B. DUNN, OF CALIFORNIA
WILLIAM A. EATON, OF VIRGINIA
REED J. FENDRICK, OF NEW YORK
ROBERT PATRICK JOHN FINN, OF NEW YORK
ROBERT W. FITTS, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
GREGORY T. FROST, OF IOWA
WALTER GREENFIELD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHAEL E. GUEST, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
RICHARD CHARLES HERMANN, OF IOWA
RAVIC ROLF HUSO, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES FRANKLING JEFFREY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
LAURENCE MICHAEL KERR, OF OHIO
CORNELIS MATHIAS KEUR, OF MICHIGAN
SCOTT FREDERIC KILNER, OF CALIFORNIA
SHARON A. LAVOREL, OF HAWAII
JOSEPH EVAN LEBARON, OF OREGON
ROSE MARIE LIKINS, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH A. LIMPRECHT, OF CALIFORNIA
R. NIELS MARQUARDT, OF CALIFORNIA
ROGER ALLEN MEECE, OF WASHINGTON
GILLIAN ARLETTE MILOVANOVIC, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JAMES F. MORIARTY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ROSIL A. NESBERG, OF WASHINGTON
STEPHEN JAMES NOLAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
LARRY LEON PALMER, OF GEORGIA
SUE FORD PATRICK, OF FLORIDA
MAUREEN QUINN, OF NEW JERSEY
KENNETH F. SACKETT, OF FLORIDA
DAVID MICHAEL SATTERFIELD, OF TEXAS
JOH F. SCOTT, OF IOWA
PAUL E. SIMONS, OF NEW JERSEY
STEPHEN T. SMITH, OF NEBRASKA
JOSEPH D. STAFFORD III, OF FLORIDA
GEORGE MCDADE STAPLES, OF CALIFORNIA
DORIS KATHLEEN STEPHENS, OF ARIZONA
SHARON ANDERHOLM WIENER, OF OHIO
HERBERT YARVIN, OF CALIFORNIA

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, AND CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MARY JANICE FLECK, OF TENNESSEE
ROBERT J. FRANKS, OF VIRGINIA
BURLEY P. FUSELIER, OF VIRGINIA
SIDNEY L. KAPLAN, OF CONNECTICUT
JOHN J. KEYES III, OF FLORIDA
ROBERT K. NOVAK, OF WASHINGTON
ANITA G. SCHROEDER, OF VIRGINIA
CHARLES E. SPARKS, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH THOMAS YANCI, OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. WILLIAM W. COBB, JR., 0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MCARDLE PRINTING CO.

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate McArdle Printing Co. on it's 50th anniversary of outstanding service. McArdle Printing represents what is right in America. It is a company rooted in family, solidified by a commitment to excellence and achievement. This company, which is in my district, prides itself on a fast turnaround and a high quality product, and for 50 years the McArdle Printing Co. has given it's customers exactly what they set out to provide.

In 1947, Mr. Walter McArdle bought the company formerly known as the Business Printing Co. In the years to follow, McArdle Printing began to expand externally as well as internally always keeping in sight the idea of a quick turnover rate. As the company grew due to their high quality of service they were forced to look for a larger facility. They relocated multiple times before they built their own 138,000 square-foot facility in Upper Marlboro, MD, where they now employ 215 people on three shifts.

Many companies lose sight of their mission as they begin to expand and evolve. This did not hold true for McArdle Printing. They continue to grow because of the trust their customers have in the service this company is able to give. The success in providing this kind of customer service cannot be achieved without an energetic, dedicated, and diligent group of employees. Without the hard work of the 215 employees the McArdle Printing Co. would not be able to live up to its mission.

Much of the company's success may also be contributed to the strong leadership of such presidents as the founder, Mr. Walter McArdle, his brother, Mr. Edward McArdle who took over in 1980 and his predecessor Mr. Joseph J. Fantozzi. Mr. Fantozzi was the first nonfamily member to take over the company in 1985 and still presides as president today. With these men at the helm, the company went from producing annual revenues of $1 million in 1947 to $26 million in 1996. This increase was a reflection of both ingenuity and customer satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, McArdle Printing has a direct impact on the productivity of our Federal Government as well as the private sector. By representing such major organizations as the American Bar Association, the International Monetary Fund, U.S. Healthcare, the National Journal, as well as the United Nations, the company affects people in all walks of life. According to the March 1997 issue of Southern Graphics, G. William Teare Jr., vice president of marketing for McArdle claims, ''We are information printers. We print time-sensitive information like daily reports, weekly newsletters, financial printing, and health care information printing. The key to what we do, our niche, is the time sensitivity of what we have, which means fast turnaround.'' For 50 years McArdle Printing has filled this niche with high quality products and fast, professional service.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join with me in congratulating the McArdle Printing Co. on 50 years of outstanding service and wishing them luck as they continue to serve our communities and country.

A TRIBUTE TO THE RIVERHEAD VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTER ROBERT HULSE

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to Robert Hulse, a volunteer fireman who has protected the lives and property of his neighbors in Riverhead, Long Island for the past 50 years.

Together, the Members of this House can join his family, friends, and fellow firefighters in recognizing Robert Hulse for his 50 faithful years of service to the Riverhead fire department. Since 1947, whenever fire or other peril has threatened the Riverhead community, Robert answered the siren's cry for help. It did not matter that the call often came in the dead of night, on a blustery winter day, or in the wilting heat of summer. Along with his confederates, Robert hastened to the scene, placing himself in harm's way to aid another human being in danger, regardless of whether it be a friend, a neighbor, or stranger.

A member of the Reliable Hose and Engine Co. No. 1, Robert Hulse enlisted as a volunteer in January 1947, soon after finishing a 2-year service to his country in the Naval Reserve. An active member of the Riverhead fire department, Hulse has served for many years on the department's bylaw and blood drive committees. Robert and his wife Joan have imparted that devotion to the Riverhead community to their children Grag and Linda.

Demonstrating that true heroes are created over a lifetime of selfless acts and giving back, Robert Hulse is a role model for every volunteer firefighter in Riverhead who has followed him. That is why I ask my colleagues in this esteemed House to join me in congratulating Robert Hulse for 50 years of service to the Riverhead fire department.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CANDICE MILLER

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the March of Dimes is an organization with a noble mission: to fight birth defects and childhood diseases. We all share the March of Dimes dream that every child should have the opportunity to live a healthy life.

Dr. Jonas Salk's polio vaccine is just one of the more famous breakthroughs that would not have been possible without March of Dimes research funding. And, without the volunteers throughout the country, the job of protecting babies would be that much more difficult.

For the past 14 years, the Southeast Michigan Chapter of the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation has honored several Macomb County residents who are outstanding members of our community and have helped in the campaign for healthier babies. This evening, the chapter will be hosting the 14th annual Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year Award dinner. The award, instituted in 1984, is named after my home county's namesake, General Alexander Macomb, a hero of the War of 1812.

This year, the March of Dimes has chosen Secretary of State Candice Miller as a recipient of the award. As a board member of Care House and backer for the March of Dimes, Candice Miller's involvement within the community exemplifies her commitment to improving life in our communities.

I applaud the Southeast Michigan Chapter of the March of Dimes and Candice Miller for their leadership, advocacy, and community service. I know that Ms. Miller is honored by the recoginition and I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting her as a 1997 recipient of the Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year Award.

CONTROLLING THE ILLINOIS RIVER

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to several constituents that recently received national recognition. Lockmaster Stan Wallace, Assistant Lockmaster Dave Hood, and Equipment Mechanic Bill Cross have been awarded the Department of Energy's Hammer Award, for their innovative work.

These gentlemen have pioneered a new procedure that raises each of the 109 wickets on the Illinois River in a less dangerous, physically easier, and more efficient process. Raising the wickets, which previously took 16 to 18 hours, now only takes 1 or 2 hours and, as a result, will save taxpayers $1 million over the life of the dam. The new process includes loading a backhoe onto a barge and floating it out to the dam. The backhoe uses a specially rigged hook to catch and raise the wicket.

I commend these gentlemen for their original thinking and hard work. I also encourage the Department of Energy to continue fostering ideas that emanate from their local employees who are closest to the problems. Stan

Wallace, Dave Hood, and Bill Cross are an excellent example of how American ingenuity and hard work pay off, not only for their fellow colleagues, but also for the taxpayers of this great Nation.

TRIBUTE TO MSGR. VINCENT E. PUMA

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention a true humanitarian, Msgr. Vincent E. Puma of Paterson, NJ.

For the past 13 years, Monsignor Puma has operated Eva's Kitchen and Sheltering Programs, a haven for underprivileged citizens who need food to eat and a place to sleep. Monsignor Puma recently decided to step down from the helm of this worthwhile organization but will leave behind a legacy which has greatly enhanced the community of Passaic County.

Born in Brooklyn, Monsignor Puma has lived in New Jersey his entire adult life. He attended Saint Mary's Seminary and Immaculate Conception Seminary, and was ordained in 1951. Monsignor Puma worked as a pastor in Clifton and Paterson before starting work at a mission in Dover, NJ. He returned to Paterson in 1962 to organize a network of churches for Spanish-speaking residents. Eventually the church gave Monsignor Puma a parish in Paterson, however, the stay was not long as he left his post as pastor to begin helping the poor and destitute.

In 1982, Eva's Soup Kitchen was founded in the basement of a former convent. Today, Monsignor Puma's organization serves 160,000 meals per year. In addition to providing food for those in need, Eva's Kitchen organizes shelters for men and women, halfway houses for the drug-addicted, and a clinic for the poor. Constant fundraising by Monsignor Puma has led to the tremendous growth of the organization, which employs a staff of 35 full-time and 30 part-time employees. Volunteers from more than 110 churches and organizations also help in providing staff for Eva's Kitchen. The ultimate tribute to Monsignor Puma's relentless work is the new $7 million headquarters that serves as the hub of Eva's operations.

On August 1, 1997, Monsignor Puma will step down and hand over the reins to his successor, the Reverend John T. Catoir. Although he will no longer be in the forefront leading Eva's Kitchen and Sheltering Programs, Monsignor Puma will continue to be an integral part in the continued success of the Eva's Kitchen program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, Monsignor Puma's family and friends, and the State of New Jersey in recognizing Msgr. Vincent E. Puma's outstanding and invaluable contributions to the less fortunate in our society.

GOP CONTRACT WITH AMERICA HAS BEEN A BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends to his colleagues this editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on August 4, 1997.

GOP CONTRACT WITH AMERICA HAS BEEN A BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION

Democrats spent $2 million attacking the Republican Contract With America in the congressional elections of 1994. The contract helped deliver the first GOP majority in the House in 40 years. Yet Democrats continued to malign it as a) typical cynical campaign rhetoric that would be abandoned or b) a mean-spirited contract ''on'' America that would go nowhere.

As the current budget agreement and the Taxpayer Relief Act move toward enactment, it's worth noting how many major policy changes can be traced back to the Contract With America.

The first provision of the contract was enactment of a balanced-budget amendment to the Constitution. That effort failed. But the No. 1 issue on Capitol Hill these days is balancing the federal budget. Democrats as well as Republicans are congratulating themselves for approving a budget designed to achieve balance in five years. The ground rules of budget debate have shifted profoundly. The need for fiscal balance is no longer the issue; the debate is over how to accomplish it.

A corollary to the balanced-budget amendment was a grant of line-item veto power to the president, which Bill Clinton gladly accepted.

On taxes, the $500-per-child income tax credit destined to become law was a major provision of the GOP contract. Other contract provisions in the current tax bill are: expanded individual retirement accounts for home ownership and education; a reduction in estate and capital-gains taxes; expansion of the home office deduction; and American Dream Savings Accounts—IRA-style accounts to which families can contribute up to $4,000 a year.

Welfare reform was another priority in the contract. The crux of the proposal was the elimination of welfare as an open-ended entitlement and the establishment of a two-years-and-out rule. Clinton twice had vetoed welfare-reform bills. But in 1996 his top campaign adviser, Dick Morris, told him that as the 1992 candidate who had promised to ''end welfare as we know it,'' Clinton might fatally wound his re-election bid by rejecting welfare reform a third time. Clinton signed into law the welfare policy derived from the Republican contract.

Roughly two dozen other proposals in the contract have become law. Among them are tougher enforcement of the death penalty, stricter review of government regulation of business, raising the tax-free earnings limit for people on Social Security, tax incentives for adoption and for care of a dependent old person, spousal IRAs and tax relief for small businesses.

The contract was a device unprecedented in national electoral politics: Here is a specific checkist of exactly what we propose to do: elect us and hold us to it. Advocates called it a straightforward masterstroke. Critics called it an ill-advised piece of political hokum.

Three years alter, there is no doubt that the GOP meant what it said in the Contract With America. Even the White House has embraced much of it. Much of what it contained is now the policy of the United States, thanks to the persistence and foresight of the Republican Congress.

DEDICATION OF ANVIL HOUSE

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Foundations Bible College and Schools in Dunn, NC on the recent dedication of its Anvil House. The president and founder of the Foundations Ministries and Schools, Dr. O. Talmadge Spence, announced the official Day of Dedication of Anvil House on May 15 with a 4-day celebration which culminated with the 23d graduation class of the college.

The vision of this learning center around a worship sanctuary results after some 30 years of thought, and more energetically after Dr. Spence attended Oxford University. Six years and nine months of actual building has been involved with a little over 2 years in acquiring furnishings, furniture, decor, and art pieces for the learning laboratory experience. Anvil House phase 1, has been completed with 30,300 square feet of floor space including: 8 divinity halls on the north and south; exterior and interior gothic walks; the first floor Founder's Foyer, and the Whitefield Sanctuary which seats 950 persons. The second floor consists of a gallery, balcony, and the colonnade walk which leads from the balcony to the podium above the first floor chancel. The cantilever pulpit projects out into the sanctuary some 30 feet with the first floor sanctuary and the second floor balcony surrounding the entire pulpit area.

The Anvil House is dedicated to three histories as pictured by its historical time and decor: World civilization, church history, and remnant Christianity. These three historical views are seen in a parallel chronology running throughout the facility. World civilization is seen in all of the rooms and areas. Church history, mingled with the parallel history of world civilization, is illustrated by the gothic walk of 46 nitches and over 100 art pieces. The divinity halls are designated by the following geographies, noting the ingredients of remnant Christianity: The French Room, noting the times of the Huguenots and the Waldensians; the Bohemian Room, the Hussites and Moravians; the Colonial Room, puritans and pilgrims; the English Room, Oxford Holy Club; the Welsh Room, the Welsh revival; the Swiss Room, the Swiss brethren and Zwingli; the Ulster Room, the dissenters and separatists; and the German Room, the Reformers and Luther.

The second floor balcony and colonnade will be the regular processional walk for the graduation class each year as they proceed to the pulpit of Whitefield Sanctuary to receive their diploma or degree.

In each of the rooms and other areas of Anvil House there is historical meaning everywhere. There are over 1,600 art pieces from all over the world. There are 688 fixed gothic arches in Anvil House besides another 500

other such arches in the art pieces themselves. This facility has one of the largest collections of Christian etchings found anywhere.

The next addition will be phase two, and it will commence immediately to add seven three- and four-story towers, using castle rock as was used for the north Calvin Pavilion. The south tower will be called Wesley Tower, and the other six east and west towers will be identified by other personalities of church history, such as Robert Murray McCheyne, Jonathan Edwards, John Wycliffe, J. Gresham Machen, Brainerd, and Zinzendorf. The building itself will occupy about 1 acre of land. In phase two, east and west gardens will be planted to resemble the distinct kinds of gardens in the Orient and the western world as particularly viewed from the perspective of Christianity and missions.

Dr. Spence, who is the president and founder of Foundations Schools as well as the original designer of the Anvil House, speaks glowingly of the project: ''We believe genuine history is being lost or neglected in the progress of modern man,'' says Dr. Spence, ''and history is being rewritten with a different presupposition than the facts of the past. We are losing the experience we have learned of the past.'' President Spence continues: ''As a Christian educational institution leaning into the twenty-first century, Foundations believes history must be protected as truthfully as we protect the Bible. To the Christian, the first authority is the Bible, the Word of God, then history, then philosophy, and then languages,'' said Dr. Spence, ''and all truth must be proclaimed, defended, and practiced by Christians no matter which compartment of life they live in during their daily activities.''

Dr. Spence, concluded his remarks at the opening ceremonies by saying, ''The two Christians who are most appropriate to speak in these early hours of Anvil House are Dr. Bob Jones, Chancellor of Bob Jones University in Greenville, South Carolina; and Reverend Michael N. Riley, pastor of the Killian Hill Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia.'' Dr. Spence was led to Christ through D. Jones and Reverend Riley has been a cherished friend in the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ of unusual gifts for interior decor.

May 15 through May 18 involved the first 4 days of worship, open house, lectures, and graduation Sunday. Personal RSVP invitations were extended for this first occasion. A commemorative publication called ''Anvil House'' and a reproduction of a 300-year-old text entitled ''The Principle Reformers'' were produced to honor this historic event.

Foundations Bible College and Seminary is located off Interstate 95, Exit 77 in Dunn, NC, on a 65-acre campus of 12 building facilities. The school also operates the radio station WLLN of Lillington, NC through the Christian Purities Fellowship for its outreach ministry program. Over its past 23 years, 100 divinity students from 15 countries and 31 States have been ordained to the Christian ministry by the Foundations School.

A TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF HIGHLAND

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine work and outstanding success of the citizens of Highland, CA. On November 24, 1997, Highland will celebrate ten years of existence as a city.

In light of the rather dire predictions made at the time about the city's chance of survival, this is a major milestone in the city's history. Many people, particularly the so-called experts, warned in 1987 against incorporation of the community because they believed the proposed city was financially unfeasible and would be bankrupt within the first 2 years of existence.

In his budget transmittal letter back in May 1989, the city manager referenced the 1980 Winter Olympic Games held in Lake Placid, NY. During those games, ABC Television commentator, Al Michaels, provided the play-by-play for the gold medal championship hockey game between the United States and Finland. The United States was given very little chance of taking the gold medal.

In the final seconds of the game, when it was apparent that the United States would win, Al Michaels emphatically exclaimed, ''Do you believe in miracles?'' Successfully completing its first year as a city, Highland's success may not have been a miracle, but in early 1989 it was regarded as quite an accomplishment.

Nearly 10 years later, Highland is not only still in existence, it is in relatively sound financial shape. With sound and prudent financial management, the future of the city of Highland looks bright. In fact, I believe that the next 10 years hold even more promise for the citizens of this great community than the last 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and the many fine people who live and work in Highland in saluting this community for meeting and overcoming many challenges during its first 10 years. The success of the city of Highland is certainly worthy of recognition by the House today.

A TRIBUTE TO THE RIVERHEAD VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTER FRANK CORWIN

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this venerable Chamber to ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to Frank ''Buzz'' Corwin, a volunteer firemen who has devoted 50 years to protecting the lives and property of his friends and neighbors in Riverhead, Long Island.

On Tuesday, September 9, 1997, Frank Corwin will be honored by his fellow firefighters for his 50 faithful years of service to the Riverhead fire department. Since 1947, whenever fire or other peril threatened a member of the Riverhead community, Frank has answered the siren's call, whether that call came in the dead of night, on a blustery winter day or in the wilting heat of summer. Time and again, Frank joined his comrades as they hastened to the scene, placing themselves in harm's way to aid another human being in danger, regardless of whether it be a friend, a neighbor, or stranger.

It was exactly 50 years ago to the month that Frank Corwin enlisted in the Riverhead fire department and that very night he was thrust into action during a fire at the GLF building. Rising to the position of 2d lieutenant with the Reliable Hose and Engine Co. No. 1, Frank was also a member of R.F.D.'s New York State Champion Ironmen Racing Team in 1948.

Frank's commitment to the Riverhead fire department and the community it protects is exceeded only by his devotion to family. In 1949, he married his wife Muriel and together they lovingly raised their children Beverly, Jeffrey, and Todd. In each of their children, Frank and Muriel have instilled the community pride and love for their neighbor that has motivated Frank during his career as a volunteer firefighter.

Demonstrating that true heroes are created over a lifetime of selfless acts and service to their God, family, and country, Frank Corwin is a perfect role model for every volunteer firefighter who will come after him. So I ask my colleagues in this esteemed House to join me in congratulating Frank for 50 years of service to the Riverhead community.

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK DHARTE

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the March of Dimes is an organization with a noble mission: to fight birth defects and childhood diseases. We all share the March of Dimes dream that every child should have the opportunity to live a healthy life.

For the past 14 years, the southeast Michigan chapter of the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation has honored several Macomb County residents who are outstanding members of our community and have helped in the campaign for healthier babies. This evening, the chapter will be hosting the 14th annual ''Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year'' award dinner. The award, instituted in 1984, is named after my home county's namesake, Gen. Alexander Macomb, a hero of the War of 1812.

This year, the March of Dimes has chosen Chuck Dharte as a recipient of the award. When Chuck retired from his position as chairman of the board and CEO of Huntington Bank of Michigan in 1996, he did not retire from public service. He has continued to serve on the board of St. Joseph's Mercy Hospitals of Macomb and as president of the Boys and Girls Club of southeastern Michigan while remaining active with the March of Dimes. As he recently said about receiving the award, ''I am still at a loss for words. And I assure you, I will continue in my care and support of this great human endeavor.'' Chuck's involvement within the community exemplifies his commitment to fighting birth defects.

Dr. Jonas Salk's polio vaccine is just one of the more famous breakthroughs that would not have been possible without March of Dimes research funding. And, without people like Chuck Dharte the job of protecting babies would be that much more difficult.

I applaud the southeast Michigan chapter of the March of Dimes and Chuck Dharte for their leadership, advocacy, and community service. I know that Chuck is honored by the recognition and I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting him as a 1997 recipient of the Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year Award.

ACR GOLD MEDALIST JAMES M. MOOREFIELD, M.D.

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the issue of providing universal access to health care for our citizens has been a major goal of every Member of Congress. Over the past 32 years we as a body have enacted many changes to achieve this goal for the Nation. In those efforts, many in the private sector have worked with us to develop responsible health legislation.

Dr. James M. Moorefield, a radiologist from California is a private sector physician leader who came to us in Congress to offer a solution to physician payment under Medicare. As a result the physician RBRVS was adopted and Dr. Moorefield, as chairman of the board of chancellors of the American College of Radiology, worked tirelessly with us to achieve that milestone.

In recognition for that leadership and his many other contributions to radiology, medicine, and America's health care system, the American College of Radiology will award him the ACR Gold Medal in Atlanta, GA, at its annual meeting September 6–10, 1997.

The ACR, in announcing his award of the prestigious gold medal, published the following comments by Christopher M. Rose, M.D. and Frederick R. Margolin, M.D. in the ACR Bulletin:

Jim Moorefield is a tireless leader in the field of radiology. Few people have made a commitment to our specialty that has been as complete or as longstanding as his. The tracks of his dedication to radiology and medicine reach from the halls of his hospital to the halls of Congress. He has served us on a local, state, and national level with distinction deserving our highest honor.

After attending Georgetown University, Dr. Moorefield received his medical training in his native New York at the State University of New York. He went on to serve as a medical officer in the U.S. Navy before his radiology residency at the University of California, San Francisco. In 1969 he entered private practice in Sacramento.

Dr. Moorefield's local and state involvement provided him his first opportunities to distinguish himself in the politics of medicine. As a delegate to the state medical society, he became an outspoken opponent of self-referral, winning him much respect, if not many friends, among the self-referrers.

His College activities began with committee and commission service, and he served as a councilor from California. After the College successfully defeated the RAPs legislation in 1987, Dr. Moorefield was picked to lead the arduous task of pulling members and staff together to develop a radiology relative value that could be used by Medicare. The system he created was copied and is still used by the AMA to set relative values recommended to HCFA for Medicare. He worked to convince Congress and HCFA to accept it, and thus helped preserve the right of the radiology profession to establish its own guidelines and definitions.

Dr. Moorefield went on to serve as vice-chairman and chairman of the ACR Board of Chancellors and as ACR president. It is particularly noteworthy that during the past 25 years, he has been in the full-time private practice of radiology. During most of his years of service to the College, he also served as president of his group. The time that he has unselfishly devoted to advance our interests as radiologists has been extracted at some measure of personal cost.

Dr. Moorefield is an articulate and effective representative of our specialty. He is a wonderful person with a fine sense of humor, a great collegiality, and fine perceptive power of people, ideas, and future trends. He is blessed with enormous stamina and a will designed to test that strength. He has used all his talents in the pursuit of the betterment of his colleagues and the College. The ACR and the profession of radiology are stronger for his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in extending our congratulations to Dr. Moorefield for this honor and thank him for the leadership and direction he provided the Congress as we deliberated our Nation's health care issues.

BRIG. GEN. JAMES W. BODDIE, 30 YEARS OF HONOR, DUTY, AND SERVICE

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to pay tribute to Brig. Gen. James W. Boddie who is retiring after 30 years of honorable and decorated service in the U.S. Army. On September 4, General Boddie will be stepping down as commander of the Army Armament Research, Development and Engineering and Center [ARDEC] at Picatinny Arsenal in Dover, NJ, after a distinguished 3-year tenure.

Born in Augusta, GA, on July 6, 1945, General Boddie attended the University of Georgia and in 1967 graduated with a bachelor of science degree in forestry. Following graduation, he was commissioned a second lieutenant through the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps. For his service overseas in combat in Vietnam and with the 7th Army in Germany, Boddie was awarded the Legion of Merit (with Oak Leaf Cluster), Bronze Star Medal (with "V" device, two Oak Leaf Clusters), Meritorious Service Medal, four Air Medals, and the Army Commendation Medal (with one Oak Leaf Cluster).

General James Boddie developed his expertise in ordnance and munitions, in great part, through his years of service in various positions with the 59th Ordnance Brigade of the U.S. 7th Army in Europe. Subsequently, he served as the Commandant of the U.S. Army Ordnance Missile and Munitions Center and School. Before assuming his final post commanding ARDEC, General Boddie was Deputy Commanding General for Procurement and Readiness, U.S. Army Armament Munitions and Chemical Command at Rock Island in Illinois.

During his service at Picatinny Arsenal, General Boddie distinguished himself as perhaps the most accomplished commander in ARDEC's history. As commander, he was responsible for managing 4,000 employees and more than 1,000 projects that constitute 90 percent of the Army's lethal power. Although he served during a period of defense downsizing, shrinking Army budgets and base closures, General Boddie and the employees at Picatinny Arsenal were recognized by the Pentagon and the Vice President of the United States as the premier military base in the Nation when in 1996 ARDEC received the quality "Triple Crown."

This unprecedented honor consisted of three highly prestigious awards for achievement, including the Research and Development Organization of the Year Award, the Army Communities of Excellence Award—for the best Army installation in the world—and the most acclaimed Presidential Award for Quality, the equivalent of the Malcolm Baldrige Award, which was presented to General Boddie by Vice President AL GORE. The Triple Crown only acknowledged what I have known for years, that the people of Picatinny Arsenal are recognized the world over as the experts in munitions technology.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again commend General James W. Boddie for his dedicated service to the American people in the U.S. Army. He leaves his post and the institution that became his life with my complete confidence in his abilities. General Boddie's guiding hand at Picatinny will surely be missed. I wish him and his wife, Shirl, all the best in the years to come.

MISSION VIEJO LITTLE LEAGUE

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of the Mission Viejo, CA. Little League baseball team, who recently represented the United States in the Little League World Series championship game. The boys from Mission Viejo rose to the top in a field of 7,000 Little League teams from around the world.

On Saturday, August 23, 1997, these boys showed the world something that people from our community already know: that through hard work, dedication, and community support, our kids can put their dreams within reach. I commend the efforts of the parents, coaches, and many citizens who have supported the Mission Viejo Little League team. They have set a wonderful example for communities across the Nation.

There is nothing more worthy of our time than supporting community activities that teach our children the values of hard work and dedication. Successful community athletic programs not only provide our children with enjoyable recreation, they bring us together as parents and neighbors.

Our community takes great pride in what these boys have achieved, but the endless

contribution of parents and citizens in supporting these activities year after year should not go unnoticed. The patience and longstanding commitment of an entire community may not always pay off at the plate, but in the life of a child, it is truly a Home Run.

Mr. Speaker, the scoreboard at the end of the game may not have shown it, but these boys are true champions. Our community is proud of their accomplishments and I am honored to request that their names be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of their achievement.

Team members: Adam Sorgi, Chad Lucas, Gary Gattis, Gavin Fabin, Ryan O'Donavan, Taylor Bennett, Mike Cusick, Nick Moore, Andrew Nieves, Adam Elconin, Brian Kraker, Ashton While, and Greg Oates.

TRIBUTE TO THE WARRINGTON ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION 11 AND 12 YEAR OLD GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM

HON. JAMES C. GREENWOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the players and coaches of the Warrington Athletic Association Girls Softball Team which came in second this year in the Little League Softball World Series. These 11 and 12 year olds and their coaches worked extremely hard and exhibited outstanding team work first as champions of the Pennsylvania District 30 competition, then to the Pennsylvania State Championship, to become U.S. Eastern Regional Little League Champions. As the East champs they played the West and Central champs and the team from Latin America. The final challenge was two games against the Southern U.S. champions. The Warrington team won the first of those games in a come-from-behind contest. It was only at the very end that they were defeated by the South in the second game, and emerged as second in the world of Little League Girls softball. Second in the world is an outstanding accomplishment and I am proud to bring this team to the attention of this House. I extend them warm congratulations and the best of luck as they continue to play together.

Team members: Jamie Ahrens, Heather Bloemker, Katie Crawford, Kimberly Garrano, Ashley Kelly, Nicole McLearnon, Linda Secka, Kip Crawford, Maryann Scarpill, Christine Alff, Jaci Borsos, Noel Darreff, Lauren Homa, Allison Morris, Jess Rankin, Cindy Spiecker, coach, John Rankin, and manager, Joe Spiecker.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INTERNET GAMBLING PROHIBITION ACT OF 1997

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act of 1997, along with my good friend and colleague from New Jersey, Representative FRANK LOBIONDO (R–NJ). I look forward to my friend from New Jersey in seeing this legislation signed into law. I would also like to thank my friend in the other Chamber, Senator JON KYL (R–AZ); for his leadership on this issue. The legislation that Mr. LOBIONDO and I are introducing today is intended to be the House counterpart to Senator KYL's bill, S. 474, and I am looking forward to working wit Senator KYL on this issue as well.

The Internet is a revolutionary tool that dramatically affects the way we communicate, conduct business, and access information. As it knows no boundaries, the Internet is accessed by folks in rural and urban areas alike, in large countries as well as small. The Internet is currently expanding by leaps and bounds; however, it has not yet come close to reaching its true potential as a medium for commerce and communication.

One of the main reasons that the Internet has not reached this potential is that many folks view it as a wild technological frontier, with no safeguards to protect children and no legal infrastructure to prevent online criminal activity. The ability of the World Wide Web to penetrate every home and community across the globe has both positive and negative implications—while it can be an invaluable source of information and means of communication, it can also override community values and standards, subjecting them to whatever more may or may not be found online. In short, the Internet is a challenge to the sovereignty of civilized communities, States, and nations to decide what is appropriate and decent behavior.

Gambling is an excellent example of this situation. It is illegal unless regulated by the States. With the development of the Internet, however, prohibitions and regulations governing gambling have been turned on their head. No longer do people have to leave the comfort of their homes and make the affirmative decision to travel to a casino—they can access the casino from their living rooms.

The legislation I am introducing today will protect the right of citizens in each State to decide through their State legislatures if they want to allow gambling within their borders and not have that right taken away by offshore, fly-by-night operators. The Internet Gambling Prohibition Act gives law enforcement the tools it needs to crack down on illegal Internet gamblers by accomplishing three main goals: First, providing that anyone convicted of running an Internet gambling business is liable for a substantial fine and up to 4 years in prison; second, subjecting those who place bets or wagers with virtual casinos to a fine and up to 6 months in prison; and third, giving law enforcement the ability to request cessation of service to Web sites engaging in illegal gambling, with enforcement by court order if necessary. Additionally, the bill requires the Attorney General to submit a report to Congress on the effectiveness of its provisions.

This legislation is supported by organizations across the spectrum, from Ralph Reed to Ralph Nader, and from the National Coalition Against Legalized Gambling to the American Gaming Association. Additional supporter are the National Association of Attorneys General and the National Football League.

It is also important to note that this legislation does not preempt any State laws, does not cover online new reporting about gambling, and does not apply to transactions that are legal in both the State in which they originate and the State in which they are received. The bill simply brings the current prohibition against interstate gambling up to speed with the development of new technology, as the Internet had not been created when the original law was passed and thus is not covered by it.

Mr. Speaker, online gambling is currently a $200 million per year business, and could easily grow to $1 billion business in the next few years. It is time to shine a bright light on Internet gambling in this country, and to put a stop to this situation before it gets any worse. The Internet Gambling Prohibition Act, which will keep children from borrowing the family credit card, logging on to the family computer, and losing thousands of dollars all before their parents get home from work, will do just that. I urge each of my colleagues to support the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act of 1997.

TRIBUTE TO PASQUALE AND THERESA ARGENTO

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1997, my good friends, Pasquale and Theresa Argento, celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary. It gives me great pleasure to wish them my very warmest congratulations on this truly special occasion.

I have known both Theresa and Pat for years and I am so pleased to have this opportunity to talk about how much this couple has given to their family and to the New Haven community. Theresa and Pat are lifelong residents of New Haven and met when both their families lived on Chapel Street near Wooster Square. As almost no one else I've ever known, the Argentos have carried on the Wooster Square traditions.

Theresa is president of the St. Andrew's Ladies Society and cochairs the annual St. Andrew's Feast. The feast is one of my wonderful memories of friends and family. St. Andrew's keeps the strong feeling of community alive and Theresa has to be given credit for the hard work she does every year to organize it. She devotes an extraordinary amount of time and her efforts assure its success every year.

Although the New Haven community is their home, Theresa and Pat have not forgotten their Italian heritage. Theresa has done amazing work with the sister cities project which sponsors exchanges with New Haven's sister city of Amalfi, Italy. Promoting the exchange of students, knowledge, and culture, Theresa has ensured that the New Haven descendants of Amalfi will not forget their roots. Because of her work, my step-son, Jonathon, will always remember his time in Amalfi.

Pat and Theresa have spent a lifetime working hard for their family. Their devotion to their two wonderful children, Frances and Antoinette, and their four grandchildren, Evelyn, Robert, Alison, and Jessica, is a testament to their love for each other.

It gives me great pleasure to rise today on behalf of the Argentos. I am grateful to them

for all they have done for me and my family and I am proud of all their hard work on behalf of so many. I join their family and their many friends in wishing them a very happy anniversary and many more years of good health and happiness. They truly deserve it.

A TRIBUTE TO THE TRONA FOURSQUARE CHURCH

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to your attention the community-wide celebration taking place later this month in the High Mojave Desert of San Bernardino County. The congregation of the Trona Foursquare Church will be celebrating its 58th anniversary on September 28th, as well as honoring its pastors for 25 years of service to the community. A dinner and evening of fellowship will mark this important occasion on September 27th.

Reverend and Mrs. Melvin Wilson came to Trona in July of 1972. Living in Trona, they have faithfully served their church family while involving themselves in numerous ways in the life of the local community. Their love, care, concern, influence, and loyalty is reflected in their service which touches literally everyone in Trona. They have truly been, by all accounts, servants of God. The citizens of Trona are grateful beyond words for their devotion and I am proud to ask our colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in saluting them today.

I would also like to pay special tribute to the Trona Foursquare Church as it, too, celebrates an important milestone—its 58th anniversary. To say the least, the entire community is very much looking forward to a weekend of celebration to mark both the service of Reverend and Mrs. Wilson, as well as the anniversary of the church itself.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me and our colleagues in paying tribute to the Trona Foursquare Church as it celebrates these important moments in its history. It is only appropriate that the House recognize Reverend and Mrs. Wilson for their 25 years of faithful community service, as well as the service of this church as it, too, celebrates a most esteemed anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO THE 25TH SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1997 PUERTO RICAN DAY PARADE OF PATERSON

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the momentous occasion of the 1997 Puerto Rican Day Parade of Paterson's 25th Silver Anniversary. The parade will take place on Sunday, August 24, 1997 in Paterson, NJ.

The Puerto Rican Day Parade of Paterson was established and incorporated in 1972. The goal of the parade was to revitalize and maintain the rich cultural diversity that portrays a spiritual, family-oriented people.

For more than 25 years, thousands of Puerto Ricans and other Hispanic groups traditionally spend a weekend to reflect upon the beauty of traditional songs and dances, to be sensitized by colors and fashions, and to partake of traditional food and drink. The parade and its week-long activities have historically fulfilled its intended purpose of allowing for the next generation to observe contributions made by the Puerto Rican-American community to improve the city of Paterson and make it a better place to live, work, and educate the next generation.

On Sunday, August 24, 1997, the parade will celebrate its 25th anniversary and over 100,000 people from all corners of the metropolitan area will share in the festivities.

The 3.5 mile-long parade will commence in the heart of the city of Paterson and proceed through the historic downtown shopping district. The celebration, as always, promises to be energetic, uplifting, and quite spectacular.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, the Puerto Rican-American community, and the State of New Jersey in recognizing the Puerto Rican Day Parade of Paterson's 25th Silver Anniversary and commending both its organizers and participants who constantly enrich the cultural flavor of our diverse community.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP FOR AVA GARDNER

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a resolution to provide a commemorative stamp for Ava Gardner, one of America's most accomplished actresses and native of the town of Smithfield in the Second Congressional District of North Carolina. I would like to submit the text of this resolution for the RECORD, and I strongly urge my colleagues to sign on as cosponsors of this resolution:

Whereas Ava Lavinia Gardner is one of America's most accomplished actresses this century;

Whereas her work was world renowned, taking her around the country and globe, residing in New York, California, Spain, and England, spreading the goodwill of the American people and setting the mark in film, radio, and television for aspiring actresses and actors to follow;

Whereas, her movie career was recognized by her peers and industry, receiving the Golden Globe Best Actress in a Drama nomination for ''Night of the Iguana'' (1964), the Academy of Motion Pictures Merit for Outstanding Achievement Best Actress nomination for ''Mogambo'' (1953), and the Look Film Achievement Award for her performance in ''The Hucksters'' (1947);

Whereas, her work personified and led the true golden age of Hollywood, when stories were of the heart and when values dictated one's performance such as her role as Sarah in ''The Bible . . . in the Beginning,'' recognized as the best picture of the month for the whole family with the Box Office Blue-Ribbon Award (1966);

Whereas, her patriotism was unparalleled, recognized by the United States Armed Forces for her spirit of public service, and distinguished performance as guest star of the Armed Forces radio network's production of ''Victorious Lady'';

Whereas, Time Magazine, one of the world's most widely read publications, recognized her achievements in 1951, dedicating its from cover to Ava Gardner, and becoming the first female from her home State of North Carolina ever to grace its cover;

Whereas, though she rose to great heights from humble beginnings, living the American Dream through hard work and perseverance, she never forgot the needs of people as she worked tirelessly for cancer research funding, nor the people of Johnston County, North Carolina, where she was born the youngest of five daughters and two sons of Jonas and Mary Elizabeth Gardner, later attending high school in the Rock Ridge Community and on to the then Atlantic Christian College (Barton College) in Wilson, North Carolina;

Whereas, citizens from every State in the United States and across the world revere her work, visiting the Ava Gardner Museum in Smithfield, North Carolina, and her numerous related worldwide web Internet sights, as well as on television, enjoying her work in episodes of the hit television series ''Knots Landing'' and her life story through biographical television movies;

Whereas, her work carries on, despite her passing from this earth January 25, 1990;

Whereas, Ava Lavinia Gardner is one of America's most accomplished actresses this century, leading the Hollywood golden age, spreading the goodwill and patriotism of the American people around the globe, and setting the mark in film, radio, and television of aspiring actresses and actors to follow;

Whereas, the ''Ava Gardner 2000 Stamp Committee,'' spearheaded by the Ava Gardner Museum and the work of its indefatigable volunteers in Smithfield, North Carolina, to celebrate her life has targeted the decade anniversary of her passing of January 25, 2000, for the publication of a commemorative stamp by the United States Postal Service: Therefore, be it

Resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued by the United States Postal Service in honor of Ava Gardner; and that the Citizen's Stamp Advisory Committee of the United States Postal Service should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a postage stamp be issued.

WORK UNFINISHED

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends to his colleagues this editorial which appeared in the Norfolk Daily News on August 18, 1997.

WORK UNFINISHED—MORE TO BE DONE REGARDING BUDGETS; VOTERS THEMSELVES MUST DO REMINDING

For his part, President Clinton saw the five-year budget legislation as a measure that would ''renew our nation and restore its

promise.'' And on the Republican side, House Speaker Newt Gingrich said, ''We have proven together that the American constitutional system works, that slowly, over time, we listen to the will of the American people.'' He added that he does not intend to abandon the spirit of cooperation that led to the agreement.

The president is being criticized by liberals within Democratic ranks for having compromised too much; the speaker for having given in too readily. It was a contentious process, as are many decisions in a democracy.

The plan is surely flawed, but it did provide evidence that the message from the voters about having something done about recurring federal deficits and high levels of taxation was heard.

It is important now to realize that this is unfinished business. There is much more to be done to reduce the burden of taxation and the rates of growth in federal spending. Voters themselves are the key to whether this will be produced in the future. If they insist, more progress is possible.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD LESHER

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, saying goodbye to colleagues and friends is rarely enjoyable and yet we must do it so often. I rise today to say goodbye to an icon of the business community, Dr. Richard Lesher.

At age 63, Dr. Lesher has decided to retire to his boyhood home in Chambersburg, PA. Since taking the top spot at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 22 years ago, Dr. Lesher has directed and expanded this group into a powerful voice for American businesses in Washington and around the world. I can state today without reservation that the chamber's positions on issues are well respected in the eyes of Members of Congress and often play a part of the many decisions made in the Nation's Capitol.

Some of the major achievements of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce during the tenure of Dr. Lesher include the implementation of a weekly communication network which includes television and print media. For example, the Voice of Business, a newspaper article, is distributed nationwide to over 600 newspapers. In addition, programs like First Business and It's Your Business reach the Nation's business men and women through cable and network television. With this strong communications network in place it is little wonder that the chamber's membership has swelled to 300,000 and its budget expanded from $40 million to $70 million during the tenure of Dr. Lesher.

Another program that Dr. Lesher designed, and one that I believe has profound impacts on policy and politicians in Washington, is How They Voted. This program earmarks votes that are critical to the chamber and rates Members of Congress based on those key votes. While I am a new member of Congress, I have learned quickly to pay special attention to the chamber's key votes because of this program.

Finally, the National Chamber Litigation Center, a public policy legal arm, represents business interests in the Federal court system and provides services where there would otherwise be a void.

In closing, I commend Dr. Richard Lesher for his long-term commitment to the chamber and for playing a critical part in the policies of this Nation. Saying goodbye is rarely enjoyable, but today we should celebrate the accomplishments of Dr. Lesher.

TRIBUTE TO THE IRS BROOKHAVEN SERVICE CENTER

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the many valued employees of the Internal Revenue Service's Brookhaven service center, as it celebrates its 25th year of operation in Brookhaven Town, Long Island. Located in Holtsville, in the heart of this great town, the IRS Brookhaven service center has enriched local residents through its employment opportunities and mentoring programs for the taxpayers of New York.

Most notably, though, the Brookhaven service center has created a selfless, community-focused vision during the past 25 years. It has helped provide a greater degree of community togetherness through its many services, and improved its communication with taxpayers through its employees' dedication and diligence. The taxpayer assistance the center provides are quite exceptional—from answering thousands of taxpayers' calls on a toll free line, to resolving customer complaints cases. Employing nearly 5,000 workers during peak times of year, the Brookhaven service center is crucial to the economic development of the town.

The Brookhaven service center would not thrive if not for the excellent service that its staff provide its customers, the American taxpayer. The continued growth of the center, and the diversity of services it provides, is a fitting tribute to the employees who have helped to forge a strong and lasting relationship with the people of Brookhaven.

The importance of the Brookhaven service center to the Federal Government can not be understated, even as we pay tribute to this 25th anniversary. Last year, the service center processed 16 million individual and business returns from Montauk Point on the East End of Long Island, to Atlantic City on the southern shore of New Jersey. The employees of this center work hard for the people all over America who call with questions and concerns when the April 15 tax season rolls around. They are problem solvers, providing a great service to their fellow Americans. Brookhaven service center employees also donate their time and resources to town food drives, annual Christmas toy drives, and the Salvation Army. Each year, employees also give blood in conjunction with the Greater New York Blood Program.

At the Brookhaven service center, a diverse group of Long Islanders have come together with one common goal—to provide assistance to their neighbors and fellow citizens. As they commence their 25th year of service, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in saluting the Brookhaven service center's work, and to applaud a true community partnership.

IN HONOR OF THE STATE CHAMPION RESTON LITTLE LEAGUE ALL-STAR TEAM

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to pay tribute to the 1997 Reston American Little League All-Star Team. On August 26, 1997, there was a parade to celebrate and welcome the All-Stars home from the Little League southern regional tournament in St. Petersburg, FL. The All-Stars have worked hard during their baseball season and through the spirit of teamwork, they have achieved major victories in the district, State, and regional Little League championships. These young players are to be commended for their outstanding efforts and sportsmanship they displayed as they competed in these three tournament championships. The Homecoming Parade in their honor will include all of the team players, and coaches who will march down Market Street at the Reston Town Center in the heart of their community. The All-Stars will be greeted and honored for their many accomplishments by several local dignitaries and community leaders. I would also like to recognize each player individually for their many achievements: Brian Beatty, Ben Bjorlo, Jeff Collins, Matt Foley, Colin Golding, Brandon Guyer, David Harrison, Scott Horton, Jared Kubin, David Miller, Ryan Smithson, John Stipicevic, Nick Tracy, Adam Wright; as well as their team manager Larry Kubin, their coach Paul Foley, and their assistant coach Harold Tracy.

The 1997 Reston All-Stars won the district IV championship for the first time in Reston Little League history. This meant the All-Stars earned the right to represent district IV at the State Little League championship tournament in Virginia. The All-Stars journeyed down to Danville where their perseverance and team work helped them achieve a come-from-behind victory over the Bristol, VA team. After the All-Stars had been defeated in the second game of the double elimination tournament, the Reston team redoubled their efforts and fought their way through the loser's bracket, playing three doubleheaders in 3 days in order to qualify for the State championship game against the Bristol team. The All-Stars were victorious over the Bristol team in a 9 to 7 nailbiter. This was another first in the history of Reston Little League as the All-Stars won the Virginia State championship and earned the right to represent the State in the southeast regional championships.

At the southeast regional championship tournament, the Reston All-Stars faced some of the best Little League teams in the Nation. The winner of the southeast regional qualifies to compete in the Little League World Series in Williamsport, PA. Reston lost their first game of the double-elimination tournament to Texas, but then won three straight games against teams from Tennessee, Alabama, and South Carolina. The All-Stars made it to the section II final where they faced the Texas team they had lost to in the first round. Reston lost to the Texas team and were eliminated from further competition; however, the Reston All-Stars finished the year as one of the best 16 Little League baseball teams in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in honoring the State championship Reston Little League All-Stars. The Homecoming Parade of All-Stars celebrates the hard work, dedication, sportsmanship, and competitive spirit of the entire team organization which resulted in their many spectacular achievements.

COMMENDATION FOR THE HAYMARKET CENTER OF CHICAGO, IL

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend and congratulate Father Ignatious McDermott and the Haymarket Center which he founded as a result of his work in the area on the near west side of Chicago. This area, formerly known as ''Skid Row'' earned Father McDermott the nickname of the ''Priest of Skid Row.''

Haymarket Center was founded in 1975 in response to the needs of the men and women who frequented the streets and flophouses in the area. Haymarket is a full-scale substance abuse treatment center which administers 28 programs that provide a comprehensive approach to substance abuse known as a continuum of care. Haymarket Center serves over 14,000 individuals each year; and since 1975, Father McDermott has inspired hundreds of thousands of individuals to overcome their addictions to alcohol, tobacco, and/or illegal drugs.

A model for other substance abuse treatment centers throughout the country, Haymarket's continuum of care is an integration of drug abuse prevention, treatment, health services, day care, parent training, vocational education, and job placement. This integration of services enables addicted individuals to recover more quickly and completely. Because substance abuse treatment services are largely financed with public funding, helping these individuals benefits the taxpaying public.

In recognition of Haymarket Center's leadership in providing high quality and effective treatment services, Gen. Barry McCaffrey, Director of the Office of National Drug Policy, recently took the opportunity to visit the center. General McCaffrey used his visit to Haymarket Center to direct the attention of the public to the value of our Nation's investment in community-based substance abuse treatment services. During his visit, General McCaffrey acknowledged that providing effective treatment services not only helps individuals to achieve sustained recovery from addiction, but also saves significant dollars which would otherwise be necessary for treating addicted individuals within our criminal justice system.

I am pleased to note that Gen. Barry McCaffrey has brought attention to the need for a better balance between interdiction and treatment in our Nation's efforts to combat drug abuse. I commend Haymarket Center for its continued commitment to improving and expanding substance abuse prevention and treatment services for all individuals in need, including those whom I am privileged to represent.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in commending Haymarket Center; and I urge my colleagues to take as much time as they can to visit a comprehensive substance abuse treatment center located in their respective districts.

Again, I commend and congratulate Father Ignatious McDermott and the Haymarket Center.

TRIBUTE TO PETALUMA CHIEF OF POLICE DENNIS DeWITT

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant, Police Chief Dennis DeWitt. Chief DeWitt is retiring after 30 years with the Petaluma Police Department. I wish I could join his family, friends, and colleagues in celebrating his distinguished career.

Dennis DeWitt attended Golden Gate University where he earned a B.A. in administration of justice and a masters in public administration. For the past 10 years, he served as chief of the Petaluma Police Department.

Dennis DeWitt's devotion to the community is admirable. He serves as a board member on the Committee on the Shelterless, is a past president of the Boys and Girls Club, a former board member of the Family Education Center, and was a member of the Host Lions Club. As the chief of police he proved over and over that Petaluma and the citizens of Petaluma were his No. 1 priority. He was proud of the city, and, in turn, we were proud of him.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great, pleasure to pay tribute to Dennis DeWitt. His service to the residents of Petaluma will be greatly missed. I wish he, his wife Tricia, and their family, the best.

A TRIBUTE TO LAKE ARROWHEAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to your attention the fine work and outstanding performance of Lake Arrowhead Elementary School in Lake Arrowhead, CA. Earlier this year, Lake Arrowhead Elementary was named a California Distinguished School by State superintendent of public instruction, Delaine Easton. This recognition, one of the highest educational awards presented in California, puts this fine school in the top tier of educational institutions in the entire state.

Lake Arrowhead Elementary School, located in the mountains of San Bernardino County, has achieved an excellent level of success in maintaining high-academic standards for its students. Under the fine and capable leadership of Principal John Fenn, this school has excelled largely because of its outstanding faculty, devoted student body, and the active and involved support of the entire mountain community. As the largest elementary school in the rim of the World Unified School District with an enrollment of 840 students, Lake Arrowhead Elementary is especially well known for its dedication to its students.

In February, Lake Arrowhead Elementary was selected as a 1997 regional nominee for the California School Recognition Program. The competition for this recognition alone was exceptionally stiff with nearly 700 schools submitting applications to the State superintendent of public instruction. Several months later, John Fenn was notified of his school's crowning achievement—selection as a California Distinguished School—a success that was shared by the entire Lake Arrowhead Elementary School community in May.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me, our colleagues, and the many admirers of Lake Arrowhead Elementary in recognizing the outstanding achievements of the staff, students, and others who continue to bring success to this fine school. This achievement provides a model of success to be emulated not only by other schools in California but across the country as well. I join the House in applauding the efforts of this fine program and congratulate Lake Arrowhead Elementary for a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO POLICE SGT. TERRY D. GUSTIN

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I take to the floor of the House today to acknowledge the outstanding career of Corona Police Sgt. Terry D. Gustin. Sergeant Gustin, who spent 32 years in law enforcement, will retire on September 13, 1997. My hometown of Corona, CA has been extremely fortunate to have had Sergeant Gustin protecting our community and making it a safer place in which to live and work.

Sergeant Gustin is a native of southern California and attended California Baptist College in Riverside. After serving 4 years in the U.S. Navy and serving in Vietnam, Sergeant Gustin returned to southern California and in 1965 was hired as a reserve police officer in Corona. This was the beginning of a long and distinguished career in law enforcement. In 1968, he was hired full time by the Corona Police Department, where he has served as a police officer, a detective, traffic sergeant, acting lieutanant, and relief watch commander. He will finish his career as a sergeant with the patrol division.

During his early years in law enforcement, Sergeant Gustin started the first YDT team in Riverside County with one RSO deputy and one probation officer. Sergeant Gustin has also been involved in a wide range of activities during his career, including being a former member of the Police National Rodeo Association for 10 years in steer wrestling, the Riverside County Peace Officers Association, the California Combat Association, the Peace Officers Research Association, the FOP Lodge in Riverside, among many others.

Sergeant Gustin has been a great credit to the Corona Police Department, and his service has been appreciated by citizens throughout the city, who will remember him as someone

who took the time to help others. On behalf of the citizens of the 43d Congressional District, I wish to extend my thanks and appreciation to Sgt. Terry D. Gustin for his years of dedicated service to our community and extend my best wishes in his future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. JOSEPH DiNATALE ON HIS RETIREMENT AS RIVERSIDE, IL, VILLAGE PRESIDENT

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant who recently completed 12 years of service, 8 of them as village president, to the people of Riverside, IL—Mr. Joseph H. DiNatale.

Mr. DiNatale was elected to the village board in 1985, and became president four years later. His leadership helped guide Riverside, one of the crown jewels of suburban Chicago, through an important period of change as younger families moved into the community of rambling Victorian homes and sleek Frank Lloyd Wright-style designs. Most would agree that Riverside is as strong a community, if no more so, as when Mr. DiNatale was first elected village president.

But Mr. DiNatale's service to his community did not begin as an elected official. He spent 7 years as an assistant Cook County State's attorney, prosecuting dangerous felons on behalf of his fellow citizens. For 22 years, Mr. DiNatale has served as governing member of the Chicago Zoological Society, which oversees the world famous Brookfield Zoo. He was also a member of both the parish council and school board of St. Mary's Church.

As a distinguished attorney, Mr. DiNatale has served as a law instructor with various police departments and as a judge at the Northwestern Law School Moot Courts. He has also received numerous professional and civics awards and recognitions. His most recent honor was being named as the Riverside Chamber of Commerce's Man of the Year. However, perhaps his most important achievement has been personal and shared with his wife, Adele, in raising their six children: Joseph Jr., Katherine, Marc, Maria, Cara, and Michael.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Mr. Joseph DiNatale on his years of dedicated community and public service, and extend my best wishes for all the best success for him and his family in the future.

TRIBUTE TO THE SOUTHAMPTON FULL GOSPEL CHURCH

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to pay tribute to the Southampton Full Gospel Church, in Southampton, Long Island, whose congregants will celebrate the 25th anniversary of the church's founding this week.

Since 1972, the Southampton Full Gospel Church and its members have been vital and active participants in the community life of Southampton Town and throughout the East End of Long Island. Since being installed as pastor in May of 1973, Rev. Donald Havrilla and his wife Eileen have successfully worked to create a ministry that has brought to life the love and saving grace of God through the healing work of church members.

Knowing that to save men's and women's souls, often we must first save their bodies, church members have faithfully tended to their neighbors' physical needs. The life-saving ministries founded by the Southampton Full Gospel Church include a Christian Education program, Bible-based drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs, and pro-life efforts to end the abortion. Also, by working with local school officials, church members have assured that traditional family values are recognized in local public schools. Through their work, church members have come to personify the Gospel message by joyfully tending to the Lord's flock.

Reaching beyond their own community, in 1981 the Southampton Full Gospel Church established a mission in the town of Leogane, Haiti. Nurturing an effort that began by feeding 25 impoverished children, the mission work has grown to feed 1,000 malnourished children a day and employ 55 residents of this poor Haitian community. At the 3-acre church and education mission, another 850 children have their minds and bodies nourished at the K–8 school, while 80 mothers and their children are given medical care at the Momto program.

For the past 25 years, members of the Southampton Full Gospel Church have devoted their time, talents, and resources to provide physical and spiritual sustenance to their fellow man. In so doing, they have brought the Gospel message to life for all of us on Long Island who are privileged to witness their efforts. May God continue to bless us all with the works of the Southampton Full Gospel Church.

REGARDING FATHER MARCOS ZAMORA

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Father Marcos Zamora and his many accomplishments upon the occasion of his departure from St. Paul the Apostle Church.

Since his ordination in 1990, Father Zamora has been serving his congregants as their priest, mentor, and friend. His sensitivity and concern for all people has been an inspiration to all and an example that is truly worthy of emulation. It is heartening to find an individual as fully committed to the service of others as Father Zamora. This commitment has helped to bring together different ethnic groups, those of different ages and backgrounds in the membership of St. Paul's Church. His vocal and passionate stance on many social issues has also helped to increase awareness within his community and to foster understanding. Father Zamora has sponsored workshops on issues such as domestic violence and teenage pregnancy as a means of helping his community through education, individual empowerment, and communication.

Mr. Speaker, as Father Zamora prepares to assume a new position at the Good Shepherd Church, also in New York City, I congratulate him on his successes and extend to him the utmost thanks from those whom he has touched. I speak for everyone who knows Father Zamora when I wish him well in his future pursuits.

NURSING HOME PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT OF 1997

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, when millions of Americans must make the difficult decision to put an aging relative in a nursing home, we trust the institution to care properly for our loved ones. But as a recent General Accounting Office [GAO] study points out, nursing homes across the United States don't always treat the 1.8 million residents like family.

At a time when the nursing home industry is undergoing explosive growth as a result of an aging population, my recently introduced Nursing Home Public Information Act of 1997 would allow families to make an informed choice when choosing a nursing home. By directing HHS to publicly disseminate information currently compiled in databases maintained or available to HHS concerning nursing homes, this bill takes a step in the right direction toward educating the public.

While most nursing homes adhere to Federal and State regulations, each year billions of dollars are lost to fraud and abuse. According to the GAO, Federal Medicare and Federal/State Medicaid programs paid nursing home providers more than $35 billion in 1995. The Department of Justice estimates that as much as 10 percent is lost to fraud and abuse.

By aggressively targeting five states, the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS], through Operation Restore Trust, has obtained 74 criminal convictions and recovered $67.3 million for Medicare. More than four dozen civil suits have collected $72.8 million in fines and settlements, and companies have returned another $47.4 million.

Convicting abusive providers, levying fines, recovering overpayments, negotiating settlements—all these actions are necessary to reduce fraud and abuse. But they will never be more than the second best way to do this. The best way is to prevent fraud, abuse, and waste from occurring in the first place. This requires informing the public. As a recent Government Reform and Oversight Human Resources Subcommittee hearing revealed, the public receives little or no information relating to fraud, abuse, and quality of care in nursing homes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join my efforts to assist millions of families across the Nation by supporting the Nursing Home Public Information Act of 1997.

H.R.—

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 ''Nursing Home Public Information Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.

(a) The Secretary shall publicly disseminate, through whatever means the Secretary determines appropriate, information compiled in databases maintained by or available to the Secretary concerning final adverse actions against and quality of care in nursing facilities.

(b) The Secretary shall determine the scope of the information disseminated under this section, but shall include—

(1) the name (and history of name changes), address, phone number, tax identification number, chairman of the board or director, and licensing State or other governmental entity, of each nursing facility involved in a final adverse action;

(2) the basis and sanction or remedy of each final adverse action;

(3) information about quality of care in nursing facilities, including information collected through the standard surveys conducted pursuant to section 1919 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r); and

(4) any information that would be helpful to consumers purchasing care or services in nursing facilities.

(c) In disseminating information under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the privacy of individuals receiving, or who have received, care or services in nursing facilities is appropriately protected.

(d) The Secretary shall determine the appropriate format and means to disseminate information under this section, but shall consider—

(2) a toll-free telephone hotline;

(2) a public website; and

(3) a printed manual or pamphlet.

(e) The Secretary shall update the information disseminated under this section not less than monthly.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

(For purposes of this section—

(1) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(2) the term ''nursing facility'' has the same meaning provided such term in section 1919 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r);

(3) the term ''final adverse action'' includes—

(A) civil judgments against a nursing facility in Federal or State court related to fraud, abuse, or improper billing;

(B) Federal or State criminal convictions related to fraud, abuse, or improper billing;

(C) actions by Federal or State agencies responsible for the licensing or certification of nursing facilities, including—

(i) formal or official actions, such as revocation or suspension of a license (and the length of any such suspension), reprimand, censure, or probation; or

(ii) any other loss of license or the right to apply for, or renew, a license of the nursing facility, whether by operation of law, voluntary surrender, non-renewability, or otherwise;

(D) exclusion from participation in Federal or State health care programs (as defined in sections 1128B(f) and 1128(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–7b(f); 1230a–7(h)); and

(E) any other adjudicated actions or decisions that the Secretary shall establish by regulation.

(4) the term ''tax identification'' has the meaning provided such term in section 7701(a)(41)).

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect not more than 2 years after the date of its enactment.

TRIBUTE TO STUYVESANT TOWN AND PETER COOPER VILLAGE

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute of the 50th anniversary of Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village, two large apartment complexes in the Borough of Manhattan, in the city of New York. On August 21, 1997, the owners, residents, and neighbors celebrated the 50th anniversary of the historic public-private partnership which created thousands of spacious apartments for reasonable rents.

Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village deserve honor here today as an outstanding example of private housing developed in the public good. In 1943, Frederick Ecker, chairman of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., worked with the city government to rebuild a run-down section of New York known as the Gas House District. He committed resources to build a large housing development, in exchange for property tax incentives. All 3,000 families who lived in the area were first rehoused by Metropolitan Life in an extensive and successful relocation program. The first families moved into Stuyvesant Town on August 1, 1947 and by June 1, 1949 all apartments were rented.

Today, Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village together house 11,000 New York families. The Stuyvesant Town apartment buildings occupy 75 acres and comprise 89 apartment buildings, stretching from East 14th to East 20th Streets and from First Avenue to Avenue C in Manhattan. Peter Cooper Village is located between East 20th and East 23d Streets and also from First Avenue to Avenue C. The complexes have their own security force, supervised play and sports for children, a senior's lounge, annual flea market, holiday celebrations, among other amenities. A very unique quality of these complexes is their park-like setting—between the many buildings are trees, flowers, grass, and a centrally located fountain to give respite from the stresses of city life, just steps away outside the complex.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honor of the historic partnership which has housed thousands of families, generation after generation, for 50 highly successful years. Congratulations to the residents of Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village and to all at Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. who have contributed to the ongoing success of these historic apartment buildings.

TRIBUTE TO SELECTMAN JOSEPH R. LEFEBVRE, JR.

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished public service career of Mr. Joseph R. Lefebvre, Jr.

Joseph Lefebvre is currently a member of the board of selectmen of Adams, MA, one of my Berkshire County towns. He has served with distinction on the board since 1985.

Mr. Lefebvre has been contributing to Adams in numerous roles his entire adult life. In addition to being a town meeting member and holding the position of custodian of the Adams Library for over two decades each, Joseph Lefebvre has served as a member of the Housing Authority, Cemetery Commission, Board of Appeals, and even as a Constable—all during the 1970's and 1980's. His commitment to public service undoubtably touched the lives of nearly every citizen in his community.

Mr. Speaker, on August 24, 1997, the town of Adams honored Joseph with an appreciation banquet. I have represented Berkshire County since 1991, and I want to add my name to the long list of citizens and officials who have paused to say, thank you, to Joseph Lefebvre for everything he has done over the years.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE MUST HAVE AUTHORITY TO RECALL TAINTED FOOD

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the recent recall of 25 million pounds of beef has caused deep concern in the minds of many Americans about the safety of the Nation's food supply. The largest recall of meat in U.S. history has awakened new fears in consumers who are increasingly skeptical about food safety.

America's food supply is the safest in the world. But it is not safe enough.

Mr. Speaker, in January 1998, new meat safety rules will go into effect which will replace the old sniff and poke method used by meat inspectors. The new system will require closer scrutiny by the meat processors and USDA inspectors and will require the use of new high-technology machinery by meat processors which will test meat for bacterial contamination.

Mr. Speaker, meat processors should not wait until they are legally bound to comply with these new regulations. Americans have come to expect the cleanest, safest food on the planet. Intense effort must be made to make the clean, safe food supply even cleaner and safer. Rigorous scientific checks at key points in the processing of meat must be implemented immediately to restore the public's confidence in our Nation's food supply.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, under current law the U.S. Department of Agriculture cannot compel a recall of tainted food. It can only ask producers to recall products voluntarily or it can withhold its inspection seal and the meat cannot be sold in the United States. But what about meat that has already reached the consumer?

Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman recently announced that he will ask Congress for the authority to recall tainted food. I strongly support this recommendation and I urge all my colleagues to work swiftly to enact this legislation. The time has come to restore public confidence in our Government's ability to ensure a safe food supply. We must give the Federal Government the power to compel a recall of tainted or potentially tainted food.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the Record a recent editorial which appeared in

the San Francisco Chronicle entitled ''Big Hamburger Recall and USDA Inspections'' for the benefit of my colleagues.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 27, 1997]

BIG HAMBURGER RECALL AND USDA INSPECTIONS

The nationwide recall of 25 million pounds of contaminated ground beef at the peak if the summer barbecue season was a timely reminder of the imperfect and outdated methods currently used to inspect the nation's meat supplies.

And it was a warning to backyard chefs that the best protection against dangerous bacteria in their burgers is to cook the red out. A rule-of-thumb is that meat should be cooked well-done at a temperature of at least 160 degrees to kill pathogens like the potentially deadly E. coli 0157:H7.

So far there have been no reports the tainted meat reached California, according to the State Health Department, but a spokesman urges consumers to be alert for suspect Hudson Foods Inc. Frozen hamburger patties with ''Establishment No. 13569'' printed inside the USDA inspection seal.

The tainted ground beef was traced to a meat-processing plant in Nebraska, which supplied hamburger patties to Burger King, Safeway, Wal-Mart and Sam's Club. They have removed the meat from their shelves. Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman acted with alacrity in recognizing the crisis and asking for the largest meat recall in U.S. history when 16 people in Colorado were stricken after eating hamburgers.

A significant weakness in the USDA's enforcement powers is that the department does not have the authority to recall tainted meat, but must depend on voluntary compliance by meat-processing companies. ''I think that most folks would be shocked to know that industry—and not federal food safety experts—ultimately make the decision as to whether or not food is recalled when the public's safety is compromised,'' said Glickman. He will ask Congress to grant him the authority to recall, which makes sense. The Hudson hamburger scare also underlined the need for new inspection regulations scheduled to be phased in over the next four years, beginning in January. The stricter new rules will require closer monitoring by federal inspectors at critical points in meat processing.

New regulations will replace the unreliable ''sniff-and-poke'' inspection techniques currently practiced by USDA sleuths who have only a few seconds to spot spoiled poultry and animal carcasses as the move along an assembly line.

The time for updating USDA inspection techniques is long overdue.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREENCROFT

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, in the twilight of our lives, we look forward to and hope for the company of our families, our friends, and our God. This is a fair expectation, but people sometimes need help in realizing it, especially those of us who require more care than we can provide for ourselves as we get older.

The Greencroft complex in Goshen, IN provides a network of services for older adults. In so doing, they ensure that retired Hoosiers live among those who are family and who treat them like family, among friends and in a place to make new ones, and with a Christian emphasis that reminds them that, above all, they are in God's care.

From its earliest beginnings, dating back to November, 1962, Greencroft has grown and expanded to meet the simplest and most dire needs of our older citizens. Providing housing, nursing care, and day-to-day assistance is the basic function of Greencroft. But they do so much more, focused on those quality of life issues that mean the difference between existing and living. Its ties to the Mennonite Church also mean that Greencroft functions as a constant ministry to its residents.

Greencroft is an entire community unto itself, yet by its very interactive nature is a full member of the larger Goshen community. At this time, Greencroft is home to some 850 persons living in independent, congregate, or assisted housing situations, with a full range of health care and other services.

Its Christian character and continuous effort to renew and upgrade its services mean the highest level of staff quality and senior services, a style of living for older citizens that has been emulated far and wide.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I stand to recognize the 25th anniversary of Greencroft, and note that September 2, 1997 is the date of the anniversary celebration. I want to particularly note the contributions of Gene Yoder, president of Greencroft, and the very fine Greencroft staff. Gene is a recognized national leader in the housing field, and he presides over one of the finest facilities of its kind. The people of Greencroft, residents and staff, can all be very proud of this occasion.

THE DRAGONFLY PROGRAM

HON. J.D. HAYWORTH

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman YOUNG for the opportunity to engage in a colloquy earlier today about the Dragonfly program.

Dragonfly, also called the Canard Rotor/Wing technology program or CRW is a revolutionary concept helicopter aviation. It uses a stopped rotor, high-speed vertical take off and landing or VTOL platform that has the performance characteristics of a helicopter take-off and fixed-wing aircraft flight.

Dragonfly has seen a tremendous base of support develop in the U.S. Marine Corps, and Navy. By the end of this fiscal year, McDonnell Douglas will have an R&D investment of about $9 million and Navy investment of $1 million. It can fill critical, future joint requirements for VTOL operations from all air capable ships, Navy and Marine Corps requirements for a joint replacement aircraft, as well as serve as a continuation of the Cobra and Huey helicopter programs.

Dragonfly will demonstrate the revolutionary flight potential of the high speed CRW concept using an autonomous unmanned air vehicle. The CRW concept uses a rotating wing for VTOL operations, and stops the rotor wing for high speed, fixed wing flight. The planned demonstration program will test and validate the new technology, characteristics and capabilities.

The Dragonfly concept represents a new performance capability for small deck ships in both manned and unmanned applications. The manned CRW concept can be applied to a number of joint missions: attack, armed reconnaissance, escort, close air support, combat search and rescue, and utility/transport. Since the Dragonfly is compact in size and needs no launch or recovery system, a CRW unmanned aerial vehicle or UAV can deliver battle damage assessments and beyond the horizon survivable armed reconnaissance, surveillance and target acquisition capability to every surface combatant in the fleet. In addition, a CRW UAV would have over triple the speed and altitude capability of current tactical UAVs and a flight envelope that significantly exceeds other UAV systems currently in production or in the planning stages.

Dragonfly promises to be a strong candidate for providing hovering and high-speed capability in an attack platform needed for a variety of future Marine Corps missions such as V–22 tilt-rotor escort, ground attack, and combat search and rescue. The program's near term transition sponsor office is the Program Executive Office for Cruise Vehicles and Unmanned Vehicles. This office has committed to take the proven CRW technology to its next state of development following a successful demonstration of the Dragonfly capabilities.

I commend the innovative engineering and design teams at McDonnell Douglas, located in my district in Mesa, AZ, for their work on CRW and Dragonfly. The Department of Defense plans to pursue this technology and include it in its budget for fiscal year 1999. The contractor is also committed to continued shared funding of the program.

Mr. Speaker, funding for the Dragonfly Program in the Fiscal Year 1998 Defense appropriations bill is critical to transition this important technology to the future.

TOBACCO BILL

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to prevent tobacco companies from collecting the increase in tobacco excise taxes included in the budget.

When this provision was inserted in the budget very few of my colleagues knew about it. Now it's time to repeal it.

Mr. Speaker, cigarettes are the leading cause of preventable death in the United States.

And, like many other Americans, I watched as the tobacco companies reached an agreement with the attorneys general to try to deal with this enormous public health problem by requiring the tobacco companies to fund antismoking initiatives.

But somehow, someone slipped something into the budget bill that lets the tobacco companies off the hook and forces American citizens to finance the antismoking initiatives instead.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this bill—the tobacco companies should live up to their agreements instead of passing them off onto the American people.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD L. LESHER

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues.

Dr. Richard L. Lesher, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has announced that he will retire after 21 years of faithful service to the chamber and business communities across the country.

Dr. Lesher began his career by receiving his doctorate in Business Administration from Indiana University. Then, he worked as an assistant professor at the Ohio State University. From 1964 to 1969, Dr. Lesher was an assistant administrator at NASA during a period marked by exceptional achievement in space exploration.

Dr. Richard L. Lesher assumed the presidency of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in 1975. Since then, he has been devoted to advancing the interests of the U.S. business community. He played an instrumental role in developing Grassroots Action Information Network [GAIN], a service through which influential legislation was passed due to its membership. Dr. Lesher then steered the chamber's launching of the American Business Network, or BizNet. This network featured two award-winning television programs: ''First Business'' and ''It's Your Business''. Lesher is also a decorated newspaper columnist in the Voice of Business, which is distributed in over 600 newspapers across the Nation.

Dr. Lesher's accomplishments and contributions to business development were rewarded when he received the Associated Trends Executive of the Year Award. His hard work, dedication, and determination lead to this monumental award.

Dr. Richard L. Lesher's service and commitment to the business world are commendable, and Dr. Lesher's work is deserving of thanks and praise of the people of his industry. I ask my colleagues to join me today in thanking Dr. Lesher, and wishing him luck and success in the future.

CONGRATULATING MS. JENNIFER GOODMAN, WINNER OF THE 1997 VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP

HON. ASA HUTCHINSON

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Ms. Jennifer Goodman of Clarksville, AR, for her winning entry in the Veterans of Foreign Wars 1997 Voice of Democracy Broadcast Scriptwriting Contest. A senior at Clarksville High School, Ms. Moore is already an active participant in our Nation's democratic process—serving as senior class president, attending Girls' State, and serving as the district president of Future Business Leaders of America.

The Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program, which began 50 years ago, provides financial awards to students whose writing expresses the spirit of democratic principles. Ms. Goodman's entry exemplifies the patriotism and self-sacrifice of those who gave their lives for freedom's sake.

I congratulate Ms. Goodman on her thoughtful and moving essay. Mr. Speaker, I just might borrow it sometime!

I would also like to thank VFW Post 8532 and its Ladies Auxiliary in Coal Hill, AR, for sponsoring Ms. Goodman. This Nation owes a debt of gratitude it can never repay to our veterans—those who served our country in times of crisis and who continue to serve our communities through programs such as this.

1996–97 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

(By Arkansas Winner Jennifer Goodman)

Democracy, a form of government above and beyond. Democracy stood by our first president in the blood and snow of Valley Forge. It was there, when our nation was born with the wilderness at her back, stormy seas at her sides and not one friendly neighbor to call on for help, the democracy earned the right to be recognized. It's existence has been paid for with a price that few today can truly comprehend.

We see in our nation's distant memory those who gave their lives for it's existence. They died in places like Pork Chop Hill, Normandy, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Pearl Harbor and the Asian Jungles, half a world away. More than a million of our finest troops died for democracy's right to speak. They are buried in Flanders Field in France, the Punch Bowl in Hawaii, some in the mud or sand where they fell. They are gone, but they are not forgotten. Even though their lives were short, their fight for the right to democracy remains. Because of their sacrifice democracy has the right to speak, so we need to listen.

Democracy speaks to the heart of every nation, to all men, women and children of every race, creed and color. Listen to her message. No other nation with any other form of government is swifter to unselfishly spend billions of dollars, sail strange seas, fly unfamiliar skies to rescue a defeated besieged people with facial features, religions and ways of living that my seem odd by my standards, but democracy never noticed. For democracy only sees them as depressed hurting people crying for help. So democracy's defenders marched on leaving a trail of their own blood behind, as they liberated people they had never seen before and would never see again. When peace came from their efforts they simply went home to mom, asking no thanks, expecting no monuments, and surely not expecting to build a world empire, because that is not what democracy is all about. Democracy does not enslave other nations, it extends to them their own freedom. A chance for them to experience the way of life that only democracy, a form of government above and beyond all others, could share with them.

As Americans we need to be proud of democracy for no other form of government guarantees you the freedom that it does. Freedom to be whatever you want to be, a street sweeper or an astronaut. Freedom to travel from state to state, freedom to speak and to write. Freedom to praise or to criticize. Freedom to save and build a fortune that at the end of your life you may simply give away. Freedom to worship as our hearts and minds dictate. Freedom to vote, knowing that one vote can and does make a difference. Freedom not only to choose those who lead you, but to be a part of that body which does the leading. Whether it be a local school board member, a state representative or even the President of the United States, every citizen of a democracy can dream that dream if they so desire.

This summer I was privileged to visit our nation's capitol. There my heart was filled with pride as I viewed the great buildings that represent our democracy, the White House, the Capitol, the House of Congress, the Supreme Court. It brought to my mind what a great nation we have. But then I returned to my home town, Maine Street USA, just an average American city, yet very special to me. As I looked around I found that same sense of pride filling my heart once again, my city hall, my court house and yes, even my school. The question came to my mind, ''Don't these buildings represent democracy also?'' As I looked at the eternal flame on the court house square, which burns in memory of our honored veterans, I was reminded once again of those who gave so much to purchase the rights and privileges that I now have. May I never forget what they have given me, Democracy, a form of government above and beyond all others.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in case you or any other Members missed it during the recent district work period, I gladly bring to your attention one of the most significant newspaper columns to appear this year.

It was written by James Glassman of the American Enterprise Institute and published August 12 in the Washington Post, which, Mr. Speaker, is never confused with a house organ of the Republican Party. It should humble us all in this body to read Mr. Glassman claim that as Members of Congress we have had little to do with the economic recovery and do well when we, and I quote, ''get out of the way.'' Truer words were rarely spoken, but I can hardly resist adding that ''getting out of the way'' is exactly the thrust of many Republican policies and exactly the opposite of the party which controlled this House for 40 years.

But the most welcome truth in Glassman's column is credit national business leaders give, not to President Clinton, but the President Reagan for today's economic recovery.

Some might say, Mr. Speaker, that Ronald Reagan has been out of office for 8 years, which is true. But the column makes clear that we are now reaping the harvest for policies that took root during the Reagan years, so much so, in fact, that Ronald Reagan is the first politician listed by business leaders surveyed on the recovery. His policies are credited by 26 percent of those surveyed, compared to 14 percent for President Bush. Down near the bottom, at 8 percent, are the policies of President Clinton.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that any survey could find even 8 percent of business leaders who would credit the biggest tax increase in American history for anything positive. But the point remains. We owe Ronald Reagan a huge debt.

I gladly place the Glassman column in today's RECORD and urge all Members to read it.

THE REAGAN BOOM

(James K. Glassman)

Whose economy is this anyway?

Both President Clinton and Congress are eager to take credit for our 3 percent GDP

growth, 4.8 percent unemployment and 2.3 percent inflation—amazing figures, all.

But government doesn't make things or sell them. People and the companies they create do. What has happened in the past 15 years is that businesses are making things (and providing services) better and cheaper. Through risk-taking, hard work, good management and the exercise of sheer talent, the economy is booming.

What have Washington politicians done to effect this success? Practically nothing, except to have the sense, occasionally, to get out of the way. President Clinton and Hill leaders are little more than supernumeraries, bit players in this great economic opera, but they still can't resist shoving to the front of the stage for the curtain calls.

For instance, last week, it was particularly annoying to see both Republicans and Democrats reveling in the balanced budget deal—as though this fictive creation were revitalizing the economy.

The truth is precisely the opposite: It's the economy that is balancing the budget, not the budget that is boosting the economy. The reason the deficit has fallen from $290 billion in 1992 to $34 billion this year is that a tidal wave of tax revenues, generated by the private sector, has washed into the U.S. Treasury.

The figures are astounding. In fiscal 1992, the government collected $1,090 billion in taxes. This year, which ends Sept. 30, it will collect $1,578 billion, according to new estimates by the Congressional Budget Office.

Tax receipts are up 45 percent in five years, while inflation has risen only 14 percent.

In other words, the government is taking in $488 billion more in 1997 than it did five years ago. Unfortunately, it is also spending $231 billion more. If that rise in spending had only been kept down to the rise in inflation, we'd be running a surplus of about $50 billion this year.

This flood of cash is not the result of higher tax rates. Yes, Bill Clinton imposed some increases in 1993, but they were paltry compared with Ronald Reagan's cuts in 1981 and 1986. The top rate, pre-Reagan, was 70 percent on ''unearned'' (meaning investment) income, 50 percent on earned income and 35 percent on capital gains. Those rates have fallen to a maximum of 39.6 percent for income and 28 percent (now 20 percent) for capital gains.

And what's happened? Revenues poured in, just as the supply-side economists predicted they would. In 1980, government tax receipts were only $517 billion. Since then, they've risen 205 percent, while consumer prices are up just 85 percent.

If not higher tax rates, then what's the reason for the increase in revenues? Businesses are generating more profits, hiring more workers and compensating them better. And government gets a lower percentage of a much higher take.

But why are businesses doing so well? The best answers may come from the people who run them. Last month, Investor's Business Daily commissioned a survey of 200 CEOs and chief financial officers from the nation's largest publicly traded firms. They were asked ''What triggered recent economic growth?''

Leading the list: productivity (making more with less). Second: Federal Reserve policies, which have helped keep inflation low. Next, in order: information technology, restructuring the globalization.

The first politician to appear on the list was Ronald Reagan, in sixth place. His policies were credited by 26 percent of the CEOs and CFOs as triggering the surge in growth. Farther down the list, at 24 percent, were ''Bush policies.'' And near the bottom, at 8 percent, were ''Clinton policies.''

Now, I'll admit these captains of industry have GOP leanings, and their answers may be self-serving. But their answers have the force of logic.

Consider Silicon Valley, subject of a cover story in Business Week. How did it ''reach its zenith?'' the magazine asks.

''What we found was a huge brain trust, companies galore to service the tech machine, and a daredevil, risk-taking culture.'' No mention of an increasingly irrelevant Washington.

In fact, the CEOs and CFOs have it right. Reagan is the only politician who deserves credit for the rebirth of the American economy. But at his Aug. 6 press conference, Clinton could not resist taking a swipe at him. ''In 1993,'' he said, ''we abandoned supply-side, trickle-down economics.'' Nonsense.

Supply-side economics is still with us, and it's performed as advertised. In fact, the past 15 years, the longest stretch in U.S. history with just one shallow recession, should be called the Reagan Boom.

The incentives of lower tax rates and deregulation have encouraged more risk-taking, less diversion of valuable resources into tax shelters, more sensible investment and work.

Revisionism dominates the press today, but the facts were clear nearly a decade ago. ''Measured in 1982–84 dollars, the income tax revenue collected from the top 10 percent of earners rose from $150.6 billion in 1981 to $199.8 billion in 1988, an increase of 32.7 percent,'' wrote James D. Gwartney of Florida State University in the ''Fortune Encyclopedia of Economics.'' ''In effect, lower rates soaked the rich.''

The current flood of revenues is merely one result of what is literally a supply-side boom. For all this, politicians shouldn't be congratulating themselves. They should be thanking the robust private sector, plus, of course, Ronald Wilson Reagan.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND CHINA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, former President Jimmy Carter recently made a compelling case in the New York Times that good relations with China are not incompatible with an American foreign policy that places human rights at the forefront of our diplomatic agenda.

President Carter cogently argued that only through sustained dialog and interaction with the Chinese can we, over time, resolve the differences that separate our two nations and encourage the Chinese leadership to give the people of China the freedoms they so richly deserve.

I commend the article by President Carter and ask that it be placed in the RECORD so that colleagues who might have missed it can have an opportunity to study it.

IT'S WRONG TO DEMONIZE CHINA

(By Jimmy Carter)

ATLANTA.—I spent the spring of 1949 in the seaports of China as a young naval officer on my first submarine cruise. Nearly 30 years later, Deng Xiaoping and I normalized diplomatic relations between our countries. We knew that even with this opening, decades of patience and persistence would be required before the bonds between our greatly different countries would be firm and predictable.

I consider sound Sino-American relations, along with the importance of maintaining human rights as a foundation of American foreign policy, to be legacies of my Administration. These two goals are not incompatible, but can be reached only if we try to understand each other.

Americans have benefited from the unprecedented stability and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region made possible by close ties among the United States, China and Japan. But the greatest beneficiaries have been the Chinese people, whose quality of life and human rights have improved enormously during the last two decades.

Both China and the United States continue to share many interests: maintaining peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, controlling weapons of mass destruction, preventing conflict on the Korean peninsula and fostering open trade. Unfortunately, many Americans and Chinese have lost sight of the original vision that brought us together. Ill-informed commentators in both countries have cast the other side as a villain and have even forecast inevitable confrontation between the two nations. The accomplishments of a quarter century are at risk.

Since my Presidency, I have been to China periodically to discuss world and domestic affairs and to visit rural areas. On my latest trip last month, I met with President Jiang Zemin, Prime Minister Li Peng, the chairman of the National People's Congress, Qiao Shi, and other leaders. They expressed concern that our leaders are encouraging Japanese rearmament and extending Japan's defense perimeter to include Taiwan. They also deeply resent American sales of F–16 jet fighters and other weaponry to Taiwan, saying that these deals seem to violate pledges made to them by Presidents Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan and me.

We also discussed America's concerns, including the mounting trade deficit, human rights and particularly the treatment of the Tibetan people.

Mutual criticisms are proper and necessary, but should not be offered in an arrogant or self-righteous way, and each of us should acknowledge improvements made by the other.

Significant changes are taking place throughout China. There is no longer a single unquestioned government policy. Instead, China's top leaders have a wide range of opinions on such issues as the role of parliaments, expansion of the election process and privatization. Since normalization, an increasingly free economic system has transformed the lives of Chinese people. Farmers now retain profits on practically all crops planted on their land, and many villagers own their own businesses. Incomes and educational opportunities have also risen sharply.

Although congregations must still register with the Government, membership in Christian churches is booming. The pastor of the church we attended in Shandong Province knew of only 200 believers in his rural county after the Cultural Revolution, and they had no churches or Bibles. There are now 15 congregations in 11 churches, 3,000 members have been baptized, and Bibles are distributed freely.

A 1987 law mandates elections in nearly a million villages. Citizens can choose among multiple candidates, including those who are not members of the Communist Party, in a secret ballot, and many nonparty members have been chosen as village leaders. The Carter Center has observed some of these contests. Arbitrary power is still exerted by some political leaders, but progress is being made in promoting the rule of law. Some citizens are even bringing lawsuits against government agencies that violate their rights.

Citizens are more free to move from one place to another, and the nation has been opened to outside interests and influence. Until 1985, no outsiders were permitted to enter the rural county we visited; now village leaders are trying to expand their 45 joint ventures with foreigners.

President Jiang's long overdue state visit to Washington in October—the first by a Chinese leader in 10 years—will provide an opportunity to address human rights and other issues.

American criticism of China's human rights abuses are justified, but their basis is not well understood. Westerners emphasize personal freedoms, while a stable government and a unified nation are paramount to the Chinese. This means that policies are shaped by fear of chaos from unrestrained dissidents or fear of China's fragmentation by an independent Taiwan or Tibet. The result is excessive punishment of outspoken dissidents and unwarranted domination of Tibetans.

But frank discussions on these and other issues can sometimes yield real progress. In private discussions in 1979, Deng Xiaoping agreed to address the issue of religious freedom, and great improvements were made. In 1987, after a visit I made to Tibet, and after subsequent conversations with the exiled Dalai Lama, discussions were arranged between his emissaries and Chinese Government officials. Unfortunately, the Tiananmen Square tragedy aborted the initiative.

In spite of our differences, China and the United States must continue to pursue ways to co-exist peacefully and productively. In addition to summit meetings, ordinary Americans and Chinese can help. For example, more than 100,000 Chinese students have attended American universities since 1979, providing an invaluable cultural and intellectual exchange for both countries.

Only through continued dialogue at many levels can be resolve differences and build a foundation for better understanding.

A TRIBUTE TO ROUNDY'S

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a Wisconsin-based firm, Roundy's, Inc. which was founded in Milwaukee in 1872 and proudly celebrates its 125th anniversary this year.

Roundy's has grown from a small wholesale grocery and coffee warehouse in Milwaukee's third ward, to the largest food corporation in Wisconsin and the Nation's 5th largest food supplier. Roundy's employs over 2,700 individuals in my home State and over 5,100 in the Midwest. The Roundy's name, whether on grocery items, frozen foods, dairy, meat, produce or bakery, is synonymous with quality.

For many years, Roundy's has been a major participant in community activities. The corporation is a strong supporter of, and major contributor to, the Special Olympics in both Wisconsin and Illinois. It's president and chief executive officer, Gerald F. Lestina, is the president and founder of ''In The Paint at One Two,'' Milwaukee's extremely successful midnight basketball league. The company is also actively involved with many area charities including the Midwest Athletes Against Childhood Cancer [MACC] Fund, the Lions Clubs, Kiwanis, Rotaries, YMCA, YWCA, the United Way, Salvation Army, and the Ronald McDonald House. Roundy's is also a contributor to the Second Harvesters food bank and other various community food pantries located throughout the Midwest.

With all of this in mind, I am pleased to join my colleagues from Wisconsin and throughout the Midwest in recognizing Roundy's as the good corporate citizen it is and in honoring the corporation on its 125th anniversary celebration.

Best wishes to Roundy's for many more years of success.

HIGH BEER TAX HURTS COLORADO

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the tax on beer hurts Colorado's economy, helps no one, and ought to be rolled back. Congress should start by repealing the 100 percent beer tax hike it foolishly imposed back in 1990.

Remember Joe Six Pack? Politicians used to invoke the name to conjure images of the average, hardworking, middle-class American. Joe Six Pack is the kind of guy who puts in an honest day's work to support a family and the mortgage.

He loves his country. He plays second base on the softball team, cheers his kids in the school play, and prays before dinner.

On Sunday, he barbecues burgers on the grill, kicks back to his mostly clean recliner, enjoys his favorite team on the T.V., and pops open an ice-cold can of beer.

Ironically, Joe Six Pack isn't too fond of the politicians who like to talk about him—and with good reason. Joe is shelling out an incredible 43 percent of the cost of every beer he buys to the Government.

In 1990, Congress passed one of the biggest tax increases in history. In fact, President George Bush, who helped engineer the deal, lost his job because of it. The tax hike included new taxes on yachts, private airplanes, expensive jewelry, furs, luxury cars, and it doubled the tax on beer.

Since 1991, Congress has repealed nearly every one of these taxes, but the huge tax markup on beer remains, and American beer drinkers continue getting nickeled-and-dimed by the Government with every sip.

Beer is big in Colorado. In 1995 Colorado's beer industry paid $53 million in excise taxes. Forty-five thousand Coloradans hold beer-related jobs earning nearly $1 billion in wages, accounting for a total economic contribution of $4.7 billion.

Coors and Anheuser Busch are two of Colorado's larger employers but the State is also home to regional brewers, microbreweries, beer wholesalers, distributorships, 3,000 off-premise retailers, 6,000 on-premise retailers, barley growers, and scads of other farmers who support the brewing industry. Yet much as brewing helps Colorado's economy, our fiscal performance could be even better.

Simply put, excessive beer taxes have stifled the industry's growth slowing Colorado's economy. In fact, a 1996 economic analysis by DRI/McGraw-Hill concluded that 50,000 new jobs would be created nationally by rolling back the 1990 beer tax.

Beer was first subject to tax in 1862 as an effort to help finance the Civil War. Since then, significant increases coincided with World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. On three occasions the tax was actually reduced.

Today, Congress is looking for ways to spend less in Washington so that Joe Six Pack's middle-class family can finally enjoy well-deserved tax relief. Consumption statistics clearly point to the beer tax as a prime target. Beer taxes hit lower-income families five times harder than upper-income families.

Beer is one of the most highly-taxed consumer goods sold in America, taxed 50 percent more than for other consumer products. And the tax is terribly inefficient and unfair to consumers.

Since Federal beer taxes are levied at the brewery, they are subject to wholesaler and retailer markup and to State and local sales taxes. Consumers are paying taxes layered upon other taxes, ultimately paying about $2 in increased cost for every $1 in tax.

Some who support the high beer tax contend falling alcohol abuse rates favor the steep tax. Again, research dispels the notion that high beer taxes have anything to do with alcohol abuse rates, which have fallen steadily for over a decade.

Long before Congress raised the beer tax, the beer industry itself had poured millions into personal responsibility campaigns aimed at youths and consumers.

Americans heard the message and enthusiastically embraced it. But the increased tax had no measurable effect on the well-established positive trend toward more responsible alcohol consumption, and no effect at all on those who are disposed to alcohol abuse.

Higher beer prices do not deter alcohol abusers who simply turn to more concentrated or cheaper products. Market research, instead, confirms that lower sales caused by higher taxes are attributed almost entirely to fewer purchases by responsible drinkers.

This year, Congress heard the pleas of Joe Six Pack, that American families are over taxed and politicians must do more to control the Government's appetite for spending. We cut capital gains taxes, income taxes, and death taxes. We made it easier to afford a college education and save for retirement. It was a good first step.

But while the 1997 tax cuts are an encouraging start, they are certainly not the full measure of adequate tax relief. Congress can do better.

What's good for Joe Six Pack is good for Colorado, and good for America too. One of several taxes Congress should further cut to bolster economic growth is the beer tax.

INTRODUCING THE HEALTHY FAMILIES INITIATIVE

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, child abuse and neglect is an epidemic that devastates our children and often leads them to a life of crime. In 1994, public welfare agencies received reports of 3.1 million children being

abused or neglected. Each year, an estimated 2,000 children—most under the age of 4—die at the hands of parents or caretakers.

A study shows that abused children are more likely to commit crimes both as juveniles and as adults. Abused children are more prone to commit a violent crime during their lives. It is also more probable for abused children to grow up and abuse their children, starting the whole cycle over again. Congress must take action to end this cycle of abuse and crime that ruins the lives of thousands of our children.

Some states and communities have found a solution that has proven 99 percent successful in preventing child abuse and neglect among those families most at-risk. Modeled after a program pioneered by the State of Hawaii, these programs utilize existing social services to provide counseling to at-risk families that volunteer to participate in the program.

Today, I am introducing the same bipartisan legislation that I introduced in the last Congress to create the Healthy Families Initiative. This bill would enable the Federal Government to help States and communities that decide to create one of these programs. Simply put, my bill would make Healthy Families programs eligible for funding as crime prevention programs under the 1994 Crime bill—at no new cost to the Federal Government.

This legislation is an innovative way to help communities fight child abuse, and has many substantial benefits. My bill helps programs that have proven effective preventing child abuse. Healthy Families programs have a solid record of success in the State of Hawaii and in communities across the Nation, including Port Angeles, in the district I represent.

This bill will create no new bureaucracy and no new programs within the Department of Justice. Most importantly, no new costs will be created by my legislation—Congress will not be required to spend one additional dollar on this program. This bill will merely enable programs to compete for existing crime prevention grant moneys. Also, qualifying programs are required to coordinate with other organizations to avoid duplication of services.

States and communities will retain control. This bill will give them a hand, but States and communities will still be in charge of their own programs.

I would like to thank each of the 21 Representatives and delegates from around the country for cosponsoring this bipartisan initiative. I urge every Member to support this strong, bipartisan solution to one of the most damaging problems afflicting our children.

HONORING PHILLIP W. LACY AND METHODIST HOSPITAL OF HOUSTON

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the tremendous contributions that Phillip W. Lacy and Methodist Hospital of Houston have made to the fight against AIDS in Houston and across the Nation. I congratulate them as they are honored by the national AIDS Action Foundation at a dinner in Houston this Thursday, September 4, 1997, for their leadership, courage, and commitment in the fight against HIV and AIDS. Phil Lacy and Methodist Hospital are certainly deserving of this honor.

Phil Lacy has been on the front lines of every battle against AIDS and is a tremendous advocate for people living with HIV and AIDS. He has lent his time, talent, commitment, and energy to countless local and national organizations and events, serving as the founder, leader, and organizer of many. It is rare that a host committee or a board of directors does not include Phil's name. But Phil is not only a supporter, but an active participant in these causes, especially in the tireless work of raising the funds necessary to turn dreams into reality.

Phil Lacy has organized or served organizations such as the Houston Black Tie Dinner, Inc., DIFFA/Houston, AIDS Action Foundation, American Foundation for AIDS Research, HIV Medical Care Fund, Inc., Bering Community Service Foundation, the Montrose Clinic, the NAMES Project, and the Texas Human Rights Foundation. An honors graduate of the University of Texas School of Law and a member of the State Bar of Texas, he has also provided pro-bono legal advice to numerous community organizations, including those dealing with HIV and AIDS.

Phil Lacy has truly made a difference in fighting AIDS and helping those facing the challenge of living with HIV and AIDS. His dedication has won him admiration and respect not only in Houston, but across the Nation, as exemplified by this recognition from the AIDS Action Foundation.

Methodist Hospital has also demonstrated tremendous commitment to helping people living with HIV and AIDS. Methodist has set the standard for giving back to the community through its generosity both to the Bering Community Service Foundation and to the SEARCH Project for the Homeless for their Tiny Treasures Program. Methodist has dedicated funds, resources, and time to help these organizations provide direct care to Houston's HIV/AIDS populations, including dental care, adult day care, and pediatric AIDS care. Methodist is a national example of how to effectively target resources for the maximum benefit in addressing the multiple health care challenges of AIDS.

Phil Lacy and the dedicated staff of Methodist Hospital remind all of us of the ways we can become involved and make a difference in the fight against AIDS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent during rollcall vote 352. If present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall 352.

TRIBUTE TO RADIO STATION WGAP

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, while we were on our district work period in August, radio station WGAP of Maryville, TN, celebrated a great milestone—its 50th anniversary.

Local radio stations are very important to this Nation. They not only help our citizens stay informed, but they also help promote the local economy and support the general well-being and cohesiveness of a community. WGAP has certainly done this, and has provided great community service to the citizens of Maryville and throughout Blount County.

In a day when many people do not stay with one company for very long and loyalty is not regarded as highly as it once was, I especially want to call attention to and commend the career of Carl Wells. Mr. Wells has been with WGAP from the very first day and has certainly been instrumental in keeping this station on the air and successful over the years. Not many small businesses are able to survive for this many years, and I want to congratulate station owner Steve Corbitt and all of those who have worked for this outstanding radio station over the years.

Walker Johnson wrote a very interesting and informative article about a small part of the history of this station for the August 15, 1997, Knoxville News Sentinel. I would like to call this article to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

[From the Knoxville News Sentinel, Aug 15, 1997]

WGAP PROUD OF ITS SPORTS HERITAGE

(By Walker Johnson)

Maryville's WGAP turned 50 years old Aug. 13. To get a true historical perspective of the station, I talked with a group of men who had been connected with WGAP from the beginning. When I asked them about the station's sports history, they all told the same story.

WGAP was the first member of the Vol Network. Steve Corbitt, third owner of the station, said that when Lindsey Nelson and University of Tennessee Coach Robert Neyland formed the Vol radio network, the Knoxville flagship station was WKGN, but due to a certain sponsor, WGAP was to be included in the first broadcast. The first sponsor on the Vol Network was Aluminum Company of America, and the execs there told Nelson the Maryville station had to be included in the broadcast or they would not sponsor the games.

Over the next five decades, WGAP carried the Vols, Maryville College football, the Brooklyn Dodgers, NASCAR and high school sports. The local sports announcer positions have been held by Tom Lyons, Ken Kribbs, Pete Williams, Steve Corbitt and Maryville's mayor, ''Skeeter'' Shields. Glen Morton is currently doing local play-by-play.

The fuel that has kept WGAP running over the past 50 years had been their wide and loyal client base. Carl Wells started with the station on Day One and is still selling advertising. Wells told me he has about 20 clients on his list, and he tries to touch base with most of them every day.

My father, Charles W. Johnson, held the title of the longest-running client of the station until he retired in the late 1970s. Dad's

show fired up at 6:45 every morning, and the theme song was Eddy Arnold's ''Cattle Call.''

If you are not familiar with the tune, let me inform you: It starts cold with Eddy yodeling. I cannot begin to describe the mental state that can be induced by a clock radio awakening someone from a sound sleep to the sound of a long, high, drifting yodel.

I knew the show was working when my first-grade teacher, Mrs. Timmons, asked her class to stand and introduce themselves. When I stood up and proudly said, ''Walker Johnson, and my daddy has the J&K Super Stores,'' that yodel drifted up from the back row.

Carl was my dad's account executive. Today the title of longest-running account in held by Maryville Furniture, and Carl is also their link to the station. A strictly unconfirmed report places Carl's age at 81; if that is true he holds seniority over every broadcast account executive I've ever known.

There is a absolutely no way I can begin to cover the entire history of WGAP in two short columns. An entire book could be written about the Sunday live broadcasts when preachers and singers would lift the roof off the station.

Another chapter could tell of the station's involvement with Blount County's ''Hillbilly Homecoming'' and how WGAP provided emcees to introduce such acts as the Lennon Sisters, Pat Boone, Red Foley and Patsy Cline.

And somewhere in that book there might be a tiny paragraph about a fine-looking 22-year-old announcer who was discovered by the station through the help of his father, who just happened to be their oldest advertiser.

WGAP is a classic example of the need to preserve our broadcast heritage before the memories and the pioneers all fade away.

I promised you last week I would tell about the cherry-bombing of the Blount County Courthouse. I'll give you the Cliffs Notes version.

When the station was across from the courthouse, a certain current station owner and a former Blount County politico and pizza proprietor came to the realization that the Blount County jail was well within slingshot range.

Late one evening a fine and accurate sling was procured, along with a number of cherry bombs. Yardage was carefully calculated, windage checked, and repeated launchings commenced.

Heavily armed officers charged out of the jail doors, looking for the gun battle that must be taking place in the street. The launch team quickly faded back into the shadows of WGAP, and to this day, their identity is a deeply guarded secret.

QUICK TAKES

WMYU's morning co-host is leaving the station. Dean Scott told me he is running two businesses, and he just ran out of time for radio. Scott said his last day on the air will be Aug. 22.

Account executive Jamie Lewis has also resigned from WMYU; she will be the sales manager for Praise 96.3 WJBZ.

My 102 Boomsday activities will not include the My 102 Boomsday 5K race on Saturday, Aug. 30. Promotions Director Mary Deschamps said the station has expanded the program to such an extent on the day of the show that they will no longer do the race.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JON CHRISTENSEN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, before the August recess I inadvertently voted ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 336. I ask that the RECORD show that my intention was to vote ''aye.''

TRIBUTE TO JUDITH AND ARTHUR HIRSHBERG

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague Mr. SHERMAN and I are honored to pay tribute to my good friends Judith and Arthur Hirshberg, who are receiving the 1997 Annual Achievement Award from Action Democrats of the San Fernando Valley. We cannot think of any two people more deserving of an award that recognizes party loyalty and community involvement.

Judith has spent much of her life involved in politics and civic causes. She began her career in Massachusetts, where she was president of the Swampscott Chapter of the League of Women Voters.

After moving to California Judith became a member of the Wednesday Committee, a Los Angeles County organization of women's PAC's. She is also vice president of Penny Lane, a residential treatment facility for emotionally disturbed and abused adolescents, and vice president of Project Focus, a drug and alcohol abuse education center.

Judith is probably best know for having spent the past 9 years as a deputy for Los Angeles city councilman Marvin Braude, who retired in 1997. Before that she worked for former Los Angeles mayor Tom Bradley. Through the years Judith used her political positions to help many people and organizations.

Arthur displays a similar devotion to his community. He was a board member of YEOP, the youth program administered by the EDD. In the aftermath of the Los Angeles riots, he served on President Bush's Commission on Los Angeles riot relief. Arthur is also a board member of the Valley Jewish Business Leaders Association, a support group for the Jewish Home for the Aging.

We ask our colleagues to join us today in saluting Arthur and Judith Hirshberg, whose dedication to politics and their community is a shining example to us all. These are two people who have truly made a difference.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PARISH OF THE NATIVITY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, WILLIMANSETT, MA

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to have this opportunity to congratulate both the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield and the Parish of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Willimansett, MA as they celebrate their 100th anniversary. Representing and serving the parishioners of this church is indeed an honor. The Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary has responded tremendously to the needs of its ever expanding faith community. Providing a strong foundation of Christian values for its spiritual community and offering a forum for Christian worship, this parish has generously given 100 years of devoted service to the residents of Willimansett and beyond. I am proud to share the history of this fine parish as I submit the following historical notes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PARISH OF THE NATIVITY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, WILLIMANSETT (CHICOPEE) MA

HISTORICAL NOTES

THE FOUNDATION

Until 1894, Catholics living in Willimansett travelled either to Holy Name Parish, Chicopee Center, or to Saint Joachim's (now Saint George's) in Chicopee Falls, to fulfill their religious obligations. In the summer of that year, however, representatives of local families petitioned The Right Reverend Thomas Daniel Beaven, Bishop of Springfield, to establish a mission church in the village. The Bishop readily agreed to their request, and delegated Father Alexis Delphos, Pastor of Saint Joachim, to found the mission. Father Delphos rented Perreault Hall, on Olivine Street, as a temporary chapel. On Sunday, December 23, 1894, three Masses were said in the chapel, the first by Father McCoy, Pastor of Holy Name, the others by Father Delphos.

The following year, the catholic population of Willimansett had grown sufficiently to consider establishing a parish with resident pastor. September 1st 1897, Bishop Beaven named Father Hormisdas Hamelin as pastor of the new parish, which would serve the Catholics of the districts of Willimansett and Aldenville. September 12, 1897, Sunday within the Octave of the patronal feast, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Father Hamelin was officially installed in his new parish.

THE EARLY YEARS

During the twelve years he spent in Willimansett, Father Hamelin was to oversee the construction, in 1898, of a parish church as the corner of Chicopee and Newton Streets; in 1901, that of a rectory. Soon, the pastoral needs of the two districts required the opening of a mission church in Aldenville, and the naming of a curate, Father Peter Higgins.

In 1909, Father Hamelin was named to the pastorate of Notre Dame Parish, in Adams. He was replaced by the Reverend Doctor James Francis McGillicuddy, who served as pastor of Nativity until 1916. Father McGillicuddy purchased the church bell which has since been placed in the bell tower of the new church. He was replaced by Father Emilien Delage, who remained Pastor until his death in 1919.

Father Delage was succeeded by Father Louis Arthur Simard. From the time he arrived at Nativity, Father Simard began a campaign to build a parochial school. To this end, he obtained title to the land adjoining the rectory, between Newton and Division Streets. On September 5, 1922, Our Lady of Mount Carmel School was opened, under the supervision of the Sisters of the Presentation of Mary. At first, the Sisters were lodged in the school, using classrooms converted into chapel, community room, dining

room and dormitories. In 1932, the school enrollment having grown, every room was needed to provide classroom space. Father Simard then acquired two adjoining properties on Saint Louis Avenue (formerly Newton Street), to build a convent. The Sisters moved into their newly built residence in October 1932.

During the pastorate of Father Simard, the Parish of the Nativity developed rapidly. In 1909, at the end of Father Hamelin's pastorate, the Aldenville mission had become the parish of Saint Rosa de Lima. In the '20s a number of families of Polish ancestry had settled in Willimansett. In 1925, these families asked Bishop O'Leary to establish a parish of their own. The Bishop asked the Franciscan Fathers to take charge of this foundation. In April 1925, the new church was dedicated as Saint Anthony of Padua Parish.

THE DREAM OF FATHER SIMARD

The Catholic population of Willimansett continued to expand during the '30s. In 1937, the parish numbered 4,500 souls. Despite the fact that seven Masses were being celebrated every Sunday, the church was hardly large enough to accomodate its parishioners. Father Simard seriously considered building a new church, to be erected between the rectory and the convent, at the corner of Chicopee and Mount Carmel. However, the difficulties of the times constrained him to forego—or at least to postpone—the fulfillment of this dream. Father Simard decided, instead, to restore the existing church. The renewal project was launched in the Fall of 1937. Soon, a newly redecorated church became a source of joy and wonder for all the parishioners.

Father Sauvageau was replaced as pastor of Nativity by Father L. George Clermont. It was during his administration that the Sisters of the Presentation, who had directed and staffed Mount Carmel School since its opening, let it be known that, due to difficult circumstances, they were obliged to withdraw from the school. The parishioners of Nativity, recognizing the immeasurable value of their parochial school, decided to embark upon an ambitious project, one that, until then, had been untried in the Diocese of Springfield. The parish school would heretofore be staffed and directed entirely by lay persons. This challenging venture has been quite successful. Under the principalship first of Frederick Becklo, and since September 1980 of Kathleen Hill, Mount Carmel School continues to provide for our young people a solid basis formation in the secular subjects, and a stable formation in Christian values.

THE DREAM FULFILLED

In 1974, his health failing, Father Clermont retired. Father W. Donald Fournier, who had been his curate, became pastor of Nativity. It was he who, at long last, saw the fulfillment of the dream shared by priests and parishioners of Nativity since the time of Father Simard: the building of a new parish church. [The government sought to take the land occupied by the church built by Father Hamelin for the building of Interstate Route 391. The monies offered for the expropriation of this property were sufficient, in the judgement of diocesan authorities, to launch the construction project. An enthusiastic building fund campaign by the parishioners, generously supplemented by gifts of donors, brought in sufficient funds to complete and furnish a magnificent new church and a spacious parish hall. On Pentecost Sunday, May 25, 1980, His Excellency Joseph F. Maguire, Bishop of Springfield, presided at a Concelebrated Mass marking the dedication of the new Nativity Church, in which the Liturgy has been celebrated since Holy Week 1980.]

In November 1980, Father Fournier answered his country's call, and began a tour of duty as a Chaplain in the U.S. Navy. He has been replaced by Father William Paquin. Beginning in December 1980, Father Paquin assumed the pastorate of Nativity. With the assistance of his curate, and the valuable support of the Parish Council, Father Paquin strives to provide for the spiritual needs of his flock, to maintain the parish buildings, to promote the generosity of the parishioners, to encourage among the faithful a genuine spirit of community—of family.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, as we return from the August break, this Congress has one last opportunity to change the current campaign finance system. We have missed earlier opportunities to have a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives for campaign reform. If we fail to act before the House recesses in October we will not see any reform of the current system in the 105th Congress. I urge the leadership of the House of Representatives to allow the Members of Congress an opportunity to vote on campaign finance reform legislation.

It is obvious that the current system is broken and needs dramatic change. Too much money is being spent on campaigns. This has prohibited many qualified individuals from running for office, it has created disgust with the democratic process and it has resulted in some of the lowest voter turnout in years. It is our responsibility as elected officials to change the current system.

As a freshman member who recently went through my first election I understand the problems in the system. I have been working with some of my freshman colleagues to draft and introduce the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act. This act would ban soft money and enact more stringent contribution disclosure requirements for candidates and independent groups. This act would take the biggest money out of elections and begin to restore some credibility to the system. The public is demanding that we enact some form of campaign finance reform. The Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act was negotiated between Republicans and Democrats and is the proper piece of legislation to be considered.

Over the next month and a half we will have plenty of opportunities to move a bill forward, through the committee of jurisdiction and to the floor of the House of Representatives. I will be following the committee and floor schedules closely in order to insure that time is available to consider campaign finance reform legislation before the end of this session. I strongly urge the leadership to take quick action to allow a vote on campaign finance reform. If we fail to act now, we will have missed our best opportunity to bring some respect back to this great institution and restore the public's trust in our democratic process. If we don't act now, next year will be too late.

IN MEMORY OF WALTER D. RAMSAY

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Mr. Walter D. Ramsay, an outstanding individual whose untimely passing will be felt and mourned by many in Washington.

Walt Ramsay, an independent consultant for the precious metals industry and a former long-time administrative assistant to Senator Harrison A. Williams of New Jersey, succumbed to lung cancer early yesterday morning at Inova Hospital in Alexandria, VA. I know my colleagues will join me in offering condolences to his wife, Leslie Sorg Ramsay, his son, Sean Ramsay, and his other family members and many, many friends.

Mr. Speaker, I consider myself very lucky to have had the good fortune to meet Walt shortly after coming to Congress. I was equally blessed with the opportunity of getting to know him better over the years. As a lobbyist, he did not have any issues of concern which came under the jurisdiction of any of my committee assignments, or, at least, any that he felt compelled to raise with me, yet he was always a friendly face in the office. His many stories and anecdotes, as well as his keen political insight, always made him a welcome participant and a joy to speak to at any office gathering.

Mr. Speaker, quite simply, Walt Ramsay was the best of men. He was intelligent and wise, kind and good natured, friendly and humorous, stoic and humble, and, of course, he was Irish. He will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an obituary which appeared in the New Jersey Star-Ledger be placed in the RECORD.

[From the New Jersey Star Ledger, Sept. 3, 1997]

WALTER D. RAMSAY, 62, CONGRESSIONAL AIDE

(By Robert Cohen)

WASHINGTON.—Walter D. Ramsay, longtime chief of staff to former New Jersey Sen. Harrison A. Williams and the mentor to many young Capitol Hill aides, died yesterday after a battle with cancer. He was 62.

Ramsay first came to Washington in 1969 as Williams' press secretary and later took over as his top aide, navigating the legislative and political waters for the senator on Capitol Hill while keeping his finger on the pulse of politics back home in New Jersey.

White House press secretary Mike McCurry, who got his start working under Ramsay in Williams' Senate office, said he was ''a great teacher'' and ''as smart and disciplined when it came to politics and policy as anyone I have ever met.''

''He taught me how to be a press secretary,'' said McCurry.

McCurry said Ramsay could be ''a very demanding boss.'' but had a sense of humor, a broad range of outside interests that included literature and music and ''a different perspective than your typical overachieving Capitol Hill aide.''

Jim Mathews, now the top aide to Rep. Thomas Manton (D–NY) and a former legislative staffer in Williams' office, said he always considered Ramsay his mentor.

''He was the nicest, best-humored person I ever knew,'' said Mathews. ''He never took himself too seriously and understood that

there were more important things in life than politics.''

Mathews said Ramsay was also a very private person who seldom complained or talked about the difficulties he encountered in life.

He said that was true in the early 1980s when two traumatic events took place in a short period of time—the indictment of Williams, his boss, on corruption charges, and a life-threatening accident that put his son, Sean, in a coma for 47 days and later required a lengthy and difficult rehabilitation.

And it was true most recently when he was dying of cancer and chose not to burden his friends.

''He called last week for advice on where a friend should go in Alaska, but never said anything about his condition,'' said Mathews.

Ramsay died yesterday morning at Alexandria Hospital in Virginia. He had been under treatment as an outpatient at the National Cancer Institute.

Born in Jersey City and raised in Cranford, Ramsay graduated from Seton hall University and Seton Hall Law School. He was admitted to the New Jersey bar but chose journalism instead, first as a reporter for the Long Branch Daily Record and later with the Elizabeth Daily Journal.

Ramsay left Williams' office in later 1981 after the senator was convicted of the corruption charges but before the senator resigned and went to work as a lobbyist for the Engelhard Corp. and then as a consultant for the precious metals industry.

He is survived by his wife, Leslie Sorg Ramsay of Alexandria, Va.; his son, Sean of Arlington, Va.: a sister, Mrs. Frances Cokelet of Cranford; and a brother, William W. Ramsay of Trenton.

Funeral services will be private.

IN HONOR OF JAMES ARCHIE McLEOD ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor James Archie McLeod on his retirement as Scoutmaster and leader.

James McLeod has dedicated his life to volunteering as a leader and Scoutmaster in the Boy Scouts of America. His career as an adult leader in scouting began in 1958, while he served as Assistant Scoutmaster in Boy Scouts of America, [BSA] Troop 16, and later in BSA Troop 75. Since 1967, James McLeod has served as the main Scoutmaster of Troop 75 in Garden Grove, California.

Scoutmaster McLeod has given an overall total of more than 40 years of volunteer service to God, Country, and the Boy Scouts of America.

Over the past 40 years, Scoutmaster McLeod has guided over 1,000 boys to the rank of First Class Scout. He has also guided 80 exceptional boys in advanced leadership to attain the rank and honor of Eagle Scout.

Scoutmaster McLeod has been recognized by the Boy Scouts of America for his excellence as a Boy Scout, a Scoutmaster, and in Woodbadge—scouting's highest indoctrination of lifetime leadership.

Scoutmaster McLeod's honors include the Award of Merit from Garden Grove's El Capitan District and the Silver Beaver Award from the BSA Orange County Council. He was also awarded the Scoutmasters Award of Merit from the Boy Scouts of America National Council. This was awarded for managing the largest, most active, and most successful scout troop in the city of Garden Grove, CA.

Scoutmaster McLeod has also helped to promote and provide the experience of scouting to the blind, the physically handicapped, and mentally challenged.

His legacy of leadership in scouting can be seen in the generations of his scouts that are serving as leaders in our community today. Throughout his great career as a Scoutmaster, James McLeod was never monetarily compensated for his time and efforts, but gave freely of his time and his life to scouting.

I would like my colleagues in Congress to join me in recognizing this very special individual, Scoutmaster James Archie McLeod, for his dedication and commitment to the Boy Scouts of America. Let us wish him many years of happiness and success in future endeavors upon his retirement from scouting.

CONGRATULATING CHARLES F. KNAPPER, MAYOR OF NOLENSVILLE, TN, FOR BEING CHOSEN AS AN OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY LEADER IN THE AMERICAN HOMETOWN LEADERS AWARD PROGRAM

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Charles F. Knapper, mayor of Nolensville, TN, for being chosen as an outstanding community leader in the American Hometown Leaders Award Program.

This program is sponsored by the National Center for Small Communities [NCSC] and the Wal-Mart Foundation. The American Hometown Leaders Award Program recognizes elected officials who have provided exemplary leadership in their community. Mayor Knapper was nominated by fellow community residents who believe he has made a difference in his community, both as a leader and as a citizen.

Mayor Knapper has held many titles in the Nolensville community since moving there in 1988. He is a husband, father, church elder, and volunteer. He revitalized the Homeowners' Association of his neighborhood and as chairman of the Community Affairs Committee of the Association, he started an investigation on the feasibility of incorporating the town of Nolensville. Mayor Knapper worked with the Tennessee State Legislature and the Governor's Office in his efforts to attain incorporation. He devoted much of his time and efforts to raising the necessary funds to publicize the incorporation effort, holding community meetings and conducting petition drives. Nolensville was incorporated in 1996.

Mr. Knapper was elected as mayor on October 1, 1996, with 75 percent of the electorate's support. In one of his first acts, Mayor Knapper appointed seven committees of citizen volunteers. These committees have been extremely active and have worked to achieve Mayor Knapper's goal to make Nolensville ''a great place to live.''

Mayor Knapper has the respect and love of the community he serves. This is the true test of a public servant. I commend him on his efforts and on his American Hometown Leaders Award, and I wish him the best of luck.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BETTY SHABAZZ

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Betty Shabazz was a remarkable woman. Her intrepid spirit and tireless efforts on behalf of her family and people of color made her a role model around the world. People from many races and nations drew strength from the courage she showed in the face of adversity.

I had the privilege of knowing Betty as a friend and colleague in the struggle for justice. Like many African-American mothers, she was a fighter and a survivor. After her husband's death, she found strength from within to overcome the tragedy and went on to raise six daughters while pursuing a professional career and serving the community. She set high goals for herself and worked diligently to achieve them.

After Malcolm X's death, Betty went back to school and earned three degrees, including a doctorate in education. She went on to teach at Medgar Evers College in Brooklyn, NY, and served as the school's director of communications and public relations. She also hosted a talk show on one of New York's major radio stations.

As a civil rights leader, Betty often spoke out against race and gender discrimination and on issues of importance to families around the world. She was actively involved in various political and social action groups including the NAACP, the National Political Congress of Black Women, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority and the Links.

Like many African-Americans, Betty was part of an extended family. At the time of her death, she was helping to raise her grandson, Malcolm Shabazz. As she had helped his mother and aunts to do, Betty attempted to help young Malcolm to thrive despite his father's absence. Unfortunately, her time with him was cut short by her untimely death.

Few of us have suffered the tragic loss that Betty Shabazz suffered when she lost her husband to an assassin's bullet. However, most of us know all too well the racism that killed him. The racial hatred that caused terror to the family that Betty and her daughters knew continues to destroy African-American families. It continues to deny blacks equal access to economic and employment opportunities, equal justice under the law, and equal representation in legislative bodies.

Betty Shabazz lived an honorable and exemplary life. She fought against racism and injustice for most of her life. Even when she could have retreated from the rest of the world without blame, she continued to fight. She fought harder for herself, her family, and her community. Her life was a tribute to all families, but to African-American families in particular.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGHWAY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE INVESTMENT ACT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. DINGELL, Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a piece of legislation which will help Congress finish a job it started earlier this summer when we passed the tax portion of the budget reconciliation package: unleashing the windfall created by the restoration of all Federal gasoline taxes to the Federal highway trust fund.

The legislation I offer today would effectively make possible two very important goals: First, a long-overdue renewal of our national commitment to sound infrastructure; second, a means to do so while meeting the letter, the spirit, and deadline of our commitment to balance the Federal budget by 2002.

When this body agreed to the 5-year budget agreement in July, it accepted a provision added by the other body which redirected into the trust fund the 4.3 cents-per-gallon Federal gasoline tax formerly dedicated to deficit reduction. it was estimated that this would add between $6 and $6.5 billion in additional trust fund revenue each year. This provision was accepted not only to end a disingenuous Federal accounting practice, but also to make possible the spending of additional revenue on our Nation's deteriorating infrastructure. While Congress improved a growing problem, it did not solve it: the money is now going to the right place, but it is still trapped and cannot be invested in our roads.

By some estimates, we need to invest nearly twice as much as we do today just to fall no further behind. In my home State of Michigan, roads have deteriorated to the point of being deplorable. The State legislature recently enacted a State gas tax increase to help increase needed highway investment. Meanwhile, Michigan ranks near the bottom in the amount of Federal money invested for roads on a per capita basis. In May, both houses defeated a measure to substantially increase road investments, each by a single vote, after a lot of persuasion to those trying to hold together a budget deal which provided practically level funding for transportation. By considering the legislation I am introducing today, my State and all of our States would realize a considerably greater return on their Federal gas tax contributions.

I would like to remind my colleagues that when Federal investment in our roads grew substantially in 1956, President Eisenhower let the Nation know that a completed interstate system was vital to our national defense. Maintaining a reliable and safe transportation infrastructure is still recognized as important to our national security, and addressing these needs is explicitly recognized in the National Highway System. With our Nation at peace and our economy strong, we have the ability today to make wise choices to preserve the transportation linkages on which all Americans have come to depend. This can only happen, however, if our highway spending keeps pace with the amount of money our drivers pay at the pump in Federal fuel tax.

In the current budget cycle, this House already has contemplated holding defense spending to the levels of the current fiscal year. I believe that such a proposal is warranted if domestic needs can be identified which clearly would serve our national security interests as well. That is why the legislation I am introducing makes possible an override of the firewall established between defense and discretionary spending. Once this procedural barrier is removed, Congress would be able to liberate $6.2 billion of the expected boost in highway trust fund revenue without delaying a balanced budget. How? By choosing to slow the growth in defense spending, and instead investing in a part of our national defense network which also supports our everyday interests: Traveling to work and school, shipping more efficiently between points across the Nation, and by upgrading our national road network to improve the safety and mobility of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Highways and National Defense Investment Act would definitely create the demand for some tough decisionmaking during the next appropriations process. However, our Nation finds itself in a unique position which not only allows, but demands a new investment: we are at peace, the economy is strong, and we are on a fixed course to balance the budget. When the cold war ended a few years ago, there was much talk in this body about a peace dividend. Budget balancing problems never gave us much of an opportunity to invest that dividend. However, that was before the budget deal. Now we have the chance to finish the job that deal started, and that is show the American people that the highway trust fund is more than a gimmick for a balanced budget. Instead, that trust fund is a tool for growth.

HONORING PRINCESS DIANA

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respect to Princess Diana, a woman the world will greatly miss. As a woman and a mother, I have been moved by her caring and her commitment to her sons and to those less fortunate than herself.

Throughout the unremitting scrutiny of Princess Diana's life one thing has shone clearly—her love for her two children. It seems clear that she was devoted to her boys, as they were to her. She gave them her affection, loving attention, and her maternal love and support. My heart aches for those two young men today. I wish them strength and peace.

Princess Diana was clearly a person of great caring and compassion. She chose to use the tremendous prestige afforded her by her station in life to touch the everyday world around her—not the world of wealth and power, but the world of poverty, war, and injustice. She was an advocate for the victims of violence and of poverty.

Her commitment to the hungry, the sick, and the poor in England and around the world should serve as a model to us all. She has lent not just her name, but the strength and warmth of her spirit to a number of causes. She has reached out to extend comfort and an empathetic hand to people whom she felt had been rejected by society including AIDS and leprosy patients, battered women, and drug addicts. She shook hands with AIDS patients when many people were still afraid to touch them. She penned personal notes to families of hospitalized children she had met. She learned sign language to address an association of deaf persons. She hugged the dying in hospices and exchanged stories with women, like herself, who suffered from eating disorders.

Most recently, Princess Diana turned her attentions to the land mines which have claimed the lives and limbs of so many. In particular, she waged a campaign against land mines in Bosnia and last month was in Sarajevo, mourning the victims of war in private talks with families of people maimed or killed by exploding mines. Her leadership on this issue has helped in moving it to the forefront of England's agenda and in moving even this Nation to a point of compromise.

Princess Diana was a very special woman and the world deeply mourns her loss. She was a princess in more than just name, but in her grace and character. She should be long remembered by women the world over. She will be remembered with deep respect and affection. She truly was the people's princess.

THE BALANCED BUDGET AGREEMENT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1997

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, it is very gratifying to be a Member of the 105th Congress which now finds its place in the history books by passing this legislation to balance the Federal budget for the first time since 1969. I am proud to be part of this movement in Government toward responsible fiscal behavior. I am also very pleased that our bottom line is not only a fiscal line but one that accounts for the need to invest in the future.

This balanced budget agreement accomplishes some things that have been driving forces for me both politically and personally. It represents good government—one that exercises fiscal responsibility but also spends money appropriately to provide financial incentives to those who can succeed, compassionate assistance for those in need, and basic protections and services as caretakers of our communities and our environment.

This country has made remarkable progress in reducing the Federal deficit since 1993. While I was not a Member of Congress when the 1993 budget agreement was passed, it is remembered as a budget that called on everyone across the board to accept spending reductions to achieve deficit reduction. The resulting decline in spending, coupled with a very strong economy, has now made it possible to finish the job and balance the budget perhaps as soon as the next year.

The American people will never agree completely on how their Federal tax dollars should be spent. In a democracy, that is to be expected and tolerated. But every American should have confidence that its Government is living within its means and requiring accountability of those investments it chooses to make. Even if those investments are not universally endorsed.

Since being elected to Congress, I have voted against what I consider to be wasteful spending. I also fought to include stronger budget enforcement guarantees in this agreement. The agreement contains some basic enforcement language including the continuation of the current caps on ''discretionary spending'' and ''pay go'' rules. These enforcement provisions are a good start but I had hoped they would be much stronger.

I am a founding member of the Bipartisan Budget Enforcement Group which proposed legislation to set a strict timetable each year for assessing whether the budget was still on track and require Congress to make necessary changes in spending or taxes if the budget did not remain balanced. Our bill was tough on spending but it also put controls on tax cuts if necessary. This guaranteed that it offended just about everyone and had little chance of becoming law. But my group shined a spotlight on the need for truth in budgeting and served notice to Congress that we are watching. We sent an important message: We will not allow the Government to run on autopilot or break its promises.

Promises—that's really the heart of my personal reason for wanting to help a balanced budget become law. My son, Johnny, is my first child. He is 1 year old and he is my daily reminder that our dedication to fulfilling today's promises will have a profound affect on future generations. This budget makes some good investments in people and their livelihoods including: Grants to provide medical coverage for uninsured children; education tax credits/deductions for tuition at institutions of higher education or training; capital gains tax cut; estate tax cut for family-owned farms and businesses; new Medicare coverage for preventive health care; higher tax deduction for health insurance premiums for the self-employed; and increased spending for federal supported job training programs.

These are worthwhile investments in the better health and education of our country. I can readily see the difference they will make in the lives of the people of western Wisconsin.

This budget also takes a long-term look at how to keep the promise of Medicare for the program's current 37 million seniors as well as the baby boomers when they retire. Initially, the agreement makes changes to the program that extends its solvency for about a decade. But it also establishes the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare. This commission must report to Congress by March 1, 1999, on the long-term financial condition of the Medicare trust funds and recommend ways to keep the system solvent through 2030.

This is not a matter to be taken lightly from the standpoint of budgetary or health concerns. Medicare has been revolutionary in its effect on the health of the senior population of America. We must not underestimate the peace of mind that guaranteed medical care in the later years of life brings to every American. It is imperative that we make some long-term fixes to protect and maintain Medicare for future generations.

We need to balance the budget today and 5 years from now, but we also need the political will to look at the long-term needs of our country's citizens. We have promises to keep to those who went before us and a responsibility to those who will travel the road we pave. The Balanced Budget Agreement is a good first step in fulfilling that promise and I urge my congressional colleagues to continue this effort for the benefit of citizens young and old.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 4, 1997, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 5

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD–226

9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings to examine the employment-unemployment situation for August. 1334 Longworth Building

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

SEPTEMBER 8

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the progress of proposed reforms of the District of Columbia school system.
SD–342

2:00 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 222, to establish an advisory commission to provide advice and recommendations on the creation of an integrated, coordinated Federal policy designed to prepare for and respond to serious drought emergencies.
SD–342

SEPTEMBER 9

10:00 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings on the nomination of Gen. Henry H. Shelton, USA, to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
SR–222

Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Immigration Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the economic and fiscal impact of immigration, focusing on the report of the National Academy of Sciences.
SD–226

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the operation of the antitrust division of the Department of Justice, focusing on the Hart-Scott-Rodino process which requires companies to notify the Government of perspective mergers.
SD–226

SEPTEMBER 10

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of Heidi H. Schulman, of California, and Katherine Milner Anderson, of Virginia, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Robert L. Mallett, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary, and W. Scott Gould, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary, both of the Department of Commerce, and Sheila Foster Anthony, of Arkansas, to be a Federal Trade Comissioner.
SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings to review Forest Service organizational structure, staffing, and budget for the Alaska region.
SD–366

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to mark up the proposed ''Workforce Investment Partnership Act'' and to consider other pending calendar business.
SD–430

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

2:30 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nominations of Thomas J. Dodd, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Costa Rica, Donna Jean Hrinak, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Bolivia, and Curtis Warren Kamman, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia.
SD–419

SEPTEMBER 11

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the implications for farmers of the recently proposed Global Tobacco settlement.
SD–106

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the health risks of 1950's atomic tests.
SD–192

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 660, to provide for the continuation of higher education through the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Alaska to the University of Alaska, and S. 1092, to provide for a transfer of land interests in order to facilitate surface transportation between the cities of Cold Bay, Alaska, and King Cove, Alaska.
SD–366

10:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nominations of Susan E. Rice, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Brian Dean Curran, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mozambique, Timberlake Foster, of California, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, Amelia Ellen Shippy, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Malawi, and Nancy Jo Powell, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Uganda.
SD–419

Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to examine the confidentiality of medical information.
SD–430

SEPTEMBER 12

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine issues regarding regulatory reform.
SD–342

SEPTEMBER 15

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To hold hearings to examine fraud in the micro-cap securities industry.
SD–342

2:30 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proliferation in the information age.
SD–342

SEPTEMBER 16

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings to review Federal outdoor recreation policy.
SD–366

Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings to examine the implications of the recent Global Tobacco settlement.
SD–430

SEPTEMBER 17

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

SEPTEMBER 18

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings to examine the implications for farmers of the recently proposed tobacco settlement.
SD–106

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

SEPTEMBER 19

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to examine regulatory reform issues.
SD–342

SEPTEMBER 23

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

Special on Aging
To hold hearings to examine screening and treatment options for prostate cancer.
SD–628

SEPTEMBER 24

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

SEPTEMBER 25

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings to examine the confidentiality of medical information.
SD–430

SEPTEMBER 26

9:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To hold hearings to review the operation of the Treasury Department's Office of Inspector General.
SD–342

SEPTEMBER 29

9:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to review the operation of the Treasury Department's Office of Inspector General.
SD–342

SEPTEMBER 30

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

OCTOBER 1

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

OCTOBER 2

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

OCTOBER 6

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To hold hearings to examine traditional frauds perpetrated over the Internet.
SD–342

OCTOBER 7

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

OCTOBER 8

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

OCTOBER 9

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing.
SH–216

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Agriculture Appropriations, 1998.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S8677–S8764

Measures Introduced: Five bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1142–1146, and S. Res. 118. **Page S8723**

Measures Passed:

Agriculture Appropriations, 1998: Senate passed H.R. 2160, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of S. 1033, Senate companion measure, as passed the Senate on Thursday, July 24, 1997, after taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S8677–82**

Adopted:

Harkin Amendment No. 1057, to provide funding for activities of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the prevention of tobacco use by youth. (By 28 yeas to 70 nays (Vote No. 212), Senate earlier failed to table the amendment.) **Pages S8677–82**

Senate insisted on its amendment, requested a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair appointed the following conferees: Senators Cochran, Specter, Bond, Gorton, McConnell, Burns, Stevens, Bumpers, Harkin, Kohl, Byrd, Leahy, and Inouye. **Page S8682**

National Day of Recognition: Senate agreed to S. Res. 118, expressing the condolences on the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, and designating September 6, 1997, as a ''National Day of Recognition for the Humanitarian Efforts of Diana, Princess of Wales.'' **Pages S8710, S8743–44**

Labor/HHS Appropriations, 1998: Senate continued consideration of S. 1061, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S8685–S8720**

Adopted:

Ashcroft Amendment No. 1061, to provide for limitations with respect to expenditures for abortions. **Pages S8689–91**

Dorgan Amendment No. 1068, to increase the funding for heart and stroke research by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health. **Pages S8695–97**

Specter Amendment No. 1072, to fund demonstration projects on Medicaid attendant care services, within amounts available. **Pages S8701–02**

Coats/Frist Amendment No. 1075, to provide for the conduct of a comprehensive, independent study of National Institutes of Health research priority setting. **Pages S8715–16**

By 95 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. 214), Wellstone/McCain Modified Amendment No. 1074, to provide for the establishment of a program for research and training with respect to Parkinson's disease. **Pages S8711–15, S8720**

Rejected:

By 25 yeas to 74 nays (Vote No. 213), Kyl Amendment No. 1056, to increase funding for Federal Pell Grants, with an offset from fiscal year 1998 funding for low-income home energy assistance. **Pages S8685–89, S8693–94, S8707–11, S8720**

Pending:

Gregg Amendment No. 1070, to prohibit the use of funds for national testing in reading and mathematics, with certain exceptions. **Pages S8697–S8702**

Coats/Gregg Amendment No. 1071 (to Amendment No. 1070), to prohibit the development, planning, implementation, or administration of any national testing program in reading or mathematics unless the program is specifically authorized by Federal statute. **Pages S8699–S8702**

Specter Amendment No. 1069, to express the sense of the Senate that the Attorney General has

abused her discretion by failing to appoint an independent counsel on campaign finance matters and that the Attorney General should proceed to appoint such an independent counsel immediately.

Pages S8702–07

Coats/Nickles Amendment No. 1077, to prohibit the use of funds for research that utilizes human fetal tissue, cells, or organs that are obtained from a living or dead embryo or fetus during or after an induced abortion. **Pages S8719–20**

Senate will continue consideration of the bill on Thursday, September 4, 1997.

FDA Modernization and Accountability Act—Cloture Filed: A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 830, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the regulation of food, drugs, devices, and biological products and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on the cloture motion will occur on Friday, September 5, 1997. **Pages S8720–21**

Subsequently, the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill was withdrawn. **Page S8721**

Removal of Injunction of Secrecy: The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following treaties:

Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters with Trinidad and Tobago (Treaty Doc. 105–22);

Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters with Barbados (Treaty Doc. 105–23);

Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters with Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada and St. Lucia (Treaty Doc. 105–24);

Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters with related Optional Protocol (Treaty Doc. 105–25).

The treaties were transmitted to the Senate today, considered as having been read for the first time, and referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

Pages S8744–45

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

R. Nicholas Burns, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Greece.

Kathryn Walt Hall, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria.

Tom McDonald, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zimbabwe.

Mark Robert Parris, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey.

Edward E. Shumaker, III, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.

35 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Foreign Service, Marine Corps, and Navy.

Pages S8746–64

Measures Referred: **Page S8723**

Communications: **Page S8723**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S8723–32**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S8732–33**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S8733–36**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S8736**

Authority for Committees: **Pages S8736–37**

Additional Statements: **Pages S8737–39**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—214) **Pages S8682, S8710–11, S8720**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 8:29 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, September 4, 1997. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S8745.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

UNION VIOLENCE

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded hearings on S. 230, to revise certain provisions of the Hobbs Act of 1946 to close a loophole which exempts unions engaged in serious violence from existing federal prohibitions and penalties that apply to everyone other than labor unions in the United States, after receiving testimony from Edwin Meese III, former Attorney General, Department of Justice; Reed Larson, National Right to Work Committee, Springfield, Virginia; Michael H. Gottesman, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C.; Julius Getman, University of Texas School of Law, Austin; Shucheng K. Huang, Winchester, Virginia; Glen Dale Yeatts, Pasadena, California; and John Benevento, Hamden, Connecticut.

ENCRYPTION TECHNOLOGY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information concluded hearings on the impact of encryption technology on public safety and law enforcement, focusing on the security needs of business and industry and the use of encryption by organized crime and terrorists, after receiving testimony from Louis J. Freeh, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; Dorothy E. Denning, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; William E. Baugh, Jr., Science Applications International Corporation, McLean, Virginia; Jeffrey A. Herig, Florida

Department of Law Enforcement, Tallahassee; Robert R. Burke, Monsanto Company, St. Louis, Missouri, on behalf of the Overseas Security Advisory Council, Department of State; R. Patrick Watson, Eastman Kodak Company, Rochester, New York; and Kenneth Lieberman, Visa USA, San Mateo, California.

GLOBAL TOBACCO SETTLEMENT

Committee on Labor and Human Resources: Committee held hearings to examine the scope and depth of the proposed settlement between State Attorneys General and tobacco companies to mandate a total reformation and restructuring of how tobacco products are manufactured, marketed and distributed in America, focusing on its long-term impact on children and the public health, receiving testimony from Mississippi Attorney General Mike Moore, Jackson; Matthew L. Myers, National Center for Tobacco-Free Kids, Washington, D.C.; D. Scott Wise, Davis Polk & Wardwell, and John R. Garrison, American Lung Association, both of New York, New York; and Lonnie R. Bristow, San Pablo, California.

Hearings continue on Tuesday, September 16.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 2298, 2379–2394; 1 private bill, H.R. 2395; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 142 and H. Res. 217–218, were introduced. **Page H6797**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

Filed on August 5: H.R. 2378, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998 (H. Rept. 105–240);

H.R. 2378, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998 (H. Rept. 105–240 Part II);

H.R. 700, to remove the restriction on the distribution of certain revenues from the Mineral Springs parcel to certain members of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians amended (H. Rept. 105–241);

H.R. 976, to provide for the disposition of certain funds appropriated to pay judgment in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians, amended (H. Rept. 105–242); and

H.R. 1903, to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to enhance the ability of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to improve computer security, amended (H. Rept. 105–243). **Pages H6796–97**

Independence of India and Pakistan: Pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 157, on August 7, the Speaker announced the following Members of the House to the delegation attending the 50th Anniversary of the Independence of India and Pakistan: Representatives Gilman, Ackerman, Hastings of Florida, Engel, and Delegate Faleomavaega. **Page H6718**

Clerk Designations: Read a letter from the Clerk wherein she designated Mr. Jeff Trandahl, Deputy Clerk; Ms. Julie Perrier, Assistant Clerk; and Mr. Ray Strong, Assistant Clerk to sign papers and do all other acts under the name of the Clerk in case of her temporary absence or disability. **Page H6718**

Resignation from the House of Representatives: Read a letter from Representative Flake of New York wherein he announced his resignation from the House of Representatives, effective October 15, 1997. **Page H6718**

Presidential Messages: Read the following messages from the President transmitted to the Clerk on August 11, 1997:

Balanced Budget Act: Message wherein he, in accordance with the Line Item Veto Act (P.L. 104–130), cancels one item of new direct spending contained in the "Balanced Budget Act of 1997" (P. L. 105–33, H.R. 2015)—referred to the Committee on the Budget and ordered printed (H. Doc. 105–115); and **Page H6718**

Taxpayer Relief Act: Message wherein he, in accordance with the Line Item Veto Act (P.L. 104–130), cancels two limited tax benefits contained in the "Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997" (P.L. 105–34, H.R. 2014)—referred to the Committees on the Budget and Ways and Means and ordered printed (H. Doc. 105–116). **Page H6718**

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Read two letters from the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure wherein he transmits copies of resolutions adopted by the Committee on July 23—referred to the Committee on Appropriations. **Pages H6719–20**

Committee on the Records of Congress: Read a letter from the Clerk wherein she appoints Mr. Roger Davidson of Washington, D.C. to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

Page H6721

Military Construction Appropriations Act Conference: The House disagreed to the Senate amendments to H.R. 2016, making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Representatives Packard, Porter, Hobson, Wicker, Kingston, Parker, Tiahrt, Wamp, Livingston, Hefner, Olver, Edwards, Dicks, Hoyer, and Obey.

Page H6724

Agreed to the Hefner motion to instruct conferees to insist on the House position with respect to funding for Family Housing, Dormitories and Barracks for military personnel serving worldwide. **Page H6724**

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act Conference: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2158, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Lewis of California, DeLay, Walsh, Hobson, Knollenberg, Frelinghuysen, Neumann, Wicker, Livingston, Stokes, Mollohan, Kaptur, Meek of Florida, Price, and Obey. **Pages H6724–25**

Agreed to the Stokes motion to instruct conferees to insist on the position of the House regarding the total funding level provided for the Environmental Protection Agency's ''Hazardous Substance Superfund'' account. **Pages H6724–25**

Transportation Appropriations Act Conference: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2169, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Representatives Wolf, DeLay, Regula, Rogers, Packard, Callahan, Tiahrt, Aderholt, Livingston, Sabo, Foglietta, Torres, Olver, Pastor, and Obey. **Page H6725**

Agreed to the Sabo motion to instruct conferees to insist on the House position with respect to providing $200,000,000 for operating assistance under the transit formula grants program. **Page H6725**

Energy and Water Appropriations Act Conference: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2203, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Representatives McDade, Rogers, Knollenberg, Frelinghuysen, Parker, Callahan, Dickey, Livingston, Fazio, Visclosky, Edwards, Pastor, and Obey. **Pages H6725–26**

Agreed to the Fazio motion to instruct conferees to recede to the Senate on funding levels provided for nonproliferation and arms control programs under the Department of Energy. **Pages H6725–26**

Foreign Operations Appropriations Act: The House considered amendments to H.R. 2159 making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998. The House completed debate and considered amendments to the bill on July 30. Consideration of amendments will resume on Thursday, September 4. **Pages H6726–55**

Agreed To:

The Yates amendment as modified that prohibits any funds to be used by the Government of Croatia to relocate the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia; **Pages H6729–30**

The Traficant amendment that allows procurement outside the United States only for purchases in the country receiving assistance when these purchases cost less, are not available in the United States, or the President determines that such purchases would result in a more efficient use of foreign assistance resources; **Pages H6730–31**

The Traficant amendment that prohibits any funding to be used to pay for NATO expansion not authorized by law; and **Page H6750**

The Bereuter amendment, offered on July 30, that prohibits direct aid to the Government of Cambodia.

Pages H6389–92

Point of Order:

A point of order was sustained against section 539 concerning restrictions on the termination of sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro. **Page H6731**

Pending Amendments:

The Campbell amendment was offered that seeks to increase funding for the African Development Fund by $25 million and decrease the Economic Support Fund accordingly; **Pages H6726–29**

The Paul amendment was offered that seeks to prohibit any funding for population control, family planning activities, or abortion procedures;

Pages H6731–34

The Fox amendment was offered that seeks to prohibit any development assistance funding to support trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, hides or rhinoceros horns;

Pages H6734–39

The Torres amendment was offered that seeks to prohibit any funding for the United States Army School of the Americas; **Pages H6739–49**

The Stearns amendment was offered that seeks to express the sense of the Congress that all member nations of NATO should contribute their proportionate share for the costs of the Partnership for Peace program and any future costs of NATO expansion; and **Pages H6749–50**

The Burton of Indiana amendment was offered that seeks to limit to not more than $41.7 million of Development Assistance funding to India. **Pages H6750–55**

The bill is being considered pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24. **Pages H5732–44**

Order of Business—Foreign Operations: It was made in order that, during further consideration of H.R. 2159, no further amendment shall be in order in the Committee of the Whole except the amendment numbered 1 in House Report 105–184 and the amendment to that amendment, under the terms of the order of the House of July 24, 1997, and the amendment numbered 40 by Representative Burton. **Page H6755**

Legislative Branch Appropriations Act Conference: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2209, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Representatives Walsh, Young of Florida, Cunningham, Wamp, Latham, Livingston, Serrano, Fazio, Kaptur, and Obey. **Pages H6755–58**

By a yea and nay vote of 202 yeas to 208 nays, Roll No. 352, rejected the Serrano motion to instruct conferees to agree to the position in Senate amendment numbered 1 with respect to the account ''Joint Committee on Taxation'' providing not more than a 4.64% increase for the Joint Committee on Taxation compared to an 8% increase in the House bill. **Pages H6755–58**

Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act Conference: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2160, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Representatives Skeen, Walsh, Dickey, Kingston, Nethercutt, Bonilla, Latham, Livingston, Kaptur, Fazio, Serrano, DeLauro, and Obey. **Pages H6758–60**

By a yea and nay vote of 299 yeas to 125 nays, Roll No. 353, agreed to the Kaptur motion to instruct conferees to recede to the Senate regarding funding levels provided under the Food and Drug Administration for the program to prevent the use of tobacco products by minors. **Pages H6758–60**

Defense Appropriations Act Conference: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Representatives Young of Florida, McDade, Lewis of California, Skeen, Hobson, Bonilla, Nethercutt, Istook, Cunningham, Livingston, Murtha, Dicks, Hefner, Sabo, Dixon, Visclosky, and Obey. **Pages H6760–61**

Agreed to the Obey motion to instruct conferees to insist on the House position prohibiting the use of funds to approve or license the sale of the F–22 advanced tactical fighter to any foreign government. **Pages H6760–61**

By a yea and nay vote of 420 yeas to 4 nays, Roll No. 354, agreed that the conference meetings between the House and the Senate on H.R. 2266 be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration; provided, that any sitting Member of Congress shall have a right to attend any closed or open meeting. **Pages H6761–62**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate today and the message transmitted to the Clerk on August 1 appear on page H6717.

Referrals: S. 1120, to provide for a consultant for the President pro tempore, was referred to the Committee on House Oversight. **Page H6783**

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on page H6799.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H6757–58, H6760, and H6761–62. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at 12:00 noon and adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

Committee Meetings

TEACHERS: HELPING AMERICA TO READ

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Held a hearing on Teachers: The Key to Helping America to Read. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence met in executive session to hold a hearing on the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office (DARO). Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

Committee Meetings

TEACHERS: HELPING AMERICA TO READ

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Held a hearing on Teachers: The Key to Helping America to Read. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence met in executive session to hold a hearing on the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office (DARO). Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1997

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, to hold hearings to examine rural and agricultural credit issues, 9 a.m., SR–332.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, to hold hearings to examine national testing for the public school system, 8:30 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Environment and Public Works, to hold hearings on S. 8, authorizing funds through fiscal year 2002 for programs of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Liability, and Compensation Act of 1980, 2 p.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, to hold hearings to examine the current situation in Cambodia, 9 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of Peter L. Scher, of the District of Columbia, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Trade Negotiator, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs, to resume hearings to examine certain matters with regard to the committee's special investigation on campaign financing, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on the Judiciary, to hold hearings to examine copyright infringement liability of on-line and Internet service providers, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, to hold hearings to review the judicial allocations for the Second and Eighth Circuit Courts of Appeal, 2 p.m., SD–226.

NOTICE

For a listing of Senate committee meetings scheduled ahead, see pages E1648–49 in today's Record.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, on D.C. Public Schools, 11 a.m., H–144 Capitol.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials, hearing on the Operation of the Superfund Program, 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing on H.R. 695, Security and Freedom Through Encryption (SAFE) Act, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, to mark up H.R. 1962, Presidential and Executive Office Financial Accountability Act of 1997, 10:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, hearing on proposals for Electoral College Reform: H.J. Res. 28, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; and H.J. Res. 43, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the Electoral College and to provide for the direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Technology, hearing on Small Business Technology Transfer Program, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Benefits, to mark up H.R. 2367, Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1997, 9:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 1061, Labor/HHS Appropriations, 1998.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, September 4

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 2159, Foreign Operations Appropriations Act (open rule); and

Consideration of H.R. 2264, Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations Act for FY 1998 (open rule, 1 hour general debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bentsen, Ken, Tex., E1643
Bereuter, Doug, Nebr., E1630, E1634
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E1644
Bonior, David E., Mich., E1629, E1631
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1636
Christensen, Jon, Nebr., E1644
Clay, William (Bill), Mo., E1646
Clement, Bob, Tenn., E1646
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E1636
Davis, Thomas M., Va., E1635
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1633
Dicks, Norman D., Wash., E1642
Dingell, John D., Mich., E1647
Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E1643
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1643
Etheridge, Bob, N.C., E1630, E1634
Forbes, Michael P., N.Y., E1629, E1631, E1635, E1637
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1632
Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E1633
Greenwood, James C., Pa., E1633
Hamilton, Lee H., Ind., E1641
Hayworth, J.D., Ariz., E1639
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E1629
Hutchinson, Asa, Ark., E1640
Jackson-Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1647
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1645, E1647
Kleczka, Gerald D., Wisc., E1642
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E1638
Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E1631, E1634, E1636
Lipinski, William O., Ill., E1637
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1638
Manton, Thomas J., N.Y., E1645
Moakley, John Joseph, Mass., E1639
Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E1637
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E1644
Ney, Robert W., Ohio, E1640
Olver, John W., Mass., E1638
Packard, Ron, Calif., E1632
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E1630, E1634
Roemer, Tim, Ind., E1639
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E1646
Schaffer, Bob, Colo., E1642
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E1644
Shimkus, John, Ill., E1629, E1635
Solomon, Gerald B.H., N.Y., E1640
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E1632
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1637
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E1636

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $150.00 for six months, $295.00 per year, or purchased for $2.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.