



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1999

No. 118

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Our guest Chaplain, Father Paul Lavin, pastor of St. Joseph's on Capitol Hill, Washington, DC, will now give the prayer.

The guest Chaplain, Father Paul Lavin, offered the following prayer:

In Psalm 103 David sings:

Bless the Lord, O my soul
and all my being bless His holy name.
Bless the Lord, O my soul
and forget not all His benefits.
He pardons all your inequities,
He heals all your ills.
He redeems your life from destruction,
He crowns you with kindness and compassion.
He does not always chide,
nor does He keep His wrath forever.
Not according to our sins does He deal
with us,
nor does He requite us according to our crimes.
For as the heavens are high above the Earth
so surpassing is His kindness toward those who fear Him.
As far as east is from the west,
so far has He put our transgressions from us.

Let us pray.

Almighty and eternal God, You have revealed Your glory to all nations. God of power and might, wisdom and justice, through Your authority is rightly administered, laws enacted, and judgment is decreed. Let the light of Your divine wisdom direct the deliberations of the Senate and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws formed for our rule and government. May they seek to preserve peace, promote national happiness, and continue to bring us the blessings of liberty and equality.

We likewise commend to Your unbounded mercy all citizens of the United States, that we may be blessed in the knowledge and sanctified in the

observance of Your holy law. May we be preserved in union and that peace which the world cannot give; and, after enjoying the blessings of this life, be admitted to those which are eternal.

We pray to You, who are Lord and God, for ever and ever. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable PAT ROBERTS, a Senator from the State of Kansas, 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the Interior appropriations bill. As a reminder, cloture motions were filed on Friday on S.J. Res. 33 denouncing the offer of clemency to Puerto Rican terrorists and on the Hutchison amendment regarding oil royalties. These cloture votes have been scheduled for 5 p.m. today and may be followed by additional votes on judicial nominations. It is hoped that action on the Interior appropriations bill can be completed by tomorrow and that the Senate can begin consideration of the bankruptcy reform bill.

I thank colleagues for their attention.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes. Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. shall be under the control of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS.

SENATE CHALLENGES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as was noted, there are 2 hours of morning business. My associates are going to undertake for the first hour to talk a little bit about the challenges that we face over the next month, 2 months. By the end of this month, of course, we are to have completed the appropriations, and we will be moving forward with that. We will be dealing with the administration and with the President on their completion. We hope that it will not end up in a closing down of Government but, rather, finding some consensus as to how we deal with our budget for next year.

We are challenged by different philosophies, of course, as to what that spending ought to be; we are always challenged by a difference of view as to what the priorities are. That is the nature of our body.

So, Mr. President, I would like now to yield to my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the Chair.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise today to address for a few minutes the tax relief package that the Senate passed before the August recess.

I had the opportunity during the August recess to travel much of Arkansas.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S10743

I was in 27 counties in Arkansas in about a month. So we were very busy. In each one of those counties there were opportunities for people to express their opinions and to talk about issues that were of concern to them. We heard much about the farm crisis. I know the Presiding Officer has been very involved in trying to fashion a farm policy that is going to allow family farmers to survive, be viable, and has been very involved in the ag policy of this country. We have heard a lot of concerns about agriculture.

I also heard a lot about the tax package, and there were a lot of questions. I want to take a few minutes today to talk about what I heard and what I shared about the tax relief package that we passed in the Senate and the conference that was agreed upon with the House. I think it is responsible and provides much-needed relief for the American taxpayer.

I think that is the first thing we have to realize—how much there is a need for tax relief. People say, well, the economy is booming; we are doing fine; people are fine; no one really wants a tax cut. I think the reality is far different.

Under the Clinton administration, taxes have risen to the highest level in peacetime history—almost 21 percent of the gross domestic product. When you compare that to the 1950s and the Eisenhower years, the tax burden upon the American people measured—there are lots of ways of measuring “tax burden,” but one of the most helpful, I think, is in terms of the gross domestic product. At that time, it was about 15 percent of GDP; it is now 21 percent of GDP. And it took that last leap when Congress passed and the President signed the 1993 tax hike.

When we are talking in terms of the tax relief package, the \$792 billion—and for a farm boy from north Arkansas that is a lot of money, \$792 billion—it is over 10 years, and when you realize that what we are doing is rolling back the tax burden on the American people by a grand total of 1 percentage point of GDP; we would take it from about 21 percent to about 20 percent, there is nothing draconian—an overused word these days—there is nothing irresponsible about the tax relief package that was passed by the House and Senate.

According to the Office of Management and Budget, total Federal receipts amounted to 19.9 percent of GDP in 1998 and will be 20.1 percent of GDP in 1999.

Now, in Arkansas, that amounts to about \$7,352 in taxes per capita, in 1998.

In a State such as Connecticut, it is about twice that; \$15,525 was paid in taxes for every man, woman, and child in Connecticut. It was Ben Franklin who said a penny saved is a penny earned. I think maybe we could adjust that motto and say: A dollar earned is 38 cents spent by the Federal Government. The typical American family sees 38 percent of its income paid in taxes, as opposed to 28 percent of its in-

come for food, clothing, and housing and only 3.6 percent that goes to savings.

I believe at a time of surplus, it would be unthinkable, it would be unconscionable for us not to allow the American people to keep more of what they have worked so hard to make. As Ronald Reagan once remarked: The taxpayer is someone who works for the Federal Government but doesn't have to take a Civil Service exam. When we think about the increasing percentage of our income going to taxes, that is, unfortunately, more true today than it was when President Reagan said it. The American people are laboring under a heavy burden of taxation and an intrusive Tax Code and tax system.

There are many provisions in the tax relief package. I want to address two that are particularly compelling. One is the marriage penalty tax.

Approximately 42 million American couples, including 6 million senior citizens, must pay an average of \$1,400 extra in taxes for simply being married. The marriage penalty punishes in two ways. It pushes married couples into a higher tax bracket, and it lowers couples' standard deduction. So two married income earners with combined income must pay their income tax at a higher rate with a lower deduction than they would if they were two single people. It is unfair. It is wrong. Most Americans are absolutely perplexed why such a quirk in the Tax Code would be allowed to continue.

Keep in mind, it is not a one-time penalty. Under our tax system, marriage is not a freeway; it is a toll road. For 10 years of marriage, couples must pay an average of \$14,000 extra; for 20 years, couples must pay \$28,000 extra. The tax relief package that passed would finally achieve equity and fairness by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

The other aspect of the tax relief package we passed that I think is especially helpful and important and about which people feel strongly in Arkansas is the death tax. Small business owners and farmers can lose their lives and all they have saved for their children because of death taxes. Since the value of a business is added to the estate and taxed after exemption, sometimes as high as 55 percent, many small businesses and farms must be sold in order to pay the death tax. It is wrong. Just as the marriage penalty, it is something we should not allow, it is something we should not tolerate, and it is something we have the ability and capacity to change this year. It is a form of double taxation. The most obvious inequity is the death tax.

It also doesn't make a lot of sense. It taxes investment and savings. It taxes the American dream. Part of the American dream is, if you work hard and save and invest well and are able to accumulate something in life, you will be able to pass that on to your children and your grandchildren so they can start their lives with better prospects

than what you did. It is not all of the American dream, but it is part of the American dream. The death tax is absolutely contrary to what we hold out as being something Americans should strive toward—investment, savings, building for the future.

Right now, the survival rate for a family farm from the first to the second generation is only about 30 percent. The odds are against a family farmer being able to pass along that farm to their children or grandchildren. I know our farmers are working hard, and these are difficult times for them. We keep having emergency bills to help alleviate the problems, but they are kind of a Band-Aid solution. We have one the Senate passed before the August recess.

Eliminating the death tax is something we can do that will permanently benefit agriculture and farmers in this country. Only a fraction of 1 percent of small businesses make it through to four generations. Just as the family farm, which is, in effect, a small business, other small businesses are also having a difficult time surviving and certainly being passed on to future generations.

Consider the case of Clarence who owns a farming and lumber business in North Carolina. He provides jobs to 720 people in his community through three small farms, a fertilizer and tobacco warehouse, and a small lumber mill. His family has worked hard for four generations to build this business to what it is today. All of that may well be lost when Clarence dies and his family is faced with a huge Government death tax bill. Clarence has worked hard to try to reduce the burden of the death tax. He slowed the growth of his business. He has hired lawyers. He has purchased life insurance. He has established trusts—all with the hope that he could create a plan to enable his children to keep the family business when he dies. All of that work and planning still may not be enough.

Clarence figures that his son will owe the Federal Government about \$1.5 million upon his death, an impossible amount to pay for a man who makes only \$31,000 a year. His son will almost certainly have to sell all or part of the business in order to pay the consequences of the death tax. Over four generations, Clarence's family businesses have been whittled down to a sliver of what they once were.

Then consider the case of Mr. Kennard, whose spirit of free enterprise is being stifled by the death tax. He owns a small septic tank company in Virginia. He began his business in 1963. Today, he employs 15 people, including his son and daughter who have worked with him since they were teenagers. His son runs one of the businesses and takes home about \$30,000 a year, hardly enough to pay the \$2 million bill the Government will hand him when his father dies.

Death should not be a taxable experience. In order to reduce the estate tax,

Mr. Kennard has stopped expanding his businesses and is considering transferring shares of his business to his children now rather than wait until his death. He would like to invest in insurance and put some of his money back into the business, but it doesn't make sense when his family will have to pay exorbitant taxes on any new appreciation. In fact, Mr. Kennard may have to liquidate one or two of his businesses in order to pay the death tax on the remaining businesses.

The tax refund bill would provide relief by lowering the 5-percent surtax on estates and replace the unified credit with the unified exemption of \$1.5 million. We would ultimately be rid of the death tax altogether. It is something we should do. It is something we have within our power to do. We have passed it. We will send it to the President. It is our hope, still, that the President will change his mind and not veto this very important legislation.

There are many other important provisions in the bill as well. People say: Why spend your time on tax relief when the President said he is going to veto it? Because it is important, because it is the right thing to do, because our responsibility to our constituents is not what the President may or may not do. I recall well my early years in the House when we passed welfare reform and had to send it to the President not once, not twice, but three times, before the President finally decided the American people wanted welfare reform. He signed an important piece of reform legislation that has transformed welfare in this country and cut the rolls in half in State after State, including my home State of Arkansas.

I hope the President will reconsider, and I hope the American people will let us and the administration know how important tax relief is. When they understand what is in it, they do support it. In 27 counties in Arkansas, I did hear some concerns, primarily because of the myths that have been perpetrated about this tax relief bill.

One of the concerns was the myth that this tax relief bill somehow trades debt reduction for tax cuts. The fact is, the budget and the tax relief bill we passed will reduce public debt by 60 percent and achieve over \$200 billion more in public debt reduction than the President's plan over the next 10 years. It is not a matter of either/or. It is not a matter of whether you are going to have debt reduction or we are going to have tax relief. We can and should have both.

Another one of the myths people are concerned about, and understandably concerned, is that somehow, if you pass a meaningful tax relief bill, as we did, it is going to erode and eat into the Social Security surplus. In fact, that is nothing but a myth. We would lockbox Social Security. We would not touch any of the Social Security surpluses, and we shouldn't. We should not perpetrate the wrong that has been done

by previous Congresses by dipping in and using those revenues which are designated and should be designated for Social Security only.

Then there is, perhaps, one of the greatest myths of all; that is, the tax relief bill will primarily benefit the wealthy. This tax relief package would provide broad-based tax relief. It cuts every bracket 1 percent. That is not much. But it cuts across the board of tax brackets by 1 percent. It doesn't take somebody trained in math to figure out that if you are in the 15-percent tax bracket and you lower it from 15 to 14 percent, it is a much bigger personal tax cut than for somebody who is in a lower tax bracket who also sees only a 1-percent reduction in taxes.

The fact is that this tax relief package benefits low-income earners in the lowest tax bracket more than any other taxable group. We not only lower the rate, we expand the bracket to include yet more hard-working Americans.

In a State such as Arkansas, where we have one of the lowest per capita incomes, lowering the tax by even 1 percent for the lowest tax bracket has a significant benefit for hard-working Arkansans and hard-working Americans.

One of the other myths I heard while I was traveling across Arkansas was that there was concern that somehow these surpluses might not become reality. Conservative Arkansans who look at the Congressional Budget Office projections a decade out, I think, are right to say: What happens if, in fact, the surpluses don't become reality? Are you going to give all of this back in tax cuts? And are we going to go back up in deficit spending?

I was glad to be able to report that there was an important provision including a trigger—maybe it is better to call it a safety valve—that ensures that if the surpluses do not become reality, the tax cuts don't kick in. They don't become reality either. That, I think, is the ultimate fallback to ensure that we don't return to the big spending, red-ink, deficit spending ways of the past.

The bottom line is that in Arkansas 683,741 people would have tax reductions under this bill. That is, 750 million Americans would see their tax bills reduced. It is not something targeted for the wealthy, but it is something that would benefit every tax-paying American.

Opponents of tax relief insist that money must be left on the table in the name of debt reduction. The reality is that if you leave it on the table in Washington, it will be spent.

Therein is the great divide philosophically between those who believe the American people can better decide and determine how they ought to spend what they have earned and what they have worked for than people in Washington, DC—Government officials and bureaucrats in Washington. For those

who believe we have to keep that money up here because we have to reserve it on the table for more spending programs because, truly, wisdom is found here inside the beltway, we reject that. I reject that.

I ask my colleagues to request of the President his reconsideration of what is desperately needed for the American people—lowering that tax burden from 21 percent to 20 percent. There is nothing too dramatic nor too drastic about it, but it is a small step in providing the American people the tax relief they deserve and they desire.

I thank the Chair.

I thank Senator THOMAS for providing this time and this opportunity to discuss what we have done in the area of tax relief.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas stated very clearly the strong feeling that I have received from folks in Wyoming. As I went around as well, when I first talked about tax relief, people kind of rolled their eyes. But when you start talking about the specifics of it—estate taxes and marriage penalty taxes—when you talk about the kinds of things that are there to encourage retirement funding and educational funding, you really get a great deal more interest in it.

I think the Senator pointed out clearly the real philosophical difference. If the money is here, it will be spent for increased government and increased programs rather than going back to the people who really own the money.

I thank the Senator.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privilege of the floor be granted to David Stewart, an intern in my office, during the course of morning business.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Iowa 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding.

Even though I am not going to speak on the issue of taxes, I just heard the remarks by the Senator from Arkansas. Obviously, voting for that bill was difficult. I agree with the statements and plead with the President to sign the bill and give the people back some of the money or let them keep the money rather than running it through Washington. We are overtaxing the people at the highest level of taxation in the history of our country.

NURSING HOME INDUSTRY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I chair the Committee on Aging. We

have been holding some hearings about the nursing home industry over the last several months. I would like to make a comment.

First of all, I would like to speak about credibility. It is similar to an old maple tree. It takes years to develop, but a big storm can wipe it out just like that. I have a story that makes the point.

The nursing home industry challenged the credibility of nursing home inspectors. The nursing home industry, after this challenge, lost.

When I refer to the nursing home industry, I mean the American Health Care Association. This group represents the for-profit nursing homes. It has thousands of members across the country.

Nursing home inspectors operate in every State. They inspect every nursing home that accepts Federal money. The inspectors gauge whether nursing homes follow the Federal laws that were passed to protect nursing home residents. They evaluate everything from the most severe problems to the most minor problems. The most severe problems include malnutrition, dehydration, bedsores, inadequate medical treatment—matters that can be life-threatening. The most minor problems might include things such as comfortable lighting and access to stationery.

At my request, the General Accounting Office has issued a series of reports documenting severe problems in too many nursing homes, thus pointing up the shortcomings of the inspection.

On March 18, when I released one of these reports, the American Health Care Association issued a critical news release. The association said:

Inspectors have closed down facilities, without consulting residents and their families, for technical violations posing no jeopardy to residents.

The association also said:

Unfortunately, the current Federal inspection system has all the trademarks of a bureaucratic government program out of control.

These, of course, were very serious charges made by the association of nursing homes, and I took those charges very seriously. The Federal inspection system is responsible for the welfare of 1.6 million nursing home residents. If that system fails, these frail individuals will bear the brunt. That is something that should concern every one of us in the Senate.

Following up, I asked the American Health Care Association for proof of its claims issued in that news release critical of what the General Accounting Office had to say at my behest to study the issue. On May 6, I received an information packet from the American Health Care Association describing 10 examples that the association saw as proof of overzealous regulations. I turned this information over to the General Accounting Office and asked for its analysis.

The GAO did not find evidence of overzealous regulation. In fact, the

General Accounting Office found just the opposite. There was adequate information for an objective assessment for 8 of the 10 industry examples. In each of those 8 cases, the General Accounting Office found that regulators acted appropriately.

I am not going to go through all eight examples, but I will use three. I think they show that there is a big difference in what the industry presented and what the General Accounting Office found; in other words, the industry's accusations that the inspection system was a bureaucratic thing out of control and that it was based upon just technicalities was wrong.

Example No. 1: The industry complained that a Michigan nursing home was severely punished for providing complimentary coffee to family members, staff, and residents. The General Accounting Office said that the nursing home inspectors saw two vulnerable residents pulling at the spigot of the hot coffee urn. The inspectors believed that the residents were in immediate danger of suffering serious burns from the coffee. Of course, with this, the General Accounting Office agreed.

Example No. 2: The industry complained that a California nursing home was cited for bed sores on a resident's foot that predated his admission, and in fact the bed sores were healing. The General Accounting Office said the inspector found conditions that actually had worsened the bed sores. The resident was wearing leather shoes when in a wheelchair. His feet were not elevated when in bed. His bed sore dressings were changed without proper techniques to prevent infection. There again, the example given by the nursing home association was wrong.

Example No. 3: The industry claimed that an Alabama nursing home was cited for a bald kitchen worker who failed to wear a hair net. The GAO reported that the industry did not identify the nursing home involved nor provide any documentation; therefore, the General Accounting Office could not assess what had happened.

I could go on in more detail from the General Accounting Office report. I have that report here, and I would like to point out to my colleagues that they should look at it, read it. Hopefully, everyone is interested and they will do so. It tells a valuable cautionary tale. Members of Congress, as I felt a responsibility to do, should always seek out both sides of every story. Industry associations work hard to seek our agreement with their side and, of course, in our system of government, and whether individual, or an association of individuals, that is their right. But it is our obligation as representatives of the people to weigh every issue with all the facts at hand. It is equally our obligation to consider the credibility of every source.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of time for Senator THOMAS.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator. Certainly, he has been the leader in

rural health care, which is very important to my State, as it is for the State of the Presiding Officer.

I am pleased to have the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, join us this morning for some comments on our future activities. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I want also to join in the Senator's praise of Senator GRASSLEY for his leadership on many of the issues affecting senior citizens and rural health care in America.

MEDICARE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, Senate Republicans are committed to enacting legislation to preserve, strengthen, and save the Medicare system for current and future generations. The Republican congressional budget plan has set aside \$505 billion over the next 10 years specifically to address domestic issues such as Medicare. Moreover, \$90 billion of this amount has been set aside in a reserve fund that is dedicated exclusively to strengthening Medicare's financing and modernizing its benefits, including the provision of coverage for prescription drugs. Prescription drugs are as important to our senior citizens' health today as the hospital bed was back in 1965 when the Medicare program was first created. Medicare clearly should be restructured to reflect these changing priorities.

The money to address this challenge has been set prudently aside as part of the Republican budget. We have the resources, we have the determination, and we have the will to address this critical issue. Now it is up to Congress to come up with the plan, which I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will help us devise. We need to strengthen and modernize this critically important program to meet the health care needs of elderly and disabled Americans into the 21st century.

In addition to addressing the long-term structural issues facing Medicare, it is essential that Congress also take action this year to address some of the unintended consequences of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, as well as regulatory overkill by the Clinton administration, which is jeopardizing access to critically important home health care services for millions of senior citizens.

The growth in Medicare spending has slowed dramatically, and that is due, in part, to the reforms that were enacted as part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. While it was Congress' intent in enacting this legislation to slow the rate of growth, it has become increasingly clear that the payment policies implemented by the Clinton administration as a consequence of the Balanced Budget Act have gone too far and that the cutbacks have been far

too deep, jeopardizing our seniors' access to critical hospital, skilled nursing, and home health care.

Nowhere is this problem more serious than in home health care. America's home health agencies provide services that have enabled a growing number of our most frail and vulnerable senior citizens to avoid hospitals, to avoid nursing homes, and to receive the care they need and want in the security and privacy of their homes, just where they want to be.

I have visited with home health nurses in Maine who have taken me on home health visits. I know firsthand how vital these important health care services are to our frail seniors. I know of couples who have been able to stay together in their own home solely because of the services provided by our home health agencies. In 1996, home health was the fastest growing component of the Medicare budget. That, understandably, prompted Congress and the Clinton administration to initiate changes that were intended to make the program more cost-effective and efficient.

There was strong bipartisan support for the provisions in the BBA that called for the implementation of a prospective payment system for home care. Unfortunately, until this system is implemented, home health agencies are being paid under a very flawed interim payment system, or IPS.

In trying to get a handle on cost, Congress and the administration created a system that penalizes efficient agencies and that may be restricting access to care for the very Medicare beneficiaries who need the care the most. These include our sicker patients with complex chronic care needs, like diabetic wound care patients, or IV-therapy patients who require multiple visits.

According to a recent survey by the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, almost 40 percent of home health agencies indicated that there were patients whom they previously would have accepted for care, whom they no longer serve due to this flawed interim payment system and the regulatory overkill of the Clinton administration. Thirty-one percent of these agencies admitted they had actually discharged patients due to the inadequate payment system. The discharged patients tend to be those with chronic care needs who require a large number of visits and are expensive to serve. Indeed, they are the very people who most need home health services.

I know that Congress simply did not intend to construct a payment system that inevitably discourages home health agencies from caring for those senior citizens who need the service the most. These problems are all the more pressing because they have been exacerbated by the failure of the Clinton administration to meet the original deadline for implementing a prospective payment system. As a result, home health care agencies will be

struggling under a flawed IPS system, the interim payment system, for far longer than Congress ever envisioned when it enacted the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

Moreover, it now appears the savings from the Balanced Budget Act were greatly underestimated. Medicare spending for home health care fell by nearly 15 percent last year and the CBO now projects that the post-Balanced Budget Act reductions in home health care will exceed \$46 billion over the next 5 years. This is three times greater than the \$16 billion that CBO originally estimated for that time period. That is another indication that the cutbacks have been far too deep, far too severe, and much more wide-reaching than Congress ever intended.

Again, the flaws in the Balanced Budget Act have been exacerbated by regulatory decisions made by this administration. Earlier this year, I chaired a hearing held by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. We heard firsthand about the financial distress and cash-flow problems of very good, cost-effective, home health agencies from across the country. We heard about the impact of these cutbacks on our senior citizens. Witnesses expressed concern that the problems in the system are inhibiting their ability to deliver much needed care, particularly to chronically ill patients with complex needs. Some agencies have actually closed because the reimbursement levels under Medicare have fallen far short of their actual operating costs. Many others in Maine and throughout the Nation are laying off staff or declining to accept new patients, particularly those with the more serious health problems that require more care and more visits.

This points to the most critical and central issue: Cuts of this magnitude simply cannot be sustained without ultimately affecting the care that we provide to our senior citizens. Moreover, the financial problems that home health agencies have been experiencing have been exacerbated by a host of onerous, burdensome, and ill-conceived new regulatory requirements imposed by the Clinton administration through HCFA, including the implementation of what is known as OASIS, the new outcome and assessment information data set; new requirements for surety bonds; sequential billing requirements; IPS overpayment recoupment; and a new 15-minute increment home health reporting requirement requiring nurses to act as if they were accountants or lawyers, billing every 15 minutes of their time.

Witnesses at our hearing before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations expressed particular frustration with what the CEO from the Visiting Nurse Service in Saco, ME, Maryanna Arseneault, termed as the Clinton administration's regulatory policy of "implement and suspend." She and others pointed to numerous examples of hastily enacted, ill-con-

ceived requirements for surety bonds and sequential billing. No sooner had HCFA imposed the cost burden of a specific mandate on America's home health agencies, than it then had second thoughts and suspended the requirements—but only after damage had been done, only after our home health agencies had invested significant time and resources they do not have, trying to comply with this regulatory overkill.

Responding to the excessive regulation of the Clinton administration, as well as the problems in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, my colleague from Missouri, Senator BOND, and I have together introduced legislation titled, "The Medicare Home Health Equity Act," which is cosponsored. I am pleased to say, by a bipartisan group of 26 of our colleagues. It makes needed adjustments in the Balanced Budget Act and related Federal regulations to ensure that our senior citizens have access to necessary home health services.

One of the ironies of the formula enacted in the Balanced Budget Act is that it penalizes the low-cost nonprofit agencies that had been doing a good job of holding down their expenses. The program needs to be entirely revamped.

The most important provision of our bill eliminates the automatic 15-percent reduction in Medicare home health payments that is now scheduled for October 1 of next year, whether or not a prospective payment system is enacted. I am not overstating the situation when I say that if another 15-percent cut is imposed on America's home health agencies, it would be a disaster. It would threaten our ability to provide these services to millions of senior citizens throughout this country.

A further 15-percent cut would be devastating. It would destroy the low-cost, cost-effective providers, and it would further reduce our seniors' access to home health care. Furthermore, as I mentioned earlier, it is entirely unnecessary because we have already achieved the budget savings that were anticipated in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. We have not only exceeded them, we have exceeded them by a factor of three.

Our legislation also provides for what we call supplemental "outlier" payments to home health agencies on a patient-by-patient basis. This is needed because there are some patients who are expensive to care for because they have complex and chronic health conditions that need a great deal of care. We need to have a formula that recognizes that there are certain higher cost patients who are higher cost in a legitimate sense. It is still far cheaper to treat those patients through home health care than in a nursing home or hospital setting.

The provision in our bill removes the existing financial disincentive for agencies to care for patients with intensive medical needs. We know from the recent studies from GAO and the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission that those are the individuals who

are most at risk right now of losing access to home health services under the current interim payment system.

To decrease total costs in order to remain under their per-beneficiary limits, too many home health agencies have had to significantly reduce the number of visits, which in turn has increased the cost of each visit. We need to deal with the regulatory issues that I have mentioned, including OASIS, surety bonds, sequential billing, and the 15-minute incremental reporting requirement. Our legislation accomplishes these goals.

The Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1999 will provide a measure of financial and regulatory relief to beleaguered home health agencies in order to ensure that our senior citizens have access to medically necessary home health services.

It has been a pleasure to work with the Senate majority leader, Senator LOTT, as well as Senator ABRAHAM, Senator SANTORUM, Senator BOND, and others who have been real leaders in this effort to come up with a solution to this very pressing problem. My hope is that we will make reforming the payment system for Medicare home health services a top priority this fall.

I yield back the remainder of my time to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator from Maine, not only because of the good job she does all across the board but particularly on this matter of health care, rural health care. As co-chairman of the Rural Health Care Caucus, I am particularly interested in those kinds of things. For example, in Wyoming, home health care is so important and sometimes quite expensive, particularly because of the amount of miles that have to be traveled. But for the patient, and because of the cost, home health care is the right way to go.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri to talk a little more about the future and our plans with respect to taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Maine for her sensitivity to a crisis which is looming in American health care and that she is willing to constructively deal with that crisis. I thank her for her thoughts on this matter and for her cosponsorship of important legislation.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, as we look to the future, most of us, in our families, in our businesses, in our civic organizations, in our churches, like to deal with some sort of plan. As a matter of fact, there is a lot of buzz or talk these days about financial planning, making sure we have the capacity to meet the demands of the future when they come to us and when they fall upon us.

It is incumbent on the Congress of the United States to engage in some planning, to take a look at the future and find out exactly where we ought to be going and how we ought to get there, and the things that are important and what we ought to do to protect our interests. It is with that in mind that we, the Members of the Congress, are delivering to the President a financial plan for the next decade. He will have an opportunity to act on that plan this week. That plan has been talked about, the tax relief contained in the plan, but it has not been spoken of very generously in terms of the other major features of this financial plan for America for the next 10 years. I think we can only understand the plan by looking at it as a whole, understanding what we are doing to protect the interests of this country in the years ahead.

The first thing I think people want us to start to do is to be more responsible in the way we in Washington handle their money. One of the areas of irresponsibility in the past has been the Social Security trust fund. When there has been a little bit more in the trust fund—or a lot more in the trust fund—than was needed for that particular year, Members of the House and Senate have been a part of budgeting that money for expenditures not related to Social Security, to support the operational costs of Government.

Americans are duly concerned because they know the reason there is a surplus in the Social Security trust fund is that big bulge of us baby boomers are paying in, but they know when this big bulge of baby boomers starts to consume instead of contribute to the trust fund, we are going to need the surplus. So the first thing we have done in our financial plan for the future is to put an end to that. We are going to stop the practice of spending the trust fund. So the financial plan which will go to the President this week says \$1.9 trillion—trillion being a thousand billions and a billion being a thousand millions; I mean, it is almost impossible to think of it that way—\$1.9 trillion is going to be reserved for Social Security, a major step forward. Americans have a right to expect us to plan to do that and we are doing it. That is a big part of the financial plan for the future.

No. 2, people say over time most families, most organizations want to reduce their debt; they would like to get their debt down to manageable levels. Most of us take 30 years to pay off a home. We have decided to start paying down the national debt. In a part of the plan which I think is very important, we are taking the publicly held debt of the United States of America from \$3.8 trillion down to \$1.9 trillion, a 50-percent decline in the national debt held by the public of the United States of America. What a tremendous decline in debt. As part of a rational plan, the debt to the gross domestic product ratio goes from 43 percent to 14 percent

over that 10-year plan we are sending to the President. First, we protect Social Security. Second, we pay the debt down by 50 percent.

No. 3, as the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, has indicated, we put aside about \$505 billion for contingencies over the next 10 years, things we might want to spend money on over and above what we are spending now. So not only do we have a reservation of \$1.9 trillion for Social Security, not only do we cut the publicly held debt of this country in half, but we also reserve a half trillion dollars for expenditures we are not now making.

It is only in the context of these three items—the saving of the Social Security surplus for Social Security; reducing the national debt, the publicly held debt of America, by 50 percent; putting aside a half trillion dollars for contingencies—that we understand what the tax relief is all about. The tax relief is what is left over. Americans earn the money. We trust Americans to earn this money; we should trust them to spend it. The question is whether we are going to fund families or bureaucracies.

We got the President to agree with us on saving Social Security to the extent of putting \$1.9 trillion aside, and I commend him for getting there. He wasn't there in his State of the Union Message. I commend the President for being willing to pay down the national debt. But the President, after that, wants to spend so much more of what is left over on more Government programs.

Frankly, we ought to be giving a tax relief package, 1 percent, to every bracket. We ought to be doing away with the marriage penalty tax. We ought to allow parents and grandparents to invest money so their kids can have money for education, and the growth of that money can have a tax preferred status. We ought to allow people to buy health care in a more tax beneficial way, especially the self-employed who do not get it on their jobs.

It is with that in mind I think this package is delivered to the President to say this is a comprehensive financial plan for the future. The tax relief only amounts to 23.8 percent of the total surplus as we have defined surpluses historically because we have been so responsible as to set that Social Security surplus aside. It is not part of what we will spend. And we start to knock down the national debt, take down the publicly held debt of the country 50 percent in the next 10 years and set aside a half trillion dollars for contingencies, and then work on abolishing the marriage penalty and tax, saving for education and expanded IRAs, and knocking every tax rate down by 1 percent—a 1-percent decline for folks at the top brackets and a 1-percent decline for folks at the bottom brackets.

It seems to me that is the kind of plan upon which a nation can march

forward. I call upon the President of the United States to reevaluate his position. He has expressed real doubts, serious reservations about this. Seeing it in the context of a financial plan for the future of the United States is to see it as a roadmap to opportunity and success and prosperity.

I close with this. Because we had the two biggest tax increases in history in this decade, Americans have paid in far more money than we are going to need. It is like going to the grocery store and you hand the man a \$10 bill for a \$2.45 gallon of milk. You expect change. You expect to get something back when you pay more than is needed for what you have ordered. You would not think much of the grocer who said: I'm going to give you two more gallons of milk and a pound of bacon, whether you need it or not. That is what has happened. The President said we have the Government covered, the costs are covered, but they have overpaid. Now we are going to give them a whole bunch more Government, whether they have ordered it or not.

I think we need a little change. Americans deserve some tax relief, and I am pleased to have had this opportunity to present this financial plan which the President should sign.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think we have used the time that has been allocated. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 10 minutes. Since I am the only one present, the chances are probably pretty good.

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

A BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very pleased my associates could come over this morning and talk about some of the programs that are before us, to talk about some of the directions we will be taking. I think there is another area, in addition to what has been talked about, that is right before us. We are dealing now with spending. We are now in the process of finishing the appropriations process. Congress must adopt 13 different appropriations bills for future spending of the Government and we are in the process of doing that.

We also have some budget limitations that we have placed on ourselves, some caps that we have to honor. We are dealing also with emergency spending. We have talked some now about the surpluses that have been available. The surpluses that are available this year, however, are generally Social Security dollars. But there are \$14 billion in the regular budget and those will, of course, be available. Most of those have already been set aside as emergency spending.

What we have before us is an opportunity to continue to work and complete this matter of funding the budget for this year. At the same time, we must pass it on to the White House. We must find some agreement, either that

or have some continuing resolutions that will put us into the future or, in fact, we are faced with the possibility of the President vetoing the legislation and of having the Government shut down, as happened in the past. I hope this will not be the case.

I noticed in the paper the other day the President has indicated he would like nothing better than a bipartisan compromise. Hopefully, that is what will happen. Yet he has suggested "if only the Republicans could be a little more reasonable." I am not sure that is necessarily a part of it. Probably his White House aides are happy about this partisan combat because, as we know, the last time the Government was shut down, the Congress shouldered all the responsibility. I do not believe that ought to be the case, and hopefully it will not be this year. We are looking forward to working in those areas.

In terms of Social Security, there are some changes that need to be made. We are talking about saving Social Security. We ought to do that. We are committed to doing that. The method of doing it currently, of course, is to put the Social Security surplus in to replace the publicly held debt. The fact is, it then becomes debt that has to be covered by the taxpayers when the time comes to use it.

We also are looking at a change in the Social Security Act which responds to what is happening with Social Security. The demographics are changing. When Social Security started, there were 34 people working for every 1 beneficiary. People paid about \$30 a year into the program. Now there are three people working for every beneficiary, and it is moving toward two. They are paying 12.5 percent of up to nearly \$80,000 into this fund.

The fact is, over a period of time, probably in 20 years, there will not be enough money to continue as we have, so we have to make some changes. The choices are very simple ones basically:

We can increase taxes. Nobody really wants to do that. The Social Security tax is the largest tax paid by almost all taxpayers in the lower-income brackets.

We can reduce benefits. People are not much interested in that.

The third alternative, of course, is to increase the revenue that comes from the moneys that are in the trust fund. We are very anxious to do that. It also gives an opportunity to take that money when it comes in and put it somewhere other than into additional national debt loans and put it into individual accounts that people would have as their own, to be invested in the private sector for a much higher yield.

These are some of the things with which we grapple. Certainly, we are going to be working with the administration to see if we can do something in that respect. I do not think there is willingness on this side to trade off tax relief for increased spending. I hope not, and I do not believe we will do that.

On the other hand, we can find, I am sure, agreement in the appropriations areas, and we can move forward with that.

Mr. President, our time has expired. I see there is a Senator on the other side of the isle, so I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. shall be controlled by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Wyoming, I did not hear all of his remarks, but I always appreciate what he has to say, agree or disagree.

ECONOMIC CONVULSION IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will not speak for a long time about the economic convulsion in agriculture. I think my colleague sees some of this in Wyoming as well. I said last week I was going to come to the floor and talk about what is happening to family farmers in Minnesota and around the country. I want to speak about this briefly today and announce a bill that I will be introducing. I also want to say to my colleagues, as I see us moving forward over the next couple of days this week, that I do intend to be back on the floor with amendments that relate to how we can get a decent price for family farmers and how we can get some competition and how we can put some free enterprise back into the food industry.

I am also prepared—and I am sure other Senators would feel the same way if they came from an agricultural State—I am also prepared, starting this week and every week, to spend a considerable amount of time before the Senate talking, not so much in statistical terms but more in personal terms, about what is happening.

I give, by the way, a lot of credit to Willie Nelson and Neil Young and John Mellencamp for putting together Farm Aid. I had a chance to be there yesterday morning with my wife Sheila. It was an important gathering. I thank them for bringing some attention to the crisis in agriculture and what is happening to family farmers.

They are not Johnny-come-latelys. They have been at this for some time. There was a rally this morning, a "Save the Family Farm" coalition rally, and then the Farmers Union was meeting with Secretary Glickman. I know there are hundreds of Farmers Union members who are going to be meeting with Republican and Democratic Senators.

What everybody is saying right now is, we have this convulsion in agriculture. When I was a college teacher in the mid-1980s in Northfield, MN, in Rice County, I did a lot of organizing with farmers. I had some friends who took their lives. I am not being melodramatic, unfortunately. I was at more

foreclosures than I ever wanted to be. I saw a tremendous amount of economic pain.

What we are experiencing now in agriculture in this country is far worse. On present course, we are going to lose, as I said last week, a generation of family farmers. I simply say, in an emphatic way, the political question for us is whether we stay the course or whether we change course. I do not believe that any Senator, Democrat or Republican, who comes from a State like the State of Minnesota and who has been traveling in communities and seeing the pain in people's eyes and seeing people who literally are almost at the very end, could not take the position that we have to do something different when it comes to agricultural policy.

I am not going to be shrill today—or hopefully any other day—but I am telling my colleagues, the status quo is unacceptable. It is unacceptable. The piece of legislation we passed several years ago called Freedom to Farm—I believe it's really "Freedom to Fail," though others can take a different position—at minimum has to be modified. If we do not take the cap off the loan rate and we do not have some kind of target price and we do not do something to make sure that farmers have a decent price for what they produce so they can get the cash flow to earn a decent living, they are going to go under. Many of them are going under right now as I speak.

The second thing I want to talk about is a piece of legislation I will offer this week as an amendment to the bankruptcy bill. I will have plenty of data. For example, five firms account for over 80 percent of beef packing market. That is a higher concentration than the FTC found in 1918 leading up to enactment of the Packers and Stockyards Act. Six firms account for 75 percent of pork packing. Now we have a situation where Smithfield wants to buy out Murphy. And the largest four grain buyers control nearly 40 percent of the elevator facilities.

The legislation I am going to introduce—I am now waiting for the final draft from legislative counsel—will impose a moratorium on mergers, acquisitions, and marketing agreements among dealers, processors, commission merchants, brokers, or operators of a warehouse of agricultural commodities with annual net sales or total assets of more than \$50 million. The moratorium would last for 1 year, or until Congress enacts legislation that addresses the problems of concentration of agriculture, whichever comes first. I think Senator DORGAN is working on a similar piece of legislation. I am sure there are other Senators who are going to be talking about this.

Going back to the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act, or Senator Estes Kefauver's work in the 1950s, Congress has said there was a role for Government to protect consumers and also to protect producers. In fact, a lot of the

history of the Sherman Act and Clayton Act goes back to agriculture and the concerns of family farmers.

What I am saying in this legislation is, obviously, the status quo is not working. These conglomerates have muscled their way to the dinner table. They are pushing family farmers out. There is no real competition in the food industry any longer. In order for our producers to get a decent price, and in order to make sure our producers and family farmers have a future, in order to make sure the rural communities of my State of Minnesota have a future, we are going to have to take some action. Our action and our legislation ought to be on the side of family farmers.

So I intend to introduce this bill later today. I will also draft this as an amendment to the bankruptcy bill. I also will be on the floor with other amendments. Unfortunately, the bankruptcy bill applies all too well to family farmers in my State of Minnesota and to family farmers all around the country.

There are other colleagues who want to speak, so I am going to try to conclude in the next 3 or 4 minutes, I say to my colleague from Oregon. I will not take a lot of time because we only have an hour and others want to speak as well.

But I have had a chance to travel a lot in Minnesota. I have had a chance to spend time in other States—in Iowa, in Texas, in Missouri. I have met with a lot of organizers around the country—in the Midwest and in the South—and I am telling you that I think rural America has to take a stand. I do not care whether we use the language of modifying legislation or amending legislation.

I personally thought the Freedom to Farm was really "Freedom to Fail" from the word "go." Others can have different opinions. But for sure, time is not on the side of family farmers. A lot of people in Minnesota, a lot of farmers are 45, 50 years old. They are burning their equity up. They look at me hard, and they say: Look, Paul, do we basically take everything we have and try to keep this farm going? We will. We want to. It has been in our family for four generations. We love farming. But if there is no future for us, tell us now.

I do not want to tell family farmers in Minnesota there is no future for them. I do not want to tell our rural communities there is no future for them. I do not want to tell our country that a few conglomerates are going to own all the land. Then what will the price be, and what will be the quality of the food? Will there be an agriculture that respects the air and the land and the water and the environment? I think not.

I do not think our country is yet engaged. I hope the national media will cover this crisis. And it is a crisis. I will be coming to the floor of the Senate with longer and longer and longer and longer speeches, backed up by lots

of data and statistics of what is happening in Minnesota, backed up with a lot of personal stories of hard-working people who have now lost their farms, where they not only live but where they have also worked. I will have amendments on legislation, in an effort to change things for the better.

If my colleagues have other ideas about how to change things for the better, great. Then get out on the floor of the Senate—this week, next week, the following week. Personally, at this point in time, I am focused on family farmers in the State of Minnesota. I am focused on our rural communities. I am focused on family farmers and rural communities all across our country.

I intend, as a Senator, to do everything I can on the floor of the Senate to fight for people, everything I know how to do to fight for people. I also am going to spend as much time as I can organizing the farmers because I am convinced, I say to Senator REID and Senator WYDEN, we are going to need farmers and rural people to come and rock this capital before we get the change we need. But we are going to keep pushing very hard. An awful lot of good people's lives are at stake.

I think in many ways this is a question that speaks to what America is about as well. I cannot be silent on it. I know of many Senators from other agricultural States who feel the same way. We have to push this on to the agenda of the Congress, and we have to do it now.

EAST TIMOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, in the final 1 minute—and I did not bring any talking points; I do not have it written now—I would like to thank the President. I was critical of the President last week about East Timor, but I think we ought to give credit where credit is due.

I am glad he spoke out. I am glad he put pressure on the Indonesian Government. I know there are a number of important questions to resolve about the nature of whatever kind of peacekeeping force goes in, but the sooner the better because this has been genocide. An awful lot of people have had the courage to stand up against the repressive government, or in this particular case, stand up for the independence of East Timor, that have been murdered. The sooner we get an international presence, an international force in there, the better.

I think the President was forceful this past weekend and should continue to be forceful. We should not let the Indonesian Government delay. The sooner we get a force in there to protect people, and to follow through on the mandate of the people—which was something the United Nations sponsored and supported, where the people voted for their own independence—I think the better off the world will be because whenever our Government can be on the side of human rights, then we

are living up to who we are as a Nation.

I thank my colleagues and yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for an excellent statement. I happen to think those statements reflect his commitment to justice, both here at home and overseas. I commend him for an excellent statement.

I also, before I begin, thank my colleague, the distinguished whip from Nevada. I understand he had the time, and he was gracious enough to give me this opportunity to speak briefly. I thank my good friend from Nevada for the opportunity to speak this afternoon.

CUSTOMER SERVICE PROTECTIONS FOR AIRLINE TRAVELERS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President and colleagues, for many months now the Nation's airlines have been doing their utmost to prevent the Congress from enacting meaningful customer service protections for airline travelers. The airline industry lobbyists have fanned out across the Nation's capital telling our colleagues that meaningful protections for consumers—such as the right to timely and accurate information—are going to increase the costs for airline passengers, reduce service, and to hear them tell it, it is practically going to bring about the end of Western civilization as we know it.

As part of their campaign to prevent the enactment of enforceable legislation to protect the consumer, the airline industry has made a host of voluntary pledges to improve passenger service.

Today, I am releasing two reports, one done by the General Accounting Office and the other done by the Congressional Research Service, that show the voluntary pledges made by the airline industry are worth little more than the paper on which they are written.

Let me be specific.

After evaluating the airline industry's proposals, it is clear the airline industry provides passengers rights in three categories:

First, rights that they already have; second, rights that the airline industry is reluctant to write into the legalese that constitute the contract between the airline and the customer; and finally, their rights that are ignored altogether.

For example, among the several rights airlines refuse to provide is disclosure about overbooking on flights. If you call an airline this afternoon and ask about a particular flight and it is overbooked, the airline is not required to tell you that before they take your money. When I and other advocates for the consumer have asked them to pro-

vide just this information—we are not calling for a constitutional right to a fluffy pillow on an airline flight but just the information about overbooking—the airline industry simply won't follow through. The fact is, the industry's voluntary pledges are gobbledegook.

To determine if there was any substance to them at all, I asked the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Research Service to compare the voluntary pledges made by the industry to the hidden but actually binding contractual rights the airline passengers have that are written into what are called contracts of carriage. The General Accounting Office found that of the 16 pledges the airline industry has made to consumers, only 4 are actually provided in the contracts of carriage. Three of them are mandated already by Federal regulation, and most of them are left out altogether, including informing the customers of the lowest fare, informing customers about delays, cancellations and diversions, returning checked bags within 24 hours, providing credit card refunds within 7 days, informing the passenger about restrictions on frequent flier rules, and assigning customer service representatives to handle complaints and other problems.

Moreover, the airlines are not exactly tripping over themselves to rewrite these contracts of carriage, the actual contract that protects the consumer. When General Accounting Office officials contacted the airlines to inquire about actually putting teeth into pledge language, the officials at 10 of the major airlines said they were "considering revisions" to their contracts of carriage to reflect at least some of the customer service plans. Even more importantly, if the passenger wants to know what their actual contractual rights are to these key services, the airlines have made it very difficult for the consumer to find out. The Congressional Research Service points out:

Frontline airline staff seems uncertain as to just what contracts of carriage are.

The Service found:

Even if the consumer knows that they have a right to the information, they must accurately identify the relevant provisions of the contract of carriage or take home the address or phone number, if available, of the airline's consumer affairs department, send for it, and then wait for the contract of carriage to arrive in the mail.

As the Congressional Research Service puts it, with their usual diplomacy and understatement:

The airlines do not appear to go out of their way to provide easy access to these contracts of carriage.

I hope my colleagues will read the actual specifics included in the airlines so-called "customer first" pledge. What they will see is a lot of high sounding rhetoric about improving service to the passengers, but the harsh reality is, it is business as usual.

Last year, there were an unprecedented number of complaints about air-

line service. Based on the figures I have just obtained for the first 6 months of this year, there has been another huge increase, in fact a doubling, in the number of consumer complaints about passenger service. It is easy to see why, when you examine how hedged and guarded the airline industry is with respect to actually giving consumers meaningful and timely information that will help them make their choices about travel.

For example, let us look briefly at the pledge to offer the lowest fare available on airline flights. What this means is if a consumer uses the telephone to call an airline and asks about a specific flight on a specific date in a specific class, the airline will tell them the lowest fare, as they are already required to do. But not only will they not provide you relevant information about lower fares on other flights on the same airline, they won't even tell you about lower fares that are probably available on their web page. The reason why is simple: They have got you when they have you on the telephone, and they will sell you the ticket when it is an opportunity to sell it and they can make money on it. But when it is a chance to help the consumer and the consumer can get a break by knowing about other fares available on the web page, there is no disclosure.

The purchase of an airline ticket today in America is like virtually no other consumer choice. Unlike movie theaters that sell tickets to a movie or a sporting goods store that sells soccer balls, the airline industry provides no real assurance that you will be able to use their product as intended. Movie theaters can't cancel shows because they don't have enough people for a show, but airlines cancel flights when they don't have enough passengers. The sporting goods store can't lure you in with a pledge to give you that soccer ball at an attractive price and then give you a less desirable product at a greater cost after you get there. But the airline industry can do both of those things. They can make arbitrary cancellations. They can lure you in for a product and, after they have you, not make it available. The fact is, the airline industry is insisting they ought to be outside the basic laws that protect consumers in every other economic field from coast to coast.

I conclude by saying that over the next few weeks the Congress is going to have the chance to right the wrongs spelled out by the Congressional Research Service and the General Accounting Office studies that I release today. I look forward to working with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to make sure airline passengers across this country get a fair shake.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and thank my colleague from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Oregon, I have appreciated his presentation. It reminds me of the work he has done since he has been in Congress. We served together in the

House of Representatives, and the Senator from Oregon was known in the House as being someone who dealt with substance. The same tradition that he established in the House, is being carried over to the Senate, as indicated by his remarks dealing with airline travel.

COMMERCIALISM OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am a great fan of public broadcasting. I listen almost every day to public radio. I am tremendously impressed with programs such as "Prairie Home Companion" and all the news stories in the morning that are extremely in depth. With public television, we all recognize the contributions made by the series on the Civil War, which is a classic and will continue to be in American television. The "MacNeil, Lehrer News Hour," which is now the "Lehrer News Hour," is the most in-depth news coverage that we have any place in America. There are many other programs on radio and on public television which I haven't mentioned that are quite good as well.

I am struck by the amount of commercials I endure and we all have to endure when we listen to public radio and watch public television. In my estimation, it is out of hand. These commercials are technically called "enhanced underwriting." You can call them whatever you want, but they are commercials.

An article appeared a short time ago in the Washington Post entitled "Now a Word About Our Sponsor." Critics say public radio's on-air credits come too close to being commercials, and, as indicated in that article, they are absolutely right. People are getting more disturbed every day with commercialism of public broadcasting.

I point this out because I am not the only one who has noticed the increasing sponsored announcements. According to this article, one survey shows a 700-percent increase in corporate funding over the past 5 or 6 years. It is just not listeners who are noticing the change. If I were the owner of a private broadcasting station, I would be up in arms. And some private station owners are tremendously disturbed about the increasing commercialism of this so-called public broadcasting.

Private stations aren't tax exempt like public broadcasting stations are. The private stations are now voicing their concerns about the existing uneven playing field. I don't want to sound as though I am beating up on public broadcasting because, as I have indicated in my opening statement, I really do like public broadcasting. I enjoy the programs on National Public Radio and public television. I believe public broadcasting should remain just that—public. That means we have to do a better job with public funding.

We can trace very clearly what has happened to public broadcasting. Newt Gingrich, and others with whom he as-

sociated, came out with the bad idea that they wanted to eliminate public broadcasting. This group found that they could not do that. So, in effect, they cut back the funding and they are strangling public broadcasting to death.

Mr. President, we need to do the necessary things to make public broadcasting more public in nature. I believe it is time for us to decide whether we want to have a public broadcasting system or whether we don't want to have one. Either we fund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting so they can exist, or we end it. I prefer the former. Therefore, when the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education marks up its bill—and I am a member of that subcommittee—I plan to offer an amendment to increase the Corporation for Public Broadcasting appropriation to \$475 million. This is \$125 million more than their request. However, I also plan to include report language that would encourage public radio and television to scale back their so-called enhanced underwriting practices and to become, once again, a public broadcasting system that is publicly funded.

As long as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is leery of Congress cutting their funds or doing away with Federal funds altogether, they will begin to sound more and more like private broadcasting stations. The people who run those stations don't like it. You have people, as indicated in the Post article that I referred to earlier, who are continually talking about how difficult it is and how unfair it is. In this article, the author cites Bob Edwards from the NPR Morning Edition, which is a very fine program for news in the morning. He says:

Underwriting has kept us alive, but there's also a downside. It has cut into our air time. If you have to read a 30-second underwriting credit [a commercial], that's less news you can do.

So as I stated, we have to either make public broadcasting public or do away with it. If we continue the road we are going on, we are going to wind up having public broadcasting in name only, and it is going to be unfair that they are competing with the private stations, in which we have people who have invested a lot of money, trying to make money on an uneven playing field because of the protections public broadcasting have.

A DEMOCRATIC PLAN WITH WHICH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE CAN AGREE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we had some good news last week when the majority leader, Senator LOTT, indicated that if the President vetoed the \$800 billion Republican tax plan, that would be the end of it.

That is good news for the American public on the \$800 billion attempt to cut taxes in this country because, in fact, it really wasn't a tax cutting

measure. It was something that would give no immediate relief to the American taxpayer. There was relief in the outyears. In fact, what it would have done is prevent us from directing monies toward the debt, and the debt of \$5 trillion is something we need to address.

If the national debt were lowered, it would be a tax cut for everyone, rich and poor. We pay hundreds of millions of dollars every year in interest on that debt. If we lower that, it will be good for everyone. We are not going to continue to live in this great economy where everything is looking good, forever. Hard times may lie ahead, and I think we will rue the day we didn't use these good times to pay down that debt.

This massive tax package that was passed on a very partisan basis, and then withheld from the American public during the August break so there could be a public relations effort to have the American people accept this tax cut, never materialized. The American people would not accept it because it was not acceptable on its face. They realized there was no meaningful tax relief in this package. It was more of a public relations ploy. The fact is that there should have been more attention focused on paying down the debt and protecting Social Security and Medicare. We must pay down the debt. That would be a tax cut for everyone.

We must protect Social Security. The majority touted the Social Security lockbox in conjunction with the tax cut. But the Republican lockbox fails to extend the solvency in the Social Security trust fund by a single day, and it includes, in this so-called lockbox, a trapdoor, a loophole, that would allow Republicans to label anything Social Security reform and to raid the Social Security trust fund. Finally, the Republican lockbox does nothing to protect Medicare.

So by proposing targeted tax cuts toward working families, the minority believes our Democratic plan is able to prioritize paying down the debt and protecting Social Security and Medicare while still providing almost \$300 billion in targeted tax cuts.

What would those cuts do? They would increase the standard deduction for all individuals and married couples. They would provide marriage penalty relief for those taxpayers who pay more as married couples than they would if they were to file their taxes as two single individuals. They would provide for a long-term-care tax credit to make it easier to care for elderly family members. They would provide for a 100-percent deduction for health insurance costs of the self-employed and include tax incentives to build and modernize more than 6,000 schools. That is important.

Clark County, Las Vegas, NV, has the eighth-largest school district in America, with over 200,000 schoolchildren. We are having to build over a dozen new schools every year. In one year

—and we hold the record—we dedicated 18 new schools in Clark County. We have to build one new elementary school every month to keep up with the growth in Clark County. We need some help to do that. The Democratic tax plan would give us some of that needed help.

Also, one of the things we have talked about, which is so important, is a tax credit for research and development for high-tech companies. That is part of the Democratic tax plan—something we hope the majority leader and others will take a look at and be willing to compromise on. Democrats have been out in front on the issue for a long time. We pushed hard for a permanent R & D tax credit. The majority talked about how they were in favor of a permanent credit as well, until it came time to actually do it. In the end, the minority, myself included, were pushing for a ten year R & D tax credit. The majority ended up only committing to a five year tax credit in their package. Due in large part to initiatives like the R & D tax credit, the high-tech industry exists and has flourished. Without knowing whether or not that tax credit will be around next year or the year after or the year after that, hinders these companies' long term planning.

ATHLETICS IN NEVADA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in Nevada we are very proud of a number of things. We have a beautiful State. We are the most mountainous State in the Union, except for Alaska, with over 300 separate mountain ranges, with 32 mountains over 11,000 feet high. Las Vegas, of course, is the entertainment capital of the world.

We are very proud of our universities for a number of reasons. We have a great engineering program at the University of Nevada, Reno. The Mackay School of Mines is there, and we are proud of that as well. We have a great school for biological sciences, which has a national reputation. At UNLV, we have the finest hotel administration program in the entire country. The universities in Nevada are very proud of the football teams that we had in the forties and fifties. Since the schools have been divided, UNR has been a power in division II football, and they have played for the national championship. They are now a division I team. UNLV has won national championships in basketball. The UNLV football team has had some bad years, losing dozens of games. Last year they didn't win a single game, but this year they were able to beat North Texas State in their first away game.

A week ago last Thursday and then this past Saturday, they played Baylor. Even though Baylor was favored by a couple of touchdowns, one of the most miraculous wins in the history of football at the professional or college level occurred when Baylor was ahead by four points with less than 10 seconds left. They had the ball inside the 10-

yard line of UNLV. Rather than take their four-point victory, they wanted to run the score up a little bit and go for a touchdown. In the end zone there was a fumble picked up by a UNLV defensive back who ran 101 yards for the touchdown and beat Baylor with no time left on the clock. This was tremendous.

People are going to be very happy with their new football coach, John Robinson, who had a great career before coming to UNLV from the University of Southern California and, of course, coaching the Los Angeles Rams.

We offer our congratulations to John Robinson and UNLV for two victories, which is two more than they had during all of last year.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ANDRE AGASSI

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the main reason I wanted to talk about athletics in Nevada is not because of the team victories that we have had over the years in Nevada but because of a great young man who was born and raised in Nevada who has been part of the Nevada athletic scene for some 25 years, even though he is only 29 years old.

Andre Agassi and his family have been great for the State of Nevada. Andre, when he was a little boy still in elementary school, it was said by Poncho Gonzales, who was a tennis great, "He will be better than I someday." This is when he was a little, tiny boy. Poncho Gonzales was right.

Andre Agassi has already proven himself to be even greater than the great Poncho Gonzales. This was certainly the case as proven yesterday when he won the U.S. Open Tennis Championship.

I want to, on the Senate floor, congratulate Andre Agassi on this remarkable comeback yesterday in the U.S. Open and, of course, his comeback victory in the French Open.

Andre, as I have indicated, is a native of Las Vegas and dominated this summer with 35 victories in 39 matches. That is almost unheard of.

Andre Agassi is the No. 1 ranked tennis player in the United States. Not too long ago, because of an injury and other problems, Andre Agassi was ranked 141. He is now ranked the best tennis player in the world, as he should be.

I was watching the tennis matches over the weekend. John McEnroe, one of the great tennis players of all time, commenting about Andre Agassi, said his ability to return service is the best there has ever been in the entire history of tennis. His reputation and his abilities are still being proven. He is getting better with every match he plays.

But yesterday he closed out one of the greatest summers in tennis history. He came up with some of the most impressive shots ever seen in tennis in a dominating fifth set to capture his second U.S. Open.

Andre has made his place in tennis history. When he won the French Open, he joined Roy Emerson, Rod Laver, Don Budge, and Fred Perry as the only men to win all four major tournaments in their career.

Andre not only won the French and the U.S. Opens this year, he was also in the finals at Wimbledon, making him the first man since Ivan Lendl in 1986 to have gone to three grand slam finals in the same year.

No man had fought back to win the U.S. Open from a 2-1 deficit in sets since John Newcombe did it 26 years ago. But that is exactly what Agassi did in a 3-hour and 23-minute match yesterday.

The match was only the fifth all-American men's final at the U.S. Open in 32 years. The matchup of these two men who are almost 30-years-old, was the oldest since 39-year-old Ken Rosewall lost to 22-year-old Jimmy Connors in 1974. Even though these two men had not reached the age of 30, they played great tennis. They will be talked about as being old men at tennis, I repeat, even though they were not even 30 years old yet. They set a great example for tennis generally and for American tennis in particular.

I have to agree with Andre when after the match he said, "I'll tell you what. How can you ask for anything more than two Americans in the final of the U.S. Open playing a great five-set match?"

Andre turned pro when he was 16 years old. We can all remember—I shouldn't say "we can all" because that was 13 or 14 years ago—a lot of us can remember when he turned pro. In those 13 or 14 years, he has changed. He won Wimbledon in 1992, the U.S. Open in 1994, and was the No. 1 player in the world by 1995.

But by 1997, Andre had, as I have indicated, come across some tough times. But he has fought back remarkably well. He finished sixth in the world last year. Earlier this year, he was ranked No. 1. He is now No. 1 again.

In a period of 4 months, he won the French Open—coming back from two sets down in the final—reached the Wimbledon final, and won the U.S. Open, a truly phenomenal comeback.

Andre deserves to be congratulated not only for his tremendous tennis, but for all the great work he does for at-risk youth in Las Vegas. He truly has put his money where his mouth is.

The Agassi Foundation has helped poor kids in Nevada. That is an understatement. He personally raises millions of dollars. He is going to have an event this month. He has gotten some of his friends to come from Las Vegas. He will raise \$3 million at that event, all of which will go into his foundation to help the youth of Las Vegas.

His exhibition against Todd Martin yesterday was exciting. Todd Martin is a great champion in his own right. His towering stature of 6-foot-6 was as towering on the tennis court. These two men were interviewed after the tennis

match, and that should certainly be an inspiration to all young people who want to compete because as winner and loser, they both talked as winners and indicated how important it was that they were able to represent the United States at the U.S. Open.

Andre Agassi is good on the court and off the court with the tremendous work he has done with the Andre Agassi Foundation. He has helped the youth of Las Vegas by giving them a helping hand in growing up to be successful individuals. His foundation even branched out to a program to help women and children who have become victims of domestic abuse.

Today on the floor of the U.S. Senate, I congratulate a great American, Andre Agassi, someone who will go down in the annals of history as a great athlete and who will go down in the annals of history in the State of Nevada as a good person. Andre Agassi is someone who is willing to help those who certainly aren't as fortunate as he.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll. Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the two cloture votes scheduled for 5 p.m. today, and regardless of the outcome of those cloture votes, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 210, the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry to be the U.S. circuit judge for the Third Circuit. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate. I finally ask consent that following that vote, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, other than to say it would be nice if the majority leader would allow that one to go to voice vote. But if he will not allow that, I will be happy to withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 2466, which the clerk will report by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Gorton amendment No. 1359, of a technical nature.

Hutchison amendment No. 1603, to prohibit the use of funds for the purpose of issuing a notice of rulemaking with respect to the valuation of crude oil for royalty purposes until September 30, 2000.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator's request is granted.

AMENDMENT NO. 1588

(Purpose: To make certain modifications to the Forest System budget)

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1588, which I believe is currently at the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], for himself, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REID and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 1588.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 63, beginning on line 1, strike "\$1,239,051,000" and all that follows through line 6 and insert "\$1,216,351,000 (which shall include 50 percent of all moneys received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 in accordance with section 4(i) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(i))), to remain available until expended, of which \$33,697,000 shall be available for wildlife habitat management, \$22,132,000 shall be avail-

able for inland fish habitat management, \$24,314,000 shall be available for anadromous fish habitat management, \$29,548,000 shall be available for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species habitat management, and \$196,885,000 shall be available for timber sales management."

On page 64, line 17, strike "\$362,095,000" and insert "\$371,795,000".

On page 64, line 22, strike "205:" and insert "205, of which \$86,909,000 shall be available for road construction (of which not more than \$37,400,000 shall be available for engineering support for the timber program) and \$122,484,000 shall be available for road maintenance:".

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, today I am offering an amendment with my colleague from Illinois and my colleague from Oregon that is a win-win for the American taxpayer and the environment.

Our amendment reduces the subsidy for the below-cost timber program administered by the Forest Service and for the construction of logging roads in our national forests.

In addition, our amendment reallocates needed monies to those Forest Service programs underfunded by the committee, such as road maintenance, wildlife and fish habitat management, and threatened and endangered species habitat management.

Each year, the American taxpayers spend millions of dollars to subsidize the construction of roads needed for logging on national forest lands.

The appropriations bill before us today contains over \$37 million for the Forest Service to assist in the construction and reconstruction of timber roads in our national forests. This assistance is in the form of contract administration, construction oversight, and engineering, planning, and design work performed by the Forest Service for the logging companies which are merely left with the task of building the roads to extract the timber.

Our amendment would reduce this subsidy by a modest amount, \$1.6 million, which is the amount the program was increased above the administration's budget request.

Similarly, this bill contains \$228.9 million for the administration of the timber sale program, which is more than \$32 million above the administration's budget request.

These expenditures for a money losing timber program are an enormous drain on the Treasury.

In their most recent Forest Management Program Annual Report, dated July 1998, the Forest Service acknowledges losing \$88.6 million from their timber program in fiscal year 1997.

This was the second consecutive year that the Forest Service reported a loss.

In addition to the reported loss, the \$88.6 million figure excludes a full accounting of all costs associated with logging.

In past fiscal years, independent analyses estimate the loss from below-cost timber sales are far greater than those reported by the Forest Service.

The General Accounting Office estimated that the timber program cost

taxpayers at least \$1.5 billion from 1992 to 1997.

Our amendment would reduce funding for timber sale management by \$32.015 million to the level requested by the administration.

In spite of the fact that our National Forests supply a mere 4 percent of our nation's annual timber harvest, this bill continues to reflect the dominance of the timber program at the expense of other programs designed to improve forest health and enhance the public's enjoyment of our national forests.

More than 380,000 miles of roads criss-cross the national forests. This is a more extensive road network than the National Interstate Highway System.

The Forest Service estimates that over 80% of these roads are not maintained to public safety and environmental standards.

As a matter of public policy, I would argue that it makes more sense to maintain the roads we already have than to spend money building new roads we don't need.

Many scientists have found that road building threatens wildlife because it causes erosion of soils, fragments intact forest ecosystems, encourages the spread of noxious weeds and invasive species, and reduces habitat for many animals needing refuge from man.

It has been found that when roads wash out they dump rocks and soil on lower slopes and into streambeds, and even when they remain intact, roads act as channels for water and contribute further to the erosion of lands and streams.

Scientists say that the overall effect is that the streams and rivers fill with silt and the shallower waters mean degraded fish habitat and more flooding.

In my home state of Nevada, the road network throughout the Lake Tahoe basin has been identified as a major contributor to the degradation of water quality and decline in clarity of Lake Tahoe.

An important component of the Forest Service's road maintenance program involves the decommissioning of old logging roads.

This program has been essential to efforts in the Lake Tahoe basin to improve erosion control and the overall water quality of the lake.

The bill before us today cuts the administration's request for road maintenance by \$11.3 million.

The Forest Service has indicated that their annual road maintenance needs total \$431 million per year, and that their backlog for deferred maintenance totals \$3.85 billion.

The bill before us today provides less than a quarter of the funding the Forest Service requires to address their annual road maintenance needs.

Addressing this need would have considerable environmental benefits, such as reducing erosion from roads and storm proofing existing culverts.

It is important to remember that the timber industry's responsibility for

maintaining logging roads ends with the end of the timber sale, leaving all future maintenance costs to the taxpayer.

Our amendment adds \$5.3 million for important road maintenance projects throughout our national forests.

The National Forests include nearly 200,000 miles of fishable streams and more than 2 million acres of lakes, ponds and reservoirs that support hundreds of inland fish species with important recreational, commercial, and ecological values.

The inland fisheries habitat management program allows the Forest Service to protect and restore inland streams and lakes, along with the fish and aquatic life they support.

The bill before us today cuts the administration's request for this program by \$7 million.

Our amendment proposes to restore \$3.115 million in funding for this program.

This additional funding would allow the Forest Service to enhance or restore several hundred miles of stream and over 400 additional acres of ponds, lakes, and reservoirs.

The National Forests also provide critical spawning and rearing habitat for Pacific, Great Lakes, and Atlantic stocks of anadromous fish, such as salmon, sturgeons, and lampreys.

These stocks contribute significantly to the quality of life, recreational and commercial fishing, and the economy of local communities.

The Interior bill cuts the administration's funding request for anadromous fisheries habitat management by \$6.4 million.

Our amendment proposes to restore \$1.6 million for this program.

This funding will enable the Forest Service to complete critical work on over 100 additional miles of anadromous streams and 1,000 acres of additional acres of anadromous lakes and reservoirs, complementing the efforts of our state, federal, and tribal partners.

The wildlife habitat management program of the Forest Service for fiscal year 2000 will focus on prescribed burns to improve wildlife habitat.

It will help to develop and protect wetlands and water sources in arid habitats for waterfowl, quail, and wild turkey, in addition to restoring riparian habitat that benefits big game.

The subcommittee cut \$5 million from the wildlife program.

Our amendment would restore \$1.6 million in funding for this program.

This funding would provide for an additional 8,000 acres of important habitat improvement, which would benefit both game and nongame species, and result in enhanced opportunities for wildlife-related recreation.

The activities of the threatened, endangered, and sensitive species program serve to achieve recovery goals for threatened and endangered animals and plants.

The Forest Service has indicated that this program continues to be essential to the mission of their agency.

The committee cut the endangered species program by \$5 million.

Our amendment would restore \$2 million for this program, which would allow the Forest Service to pursue conservation strategies to prevent the need for listing, thereby avoiding the loss of management flexibility and increased operating costs once listing occurs.

Mr. President, the \$20 million our amendment adds to wildlife, fisheries, and rare plant habitat management programs would enable the Forest Service to increase Challenge Cost-Share partnerships with organizations throughout the country, enabling the agency to leverage funding, better serve the public, and improve vital habitats for fish and wildlife.

This funding is an investment for the nation's 63 million wildlife watchers, 14 million hunters, and 35 million anglers who spend approximately 127.6 million activity days hunting, fishing, and observing fish and wildlife annually on national forests.

This result in local community expenditures of billions of dollars and over 230,000 full-time equivalent jobs.

One out of every three anglers fish national forest waters nationally, and two out of three anglers in the West fish national forest waters.

That is why our amendment is supported by groups like Trout Unlimited, the American Sportfishing Association, and Wildlife Forever.

Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues to join a strong coalition of environmental, hunting, fishing, and taxpayer organizations in support of the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG. 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. BRYAN. 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. 1623 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1588
(Purpose: To make available funds for the survey and manage requirements of the Northwest Forest Plan Record of Decision)

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. FITZGERALD, proposes an amendment numbered 1623 to amendment No. 1588.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 1, line 3, strike "\$1,216,351,000" and all that follows through "management" on page 2, line 4, and insert

“\$1,225,351,000 (which shall include 50 percent of all moneys received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 in accordance with section 4(i) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 4601–6a(i))), to remain available until expended, of which \$33,697,000 shall be available for wildlife habitat management, \$22,132,000 shall be available for inland fish habitat management, \$24,314,000 shall be available for anadromous fish habitat management, \$28,548,000 shall be available for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species habitat management, \$196,885,000 shall be available for timber sales management, and \$10,000,000 shall be available for survey and management requirements of the Northwest Forest Plan Record of Decision, for which the draft supplemental environmental impact statement is to be completed by November 15, 1999, and the final environmental impact statement is to be published by February 14, 2000”.

On page 2, line 6, strike “\$371,795,000” and insert “\$365,795,000”.

On page 2, line 11, strike “\$122,484,000” and insert “\$116,484,000”.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I note that my colleague, one of the prime sponsors of the amendment, has joined us on the floor. I yield the floor at this point.

Mr. WYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Nevada for all his effort in working with me and other colleagues from the Pacific Northwest on this issue. Folks in your part of the United States want to be sensitive to environmental values and economic needs in our communities. As a result of recent court decisions and other problems, instead of that win-win, we have essentially had a lose-lose, where we are not doing what is needed to protect environmental values; nor are we doing what is needed to protect communities—particularly rural communities—that have very legitimate economic concerns as a result of having resource-dependent economies.

The Senator from Nevada has been working with us. I will begin my remarks by saying what we are trying to do in the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment is incorporate some of the thinking that has been behind what the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator GORTON, has talked about on the floor and some of what Senator ROBB tried to do last week with respect to environmental values. I think if you look at the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment, you will see, to some degree, efforts to try to reconcile some of the important points that Senator GORTON has made and the important points Senator ROBB has made that are brought together in our amendment so we can take advantage of an opportunity to both improve the environment and move timber more quickly from the forests to the mills.

When President Clinton took office in 1993, he came to the Pacific Northwest with a promise to help resolve the battle over owls and old growth. The administration put in place the North-

west Forest Plan which promised protection for my State's ancient forests, and also sustainable forestry for a State that has long been dependent in rural communities on forestry for family wage jobs.

Over the past few months, the plan, which has already been failing to deliver what it promised, threatened to come completely undone when a Federal judge ruled that the Forest Service had failed to conduct biological surveys—an obligation known as survey and management—as required under the court-approved Northwest Forest Plan.

Later this week, in the Forestry Subcommittee, chaired by my friend and colleague, Senator CRAIG, we are going to talk about who exactly is to blame for that fiasco. But today, we in the Pacific Northwest are left with dozens of suspended timber sales as a result of the Forest Service's failure to follow through on environmental protection obligations.

The Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment would earmark resources for this costly environmental work and place a stringent timetable on the completion of the surveys' environmental impact statement. Thus, by making sure these environmental surveys get done, and done quickly, we will help both the environment and timber workers do well.

Building on the philosophy that we heard from Senator GORTON, that the program has not worked very well, and what we heard from Senator ROBB about the importance of environmental values, what Senator BRYAN, Senator FITZGERALD, and I are trying to do is incorporate some of the thinking behind both of those approaches so we can try to put this survey and management program on track but also bring to it some of the accountability that Senators GORTON and CRAIG are absolutely right in saying has been lacking in the past.

I have shared, as I say, many of the concerns of the manager of the bill. But I don't think we can simply waive survey and management requirements altogether because what will happen is that will lead to a full employment program for lawyers if it were adopted and, even if in the short term, very serious problems because the bill would be vetoed by the President if section 329 survived conference in its present form.

In August of this year, right after the first Northwest Forest Plan timber sales were enjoined, Senator MURRAY and I sent a letter to Under Secretary Lyons asking that the Forest Service and BLM meet with our offices to discuss how and why the survey and management requirements were stopping the Northwest Forest Timber Program and what could be done about it.

Initially, in the August meeting between agency staff and the congressional staff, held both in D.C. and in my hometown of Portland, the Forest Service stated that \$10 million more funding for personnel and addressing

the scientific issues was necessary in order to get the survey and management program back on track. So let's be clear; the survey and management program is an unparalleled undertaking. It is going to provide new scientific protocols and data that can be useful in forests across the country. But it has to be done in a way that addresses the legitimate issues with respect to accountability that our colleague from Washington State, Senator GORTON, and Senator CRAIG of Idaho have addressed on this floor.

So the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment directs \$10 million for survey and management requirements to help the Forest Service conduct surveys on judicially stalled timber sales for species with known survey protocols. It will help the Service create protocols for the species currently lacking such data. This money starts us toward completion of the environmental scientific work that is necessary to move timber sales toward harvest.

During the August meetings, the Forest Service was initially optimistic about the time it would take them to complete the environmental impact statements which they believe will answer the questions with respect to the success of the Northwest Forest Plan. At first, the Forest Service told me in a draft response to the letter Senator MURRAY and I sent them that the environmental impact statement, draft statement, would be completed this fall, and that the final would be ready early next year. Now the Forest Service is telling us that the draft will be available for public comment by December and perhaps the final environmental impact statement will be ready in May or June of next year. They have not given us any indication, other than overlap of this work with the holidays, why the timing of the work had to change.

The Forest Service has been working on this project since 1997 and knew since 1994 that the survey and management requirement was coming down the pike. I certainly wasn't one who succeeded in getting his homework always done on time, but the Forest Service's timetable reflects extraordinarily poor planning, by any calculus.

It is time for some accountability. We are going to have a chance to discuss those accountability issues later this week. I note the chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee has arrived. He knows I share many of his concerns about the lack of accountability with respect to the Forest Service on survey and management, and in other key areas.

The Forest Service needs administrative deadlines to move this process along. They need to make this environmental impact statement a priority and get it done. The Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment states the survey and management draft environmental impact statement should be completed

by November 15 of this year, and the final version of that impact statement should be published by February 14, 2000.

Those deadlines also allow for the public a comment period required by law, plus some additional time for open and public discussion.

This administration for years has been promising Congress they will get to work on the Northwest Forest Plan. The time for those empty promises is over. This administration needs some direction, and they need the extra money to achieve it.

Finally, let me reiterate what I think the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment does. I say this to colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It incorporates much of the important analysis done by Senator GORTON and Senator CRAIG with respect to why the survey and management program has not worked and why the administration has dragged its feet on it while at the same time trying to incorporate the environmental concerns Senator ROBB has legitimately addressed to ensure this program gets carried out.

Under the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment, we would add the money necessary to carry it out. But we would finally have some real accountability and some real deadlines to make sure these important obligations, both in terms of environmental protection and in terms of meeting economic needs of rural communities, are addressed.

I hope my colleagues on both sides will support it. If we adopt this amendment, I believe the end result will be healthier forests and a healthier timber economy.

I, again, thank my colleague from Nevada for all of his assistance. I know my colleagues from Idaho and Washington as members of our Senate delegation from the Northwest have strong views on this as well. The Senator from Idaho knows how much I enjoy working with him. We are getting ready to go forward with our accounting payment legislation which gives us a chance to break some gridlock in that area. I am hopeful as we go forward on this important Interior bill we can also break the gridlock with respect to survey management and have additional funds that are needed but also additional accountability. That is why I am hopeful my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, as we debate the Interior appropriations bill—and now the amendment and the substitute amendment offered by Senators BRYAN and WYDEN—I guess I can say at the outset that the only thing I arrive at in trying to consider a \$34 million cut in a very essential program to the U.S. Forest Service, especially when the advocacy of the cut comes from the two Senators from large public land Western States such as Nevada

and Oregon, is “frustration” over the lack of understanding by a Senator from Nevada who is responsible for representing his State which is predominantly a public lands State where grazing on public lands and mining the natural resources from those public lands are two of the primary economies of that State, that he would not be supportive of programs within the U.S. Forest Service that deal with public land resources in an appropriate and responsible way.

I say that before I get to the specific issues of the amendment because I find it fascinating that in a publication called “Public Lands Forests, What We Get, What We Pay For”—an interesting publication from the Political Economy Research Center which deals with the subject that the Senator from Nevada knows a great deal about, and in fact knows a great deal more about than I do as the chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee. That the Tahoe Basin, a beautiful and unique area in his State that is being dramatically impacted at this moment by a lack of forest management in a responsible way as we begin to see a relatively affluent urban interface grow around Lake Tahoe and into a forest that is dramatically different than what it was 40, 50, or 100 years ago.

Let me quote from this article. I am trying to set a tone for my frustration over why the Senator from Nevada is doing what he is doing and the Senator from Oregon would join with him. Let me quote from this publication, and the title to the article is called “One Spark From Disaster.”

I quote:

As the road dropped out of the Sierras into the Lake Tahoe basin below, the scenery made an abrupt change from healthy, green forests to dead and dying stands of timber. The congressmen on their way to the June 1997 Presidential Summit on the problems facing the lake and surrounding basin were taken aback by what they saw. Later, during a session on forest health, U.S. Senator Richard Bryan of Nevada exclaimed, “This forest looks like hell!” It appeared as if someone had drawn an imaginary line across the landscape and then nurtured the trees on one side, while destroying those on the other.

What the Senator was experiencing was what many are now experiencing on a Forest Service landscape across our Nation where we have constantly put out fires over the last 75 to 100 years and have not gone in and done selective logging or fuel reduction on our forest floors. We have literally created jungles—jungles that some would like to portray as beautiful, sweeping landscaped timbered vistas when it is quite obvious they are jungles that in the right environment—and the Tahoe Basin gets that environment every so often—could explode into total disaster of the landscape by the kinds of fires California has experienced this year and as have other parts of the country. Those of us more to the North in the Pacific Northwest have been fortunate enough this year in that our relatively unmanaged forests—and mismanaged

in some instances—have been wet enough that we haven’t had the fire threat.

The article goes on to say:

Ironically, forest management practices on surrounding federal lands have put at risk the very qualities they were supposed to preserve: the integrity of the forest and the clarity of the lake below—

Talking about the beautiful Lake Tahoe—

Environmental regulations have delayed some management actions and restricted timber harvests for forest treatments.

It has resulted, of course, in the situation that I described around the Tahoe Basin.

Of course, the reason the Senators from Nevada are appropriately concerned about the Tahoe Basin is not timber production per se because I don’t think you would view the Tahoe Basin as being an area where you would expect timber production, but it is the recent interfacing of resort homes—summer homes, many of them going in the millions of dollars—that use Lake Tahoe and find Lake Tahoe to be a marvelous place to live and, of course, coupled with the thousands of tourists who come there on an annual basis to see this tremendously beautiful high mountain alpine lake.

Why, then, would a Senator from Nevada want to cut a program where the money is utilized to do the necessary surveys and the preparations for the kind of fuel unloading or fuel decreases that Tahoe Basin would need because most of our timber sales are no longer green sales, they are sales of dead and dying timber. They are sales that are a product of forest health and not an ongoing aggressive timber program of the kind that brought the environmental outcry of a decade or two ago.

I must say the Senator from Oregon has a bit of a different circumstance. He and I joined ranks on the floor last week on a very critical issue. As you know, when this administration came to town a few years ago, they were faced with the situation of a timber industry imploding in the State of Oregon, imploding as a result of a spotted owl decision that took a tremendous amount of the timbered landscape of that State—both Forest Service and BLM timber—off the table, or at least had locked it all up in the courts.

This President, with the right intention—with the right intention—went out to try to solve the problem and basically said: Let me reduce your cut by 80 percent and for the other 20 percent remaining, or something near that, we will focus all of our intent there, all of our energy, and do the finest environmental assessment possible, and that you will be able to log.

We know the court decisions have gone well beyond the intent of the Endangered Species Act—reasonable and right surveys—and basically even stopped all of that logging.

I can understand why the Senator would want to try to divert money to solve his problem. But he also probably

fails to recognize that, in that diversion, he is affecting timber sales or timber management programs everywhere else in the country because while he is supporting taking 34 million dollars out of that sales and preparation base and putting some of it over into surveys, he is denying the States of Arkansas, Idaho, and others the very resources they need to keep their people working and to keep an industry that is now staggering to stay alive on its feet.

That is what brings Members to this point. Yes, we come to the floor now after having dramatically reduced these programs in the name of the environment—and in many instances appropriate reductions—and say we have to notch them down even more.

For the next few moments I will talk about the adverse effects on rural communities and jobs that the Bryan-Wyden substitute will have. That substitute takes money away from the program that supports good family jobs. I am talking about good-paying jobs. The two Senators plan to redirect funds out of the timber program into wildlife surveys and road maintenance, which I think will be counterproductive because we are already putting millions of dollars into that program.

For me to oppose their amendment does not mean we oppose the surveys. We know we have ramped up the amount of money that goes into those surveys and, of course, in ramping up the surveys, added costs to every timber sale. Then the Senator from Nevada can come to the floor and talk about these timber sales being too expensive and we ought to eliminate them. The reason they are expensive is that the court and some in the environmental community are demanding the money be transferred over to do the surveys.

It is a Catch-22. We shove these costs off on to the price of a timber sale. We escalate it to the point it is not a cost-effective timber sale. Therefore, we give some Senators a basis to come to the floor and argue we ought to eliminate them because we can't make money at them when, in fact, the politics have pushed the cost of the surveys well beyond what would be reasonable, appropriate, and responsible, for the purpose of cutting those trees. That is the ultimate Catch-22 in forest management today that has nearly laid the State of Oregon low and has dramatically impacted the State of Idaho.

Regarding the timber funding and the Forest Service that prepares the administrative forest activities, the committee already has an appropriate amount for wildlife and for road funding. Redirecting funds, as I have said, will harm the timber program. It will not be consequence free. It will cost jobs in Arkansas, in Idaho. It could cost jobs in other forested States across the Nation where there remains a struggling timber program.

The President traveled this summer to several sections of the country suf-

fering from poverty. I applaud him for dramatizing where poverty still exists in a country today that is nearly at full employment. It is almost ironic that in nearly the same breath it could be said that we are at full employment yet we have in certain areas high degrees of poverty. Most of that poverty exists in rural areas today. Most of that poverty exists in rural areas where those communities of working men and women are tied directly to the public lands and tied to the resources of those public lands.

Nearly one-third of the counties adjacent to national forests suffer poverty levels that are at least one and a half times higher than the national average. Let me refer to a fascinating chart that comes from the U.S. Forest Service's TSPIRS employment figures.

I refer to the solid bars on this chart showing employment from the harvesting and processing of national forest timber between 1989 and 1997—just over a few years—has dropped from 140,000 working men and women to 55,500. Let me repeat that. That is more dramatic than any other employment sector in our country, except in the making of buggies and buggy whips, and no young person on this floor even knows what I am talking about because that industry died a long time ago. In a decade we have lost from a 140,000 high down to 55,000 jobs for working men and women. The Senator from Nevada wants to take that down even further by the action he proposes today.

I am not quite sure I understand why, but let me show the very real impact. I am tremendously familiar with this because not only in my lifetime but in my tenure in the Congress, from when I started serving in 1981 until today, what I speak of has happened. I have watched it happen. I have been to the locations. I went to Grangeville, ID. I watched grown men sit on stacks of lumber and cry, literally, tears rolling down their cheeks because there were no more trees to cut under the Federal forest plan and they had lost their job. The mill was going to be unbolted, placed in shipping containers, and sent to Brazil to cut the rain forests because the environmentalists decided that the Nez Perce Forest in Idaho was no longer producing trees—although it was growing 10 times more trees than it was cutting.

What happened? Here are the very dramatic figures from a tremendously narrow period of time. The State of Washington, 1989 to today, 55 mills closed and the loss of 3,285 jobs; Oregon, 111 mills closed and the loss of 11,600 jobs; Montana, 13 mills closed and 1,083 jobs lost; Idaho, 17 mills and 707 jobs lost.

Let me talk about Midvale, ID, my hometown. If I am a little sensitive today, I should be. I used to go to that mill and buy lumber. It employed 45 men. The attitude on the floor is: What is the big deal? It is only 45 jobs. But it was 45 jobs and 45 homes in a commu-

nity of 300 people—not 30,000, not 50,000, not 100,000, but a community of 300 people. To lose 45 jobs is to lose a lot. That mill has closed. Why? Because on the Payette National Forest, argumentatively, at least by national forest standards, there were no more trees to cut.

That is why I can responsibly and legitimately turn to the Senator from Nevada today and say: Senator, your bill destroys jobs. Your bill destroys high-paying jobs, \$35,000, \$45,000, \$55,000-a-year jobs for men and women, important jobs in rural communities, in Idaho, Oregon, Washington, California, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alaska.

In talking of mill closures—and I referred to the dramatic numbers—let me also quote the Western Council of Industry Workers, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. It is their people, in many instances, who are losing these jobs. They say:

Legislative efforts to reduce funding for forest management programs seriously jeopardize the livelihoods of our members and tens of thousands of forest products workers nationwide. Job loss within our industry has been severe, as the timber sales program has been reduced by 70 percent since the early 90s.

A 70-percent reduction in the timber program, a reduction in jobs from 140,000 to 55,000, and the Senator from Nevada wants to cut it even deeper. It is pretty hard to understand why, especially when you look at the new environmental standards of today and what the Forest Service is demanding of a timber sale as it relates to the survey and the kind of mitigation plan that comes because of the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act and, of course, the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act and all of those kinds of rules and regulations and processes and procedures that by law are required. I am not sure I understand why.

I do know several years ago the National Sierra Club developed as one of their policies, zero cut on public lands. I know that is what they believe. I know that is what they advocate. I know they are champions of this kind of amendment because if you cannot stop logging altogether, you stop it a little bit at a time until it is all gone, even if the health of the forests are at the point of explosion from wildfires like those being experienced in California today, and even if the Tahoe Basin runs at a high risk, with the risk not just to the trees but the loss of hundreds of multimillion-dollar homes where the wealthy come to play and reside in the urban/rural interface. That is the issue at hand.

I will go on to quote from those men and women who work in the industry. They say:

More than 80,000 men and women have lost their jobs as that timber program has reduced by more than 70 percent since 1990.

We know that is real. The Senator from Oregon knows it is real. The Senator from Idaho knows it is real. I have

attended the mill closures. My guess is, so has the Senator from Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these letters from the Western Council of Industrial Workers and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, opposing reductions in the timber program.

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

WESTERN COUNCIL OF INDUSTRIAL WORKERS, UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,

Portland, OR, July 19, 1999.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the 20,000 men and women of the Western Council of Industrial Workers (WCW), I urge you to oppose any effort to reduce funding for the U.S. Forest Service timber sale and related programs when the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill comes to the Senate floor for consideration.

Legislative efforts to reduce funding for forest management programs seriously jeopardize the livelihoods of our members and tens of thousands of forest products workers nationwide. Job loss within our industry has been severe as the timber sale program has been reduced by almost 70 percent since the early 1990s. More than 80,000 men and women have lost their jobs due to this decline and further cutbacks in these important programs will only add to the unemployment.

Additionally, adequate funding for forest management programs is critical to protect the health of our forests. According to the Forest Service, approximately 40 million acres of our national forests are at high risk of catastrophic forest fire. Active management is the single most effective tool for reducing the risk of wild fires and protecting nearby communities, as well as maintaining forest health and limiting the spread of insects and disease.

The WCW urges you to support land management policy that provides an adequate balance for all concerns—environmental and economic. Please support the current funding levels in the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill and oppose any effort to cut funding for these important active management programs.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MIKE PIETI,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,

Washington, DC, July 21, 1999.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, I urge your support for the federal timber sale program as the Senate debates the Fiscal Year 2000 Interior Appropriations bill. Additionally, I urge you to oppose any harmful amendment that seeks to reduce timber sale funding.

The livelihoods of U.S. forest products workers—including tens of thousands of our lumber, sawmill, pulp and paper workers—rely on Forest Service programs that promote active management. Timber harvests on federal lands have fallen by almost 70 percent over the last decade, resulting in mill closures and job loss. Further reductions in funding for the federal timber sale program will only exacerbate the economic devastation to working families and rural communities. Also reductions in timber supply continue to contribute to the rising U.S. trade

deficit in the forest products sector, as wood and paper imports reach record levels.

In addition, the health and vitality of our nation's forests are being crippled by crisis. Twenty-six million acres are in jeopardy from insect and disease, while forty million acres are at risk to catastrophic wildfire. Our union supports responsible efforts to protect our forests, including thinning and harvesting to maintain forest health, limit the spread of insect infestation and reduce the risk of forest fires.

We must continue our nation's global leadership in environmental stewardship without sacrificing the livelihoods of thousands of working families. The UBCJA urges you to help protect forests, jobs and communities by supporting the current funding levels for the federal timber sale program in the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill and by opposing any effort to reduce funding for this essential program.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS J. MCCARRON,
General President.

Mr. CRAIG. Unemployment in rural timber-dependent communities is in double-digit figures despite rosy employment figures in the rest of America. The Senator from Oregon and I visited similar communities—he in his State, I in my State—over the August recess. I can go from my community of Boise where there is near zero unemployment—it is a growth community, it is a high-tech community, it is doing very well—and I can drive 100 miles to a community that has 14 to 16-percent unemployment. Why? That community is right here. That community is right here. That is because they were dependent upon the public lands and our Government and the politics of the public lands said: Stay off the land. Don't cut a tree. The mills closed or the mill is closing or the mill is at risk. Those people are unemployed.

They cannot identify with a job in the high-tech industry. Why? Each of them would have to move 100 miles and uproot their family and they would have to be retrained and educated. A 45-year-old man does not want to do that. He cannot understand, if we are growing five times more trees than we are cutting, why we cannot at least create a balance in a program that will afford him or his son, who is graduating from high school and does not want to go on to college, a job in the forest products industry.

While the national average unemployment rate hovers at around 4 percent, more than 30 forest-dependent counties have three times that rate. Over a dozen forest-dependent counties have an unemployment rate of 16 percent. I believe the Bryan amendment will bring even further economic harm to the people of those rural areas.

When I first got here in 1981, there was a mantra about the debate on the forest products industry and about forest management: Take away a few jobs and we will replace them. We will replace them with tourism and recreation. It was America wanting to go to the public lands to enjoy the environment of the public lands.

To some extent that has happened but only to a minor degree compared to

what was projected during the decade of the early 1980s. But remember, while some of it happened, the kind of jobs that were created were fundamentally different jobs from those \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000-a-year jobs that I am talking about in the forest products industry. A maid or waitress or a gas station attendant or a tour guide does not make that kind of money. They work at slightly above minimum wage. They have no health benefits. They have no retirement program. Their work is seasonal. They are oftentimes out of work 4 or 5 months out of the year. And, yes, they are on welfare. And, yes, they qualify for food stamps.

I must say these once were the proud men and women of the forest products industry that we politically destroyed. We politically destroyed it. We are here today for politics. We are politically trying to destroy what remains of a responsible way of managing our forests today, not because it is the right thing to do from a management point of view but because it is the right thing to do politically. I know of no other reason. I cannot understand why the Senator from Nevada, who comes from the great public land State that he does, would want to turn his back on one segment of the economy of a public land State such as Idaho or Nevada.

He and I stand arm in arm together on mining issues. I was in Elko, NV, last week in a community that 15 years ago was 5,000 people; today, 25,000 people, not because of the high-tech industry but because of gold, gold in the Carlin Trend; mining, high-priced jobs being paid to thousands of men and women in the mining industry. So when we battle on that issue, the Senator from Nevada and I stand arm in arm. But when we try to work on a reasonable and responsible forest management plan that allows some tree cutting, I am tremendously frustrated the Senator from Nevada and I cannot stand arm in arm on that issue also.

It is an issue of jobs. It is an issue of right and responsible ways of managing our forests. It is political. I am saddened that it is.

The substitute amendment transfers \$10 million of the reduction that I have talked about, \$34 million in timber funds to pay for surveys on rare species. I do not think that is responsive to the problem of the unreasonable wildlife survey requirements in the President's Northwest Forest Plan, which we discussed in this body last week.

First of all, the Forest Service timber sale budget is what pays for the surveys. Thus, rather than a \$10 million increase for this purpose, the net effect of this proposal is a \$24 million decrease. So we give them not even a half a loaf. We give them a quarter of a loaf.

Second, the Clinton administration has agreed that many of these surveys should not be done; indeed, many cannot be done. That is precisely why the administration is writing an EIS in an

attempt to change these requirements. Unfortunately, timber sales are enjoined until the EIS is completed.

I happen to agree with the editorial statement this past Sunday in the Portland Oregonian, the largest and most respected newspaper in Oregon. The Oregonian correctly notes that:

The surveys of rare species of animals and plants required in the Northwest Forest Plan are "technically impossible" and [they use the right word] "preposterous. . . ."

The Senate didn't use the word "preposterous," but last week the Senate said no to the judges; they are not going to let the judges in the Eleventh Circuit and the Ninth Circuit write policy. That is our job. That is what we are elected to do. They are appointed to interpret the Constitution and not to write timber policy. The Oregonian calls it "preposterous." The Oregonian further describes the requirements as:

. . . a poison pill—a way to block all logging and prevent the plan from working as it was designed.

Yet we want to put more money into that. It makes no sense to spend \$10 million for a prescription for a poison pill or for preposterous survey procedures. This Congress should not spend 10 cents in what I believe is a most inappropriate fashion.

That is the foundation of the debate as I see it. I believe that is a reasonable interpretation of why we are on the floor today. I know of no other. At a time when we have reduced the overall timber program in this country by 7 percent, we have reduced employment by almost 50 percent, and we have dramatically transformed the rural landscape to communities of unemployed people and empty homes. That is the policy of this Government at this time. And somehow we want to perpetuate that or increase it? I think not.

The only explanation possible that I believe is reasonable and right is the politics of it. We are on the floor today because the National Sierra Club and others said we ought not be cutting trees on public lands at all, zero, end of statement, not to improve health, not for fire prevention, not to create vibrant and youthful stands just do not cut them at all; let Mother Nature be our manager.

That is not good business. We know that is not good business, especially when man, for the last 40 or 50 years, has put out all the fires and not allowed Mother Nature to manage. Now when she has an opportunity to manage where there are 50 trees instead of 5—that would have been true 100 years ago—we create monstrous wildfires that not only destroy the stands but scald the land and make it sterile and nonproductive for decades to come. That is where man has to step back in as a good steward, a right and responsible steward, for all of the environmental reasons, the water quality reasons, and the wildlife habitat reasons for which we manage a forest.

I yield such time as is required to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Idaho for clearly laying out the issues in this debate, and I associate my remarks with his.

I rise to strongly speak against the Bryan-Wyden amendment for a variety of reasons but, most importantly, because it simply does not support healthy and sustainable national forests. Many Senators, I suspect, will speak today claiming this reduction to the Timber Management Program makes sound fiscal and environmental sense.

From my perspective as an Arkansan, as a Senator from Arkansas, I can tell you that is far from the truth and that there are 35,440 workers in my home State who make up the forest products industry who strongly oppose this amendment. If our forests are not healthy and if we continue to ignore the problems facing these public lands, we run the risk of jeopardizing these jobs and the future health and sustainability of our Nation's forests.

During the August recess, I met with the Forest Service on the Ouachita National Forest in Arkansas. Sometimes our distinguished Senators from the West forget that there are national forests all across the South, and in the State of Arkansas, I say to my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, we have two large national forests, the Ouachita National Forest and the Ozark National Forest.

In a meeting with the National Forest Service on the Ouachita National Forest last month, I discovered, because of decreasing budgets in the timber sales account, they are doing only one-third of the vegetation management required by the forest plan. So forgive me if I find it ironic that this second-degree amendment, the substitute amendment, would shift \$10 million from the Timber Management Program to the surveys in the Northwest when, in the State of Arkansas, in our national forests, they are only doing one-third of the vegetation management required by the forest plan.

Because of the severe erosion of funding that the Senator from Idaho has alluded to, the forest is unable to achieve the desired future conditions required for a healthy and sustainable ecosystem. Extremists, litigation, appeals, or lack of public support did not bring about this crisis. It is the result of a misguided effort by the administration to reduce timber harvests without taking into consideration the real impacts on the conditions of the forests and the communities associated with these national forests.

The Timber Management Program is funded at a level equal to the fiscal year 1999 funding level. There was level funding before this amendment. Before these additional cuts, there was level funding, no increase, and yet the demands on the program have increased dramatically.

The program objective for the timber sales program is "a sustainable yield of forest products that contributes to meeting the Nation's demands and restoring, improving, or maintaining the forest ecosystem health." Yet the amendment before us reduces the funding level when more than 40 million acres of our national forests are at high risk of catastrophic fire due to an accumulation of dead and dying trees and an additional 26 million acres are at risk of insect and disease infestation.

We have a crisis now; we risk a catastrophe. We have level funding in the appropriations bill before us, and the amendment suggests we should cut even further in a program that has not the resources to do the job it has been charged with doing as it stands.

The addition of Senator WYDEN as a cosponsor of the amendment, the second-degree amendment, only exacerbates the problem that the underlying amendment creates in shifting an additional \$10 million out of timber management and moving it to the Northwest. This impacts every national forest, every timber management program in the Nation. It dilutes what can be done in those areas where they are already suffering, where they are already short to move additional resources because of the situation faced in the Northwest. I think that is wrong. It is not economically or environmentally advisable.

The debate today will speak about doing right by the environment. How can you justify reducing a level-funded program that is dealing with millions of acres of land that are too crowded for new and healthy trees to grow?

We will also hear talk today about how the Timber Management Program is antienvironmental or environmentally destructive. That is not what I have seen in the management that is being done in the Ouachita, the Ozark, St. Francis National Forests in Arkansas. Our national forests are adding 23 billion board feet each year. While 3 billion board feet are being harvested each year, 6 billion board feet die each year from insects, disease, fire, and other causes, and the amendment before us will only make that situation worse.

The majority of the timber sales in the program are done for other ecosystem objectives—improving habitat for wildlife, reducing fuels that may increase fire risk, especially in the urban interface areas, combating insect and disease infestations, and improving true growth for future timber.

We cannot ignore the contributions that the Timber Management Program makes each year, even if it might sound politically advantageous. The byproduct of a healthy, sustainable timber program is equally as important as healthy rural communities. The timber sales program generates regional income of \$2 billion—over \$2 billion; in fact, \$2.3 billion—in Federal income tax receipts. Seventy percent of

the timber from national forests is sold to small businesses that could be forced to close their doors if we support further reductions to the program.

A \$1 million reduction in the timber sales program on the Ouachita, Ozark, or St. Francis National Forests simply means 10,000 acres of forest designated for treatment by the forest plan will go untreated. That is what it will mean: a \$1 million reduction, 10,000 acres that will go unmanaged, untreated. Perhaps that is the goal. Perhaps that is the backdoor objective of such an amendment. The byproducts—round wood and saw logs—will be unavailable. Communities will lose 500 years of work and over \$15 million from the local economy.

By any reasonable standard, the U.S. forest practices are the best in the world, ensuring forests are regenerated and that water quality and wildlife habitat are protected or enhanced. Decreasing this program is wrongheaded. It will only set us back environmentally. It will surely negatively impact us economically.

I suggest we do the right thing and support no less than level funding for this important program and oppose the Bryan-Wyden amendment.

I thank the chairman. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I yield the chairman of the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Senator MURKOWSKI, such time as he may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, let's start with some facts because what is appropriate is to recognize just what the current policy of the administration is towards the U.S. forests managed by the Forest Service.

Clearly, as we look at where we are today, as this chart shows in the dark purple, the U.S. Forest Service volume sold, vis-a-vis the annual mortality—the annual mortality are those trees that are dead or dying—that in the years 1990, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, the annual mortality, compared with the volume sold—and that is evident by the green spheres that come up through the chart—the mortality has exceeded the commercial volume sold.

The suggestion is, what has happened to forest health?

You have to manage for forest health based on professionals, professionals who are trained and have committed their lives to best forest management practices.

What we have in the debate that is occurring on this floor is a debate over emotions, the emotions over whether timber, trees, a renewable resource, should be harvested or not.

We have heard the Senator from Idaho expound a little bit on the attitude prevailing in the U.S. environmental groups, and particularly the Si-

erra Club, which, much to their credit, has come out wholeheartedly and said: We want to terminate harvesting in the national forests, all of the national forests.

They make no bones about it. That is just a fact.

The justification for Senator BRYAN's amendment, which would timber program in the committee bill by \$34 million, leads to the environmental agenda, the agenda of the Sierra Club that wants to terminate harvesting in national forests.

The amendment isn't what it appears to be. While I am sympathetic to my friend from Oregon and his efforts to redirect \$10 million to wildlife surveys in the Northwest, I again think we ought to go back and recognize where the objection is. The objection comes from national environmental groups who are opposed to logging in the national forests. The policies of the Clinton administration relative to logging in the national forests are evident, but the justification to support that is very lacking if we look at the facts.

The facts are that there is currently almost 250 billion cubic feet—more than 1 trillion board feet—of volume of standing timber in the national forests. That is a significant amount—250 billion cubic feet of volume. The annual growth—that is the growth that occurs every year—is about 23 billion board feet.

Do you know what we are cutting, Madam President? We are cutting somewhere between 2.5 and 3 billion board feet. What is the justification in the sense of forest management practices and the forest health when clearly the forests are not in danger of being overcut? The regrowth at 23 billion board feet each year, compared with the cut of 2.5 to 3 billion board feet, clearly shows we are growing timber faster, much faster than we are cutting it—in fact, about 7 to 8 times faster than we are cutting it. As evidenced by this chart, the mortality now is exceeding what we are cutting in commercial timber.

Good forest management practices would indicate something be done about the dead and dying trees that are infested with the spruce bark beetle and so forth, and that a program be initiated so healthy trees grow back in again. But, again, these decisions are not being made by those responsible for forest health, professional forest managers. They are being made by environmental groups, and they are being made on the basis of emotional arguments.

You should recognize the reality that timber is a renewable resource that can be properly managed, as evidenced by the existing volume that we have in this country, 250 billion cubic feet in the national forests—and I will repeat it again—with 23 billion board feet annual growth, and the realization we are only cutting 3 billion board feet a year.

We certainly need some changes. The changes need to move off the emo-

tional arguments and get into what is good for the forests, what is good for the health of the forests. You clear out the diseased trees. You encourage programs that eliminate fire hazards.

I have worked with Senator BRYAN and his colleague from Nevada on mining legislation which is important to his State and important to Western States, important to my State of Alaska. I am disappointed that he has seen fit to again take this issue on to reduce by \$34 million the Committee's recommended timber program. I recognize that is not a big issue in his State. But I think it basically addresses a policy within this administration that has prevailed for some time, and that is to oppose resource development on public lands, whether it be grazing, whether it be oil and gas leasing, whether it be mining, and certainly in the case of timber.

I would like to communicate a little experience that we had in Alaska relative to studies and the resource management associated with the wildlife of the forest and to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that these challenges on the adequacy of wildlife studies seem endless. You no sooner get a professional opinion on the adequacy or inadequacy of a certain species within the forest, and if it is unfavorable to those who want to terminate logging in the forest, they simply go to a judge, get an injunction, and suggest that the study was inadequate and lacked the thoroughness that it needed.

Let me tell you a little story about what happened in Alaska.

We had the U.S. Forest Service involved in what they called the TLMP, the Tongass Land Management Plan. They spent 10 years to develop a plan. They spent \$13 million. Previously, we had been cutting about 420 million board feet a year. The TLMP came down, after this 10-year study and \$13 million, and cut it, the allowable cut, to 267 million board feet.

What happened as a consequence of that? We lost our only two year-round manufacturing plants in our State. The Sitka and Ketchikan pulpmills, the combined workforce, plus those in the woods, amounted to some 3,400 jobs, most of which were lost.

What was the forest health issue regarding this reduction? All the timber in the Tongass, as most Members who have been up there know, is old growth timber. But what they do not realize is that 30 percent of that timber is dead or dying. It has no other use than wood fiber. So it is put in the pulp mills.

Without the pulp mills, we have no utilization of that timber. Much of those logs are now ground up in chips or exported to Japan or out to pulp mills in the Pacific Northwest.

Let me go back to the Tongass Land Management Plan where they cut the sales level from 420 million board feet to 267 million board feet. Within 9 months, the administration, after spending 10 years and \$13 million, decided that volume of 267 million board

feet was too high. So they cut it arbitrarily, without any public hearing, as a consequence of pressure from national environmental groups who used an emotional argument, and also the reality that maybe the easiest place to terminate harvesting in national forests is in Alaska. We have two Senators and one Congressman. Alaska is a long way away. Nobody can go up and look at it and recognize that we have cut less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the Tongass forest in Alaska over the last 40 years and that our regrowth is 10 times what we have cut. They want to terminate harvesting, and the Tongass national forest in Alaska is a good place to start. So they came back and cut the proposed allowable sales level from 267 to 178 million—no public hearings, no input, no further studies. They spent, again, 10 years and \$13 million for the first study, and they weren't satisfied with it.

So I say to my friend from Oregon, don't be misled by the question of the adequacy of wildlife studies in the Pacific Northwest. On the goshawk, we in Alaska are now under a challenge, on an issue we thought we had behind us because several years ago we had a challenge on a threatened and endangered species, the goshawk. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service spent several years working with the Forest Service to do an evaluation, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service came to the conclusion that the goshawk was not threatened by the timber harvest program in the Tongass. We thought we had that issue behind us. We didn't.

Environmental groups—from the Southwest, I might add—petitioned the judge on the adequacy of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service evaluation of the goshawk study and the judge said, go back and do it again. If you can't depend on the best experts to come to a conclusion, then this is simply an open-ended effort by either bureaucrats, or environmental groups, or both to terminate harvesting in the national forests. That is what has happened as a consequence of the attitude of this administration towards timber harvesting.

Again, we have 250 billion cubic feet of volume standing in the national forests of the United States. The annual growth is 23 billion board feet. We are harvesting between 2.5 and 3 billion board feet. We are regrowing seven to eight times our annual harvest. Yet we have those who would say the forest program is being subsidized. There is no realization of what timber sales and related roads offer in providing access for timber, availability to the public, jobs, payrolls and communities. The proposal by Senator BRYAN would reduce the program about 13 percent below the current 1999 program level.

I am pleased the Society of American Foresters opposes the amendment. I believe that letter has been introduced in the RECORD. If not, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS,
Bethesda, MD, July 26, 1999.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has come to our attention that Senator Bryan may offer an amendment or amendments to the Interior Appropriations bill designed to significantly reduce the amount of funding available for the Forest Service Timber Sale program or its Roads program. We believe this would be a mistake.

While we are sure that Senator Bryan is well intentioned in his efforts, he may not understand the significant contributions the timber sale program makes to improving our national forests. The Fiscal Year 1998 Report of the Forest Service states "today, national forest timber sales are designed to incorporate multiple objectives, including insect and disease prevention and control, wildlife habitat management, fuels treatment, and reconstruction or construction of roads needed for long-term access." Foresters in the private and public sector design timber sales for purposes in addition to producing timber.

There are many examples of timber harvests that benefit other resources. For example, the July 1999, edition of the *Journal of Forestry* has an article called "Designing Spotted Owl Habitat in a Managed Forest." The article describes how to harvest trees and manipulate the forest for the benefit of spotted owls. Natural resource management professionals can produce forest products and healthy forests; they just need tools like the Forest Service's Timber Sale program to accomplish their goals. We can harvest trees from the forest and still leave behind quality conditions for wildlife.

We are also very concerned about a possible reduction in funding for the Roads program. The Forest Service estimates that they have a \$10 billion backlog in road maintenance. Now is not the time to reduce funding for these important forest assets that can turn into environmental nightmares without proper design and maintenance.

Thank you for your consideration and your support of professional forestry.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. BANZHAF,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I urge the Congress to support the significant contribution that the timber program, even though it is in decline, has been making to improve the national forests.

Again, recognize that the program is smaller than a few years ago. The BRYAN amendment would continue this harmful slide, because the ultimate objective is to terminate harvesting in the national forests. The redirecting of timber funds to wildlife activities in support of timber still has the same negative effect. That negative effect has been highlighted by my friend from Idaho, as he discussed the effects of a reduction in the timber program.

What we are talking about on this chart is that there is more timber dying than is being cut. That is the harsh reality of where we are. What kind of forest management practice is that? It is a preservationist practice.

What is the role of the Forest Service? Habitat management? Stewards of the forest? They are not aggressive in

thinning programs, which are needed for the growth of new trees. What the Forest Service has become is a custodial management agency. They don't know where they are going. They are torn between past leaders that used to make decisions on the basis of what is best for forest health, and the new generation that is directed to a large degree by national environmental groups that want to terminate harvesting in the national forests.

It is OK if you are from a State that has large private holdings. Washington State has a number of large private land companies. It is OK if you have large State-owned forests. But if you are in my State of Alaska, where the Federal Government, the U.S. Forest Service—the entire Tongass National Forest is owned and managed by the Federal Government—you have a different set of circumstances. Our communities are in the forest. Our State capital, Juneau, towns like Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Haines, Skagway, Sitka, all are in the forest. People live in the forest. They were under the assumption they would be able to work with the Federal Government, when we became a State in 1959, to maintain, on a renewable basis, an industry base. They recognize that in our case our forest, as an old-growth forest, is in the process of dying. Thirty percent of that timber is dying.

I had an opportunity to fly over some of the Northeastern States over the recess, Maine and other areas. I noted that they have a healthy timber industry, managed, if you will, to a large degree through the private holdings of landowners and corporations and the State. They have jobs. They have pulp mills. They have a renewability. Yet we are strangled by policies that are dictated by environmental groups, that are dictated by Members from States who have no interest in the national forest from the standpoint of those of us who are dependent on it in the West and particularly in my State in Alaska.

Finally, I ask that my colleagues reflect that this amendment would really reduce the tools the Forest Service has available for stewardship activities, tools that improve forest health and improve wildlife habitat and improve other forest ecosystems as well. Don't be misled by the objective of those who have a different agenda with regard to the national forests. Let us recognize that forests live and die. With proper management, they can yield a bounty of prosperity, a bounty of renewability. But we have to have the recognition that those decisions with regard to the forest are not going to be made by the politicians in this body. They are going to be made by those professionals who are prepared to put their reputation behind their recommendations or, for that matter, the other way around, and do what is best for the forest. The Bryan amendment certainly does not do this, by cutting funding for timber sales and roads, and hence, decreasing the timber program.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. Madam President, during the course of the debate, the Senator from Idaho propounded to the Senator from Nevada a query as to how I could be supportive of this amendment and then made reference to the fact of Lake Tahoe, with all the problems we have in Tahoe. My own previous statements on Tahoe indicated the extent of the devastation that has been caused with dying trees and timber.

To suggest that somehow increasing the commercial harvesting of timber would in any way ameliorate the problems we face at Tahoe would be a totally spurious argument. The problems at Tahoe are compounded because we had a 7-year drought, the most protracted in recorded memory, and as a result, the forest became very vulnerable to infestation from beetles that ultimately killed vast amounts of trees in the Tahoe Basin. So adding to the commercial harvest would in no way help.

Secondly, with respect to Tahoe, we are reaping a whirlwind of practices that involve the extensive cutting of road network to the Tahoe Basin. The clarity of the lake is declining rapidly. This is a lake that Mark Twain rhapsodized about. John C. Fremont, on Valentine's Day in 1844, was the first European to see Lake Tahoe, and perhaps that date has some significance because those of us who live in Nevada have had a love affair with Lake Tahoe ever since.

The problem in Tahoe is exacerbated because of this road network that was built throughout the basin during a period of intense harvesting in the last century. The timber at Tahoe was used for the great mining activities of Virginia City. But it is instructive and helpful because the primary contributing factor to the erosion that is causing the deterioration of waters and clarity is the runoff from these old roads, and road maintenance is what we need so desperately.

So I say that my friend from Idaho confuses the issue when he talks about the problems at Tahoe and the thrust of the Bryan-Wyden amendment, which is simply to take about \$32 million from the commercial timber operations and reprogram those into some accounts that include road maintenance and fish and wildlife management.

Let me make the point about road maintenance, if I may, again. The Bryan-Wyden amendment does not eliminate commercial timber sales in the national forests. My friend from Alaska referenced that we should allow professionals to make the determination as to how much harvesting should occur. That recommendation is included by the managers of the Forest Service, and they recommended a number of \$196 million. That was in the President's recommendation.

Now, what the appropriators did was, they stripped out \$34 million from road maintenance and fish and wildlife accounts and added that back into the

timber sales to bring that number up to about \$228 million. My friend from Arkansas was talking about the need for forest health and to do a lot of things. Those are totally different accounts. We are talking, on the one hand, of reducing to the level of the President's recommended appropriation the commercial timber sale account of \$196 million and to add \$32 million to that account. What the appropriators did was to reduce by \$11 million the road maintenance account.

It is the road maintenance account that helps to alleviate the erosion and the other adverse environmental consequences that attach to the neglect of that maintenance. The testimony is that the Forest Service would need \$431 million a year for road maintenance alone, that there is a total backlog of \$3.85 billion in road maintenance. By rejecting the Bryan-Wyden amendment, you make that backlog even longer because the appropriators have stripped \$11 million from that account.

Now, every mile of new construction adds to that backlog because under the law, once the harvesting operation has been completed, the timber harvester has no responsibility for the maintenance of that road. That, then, is left to the Forest Service and the American taxpayer. We already have 380,000 miles in the National forests. As I commented in my opening statement, that is more mileage than we have on the interstate system in America.

The things my friend from Idaho was talking about, in terms of fire burns and removing dead timber, have nothing to do—absolutely nothing—with the commercial timber sale account. Those activities are included in other accounts, such as the Wild Land Fire Management Act. So I think we have a confusion here as we debate these issues.

The Bryan-Wyden amendment would simply reduce to the level of the professional managers' recommendation in the Forest Service the commercial timber sale account of \$196 million and would restore, essentially, to the environmental accounts and road maintenance accounts much of that money that was taken out. That is where the management practices need to be addressed. That is the focus. That is where the environmental problems are—road maintenance and fish and wildlife habitat.

In effect, what the appropriators did is to strip those accounts and reduce them substantially to add to the timber sale account. There is no benefit to the environment at Lake Tahoe by increasing the commercial timber sale accounts. That simply does absolutely nothing for us at all. So I wanted to clarify the RECORD where my friend from Idaho has confused it. The Senator from Nevada is being absolutely consistent.

I might just say, in terms of the broad public policy, the General Accounting Office concluded that, from 1992 to 1997, the commercial sales in

the national forests have cost the American taxpayer \$1.5 billion. So there is another issue out here to be debated in terms of the public policy. The Bryan-Wyden amendment does not eliminate but simply reduces to the level of the Presidential recommendation in terms of the appropriation.

If the Senator from Idaho were interested in seeing the problems more adequately addressed, he would favor reducing the amount of the commercial sales and restoring the \$11 million that was stripped from that account. We need far more dollars in the road maintenance account, in which the backlog is over \$3 billion.

So every attempt to reduce the amount of the road maintenance account and add money to the new construction account makes the situation much worse. I argue that the more prudent and rational public policy is to deal with neglected road maintenance and provide additional money in that account rather than to add to the commercial sale account. I wanted to make that point for the record.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, this has been an important debate—important for the Northwest and important as it relates to the direction of the Forest Service.

I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would be surprised to know that I agree with a number of the things they have said about the Forest Service not knowing where they are headed. Frankly, I have made much stronger statements than that in the last few days. It is very clear in the Pacific Northwest that the Forest Service is just flailing around.

The chairman of our subcommittee and I both read these Oregonian editorials talking about blame with respect to gridlock in the forests. In the Northwest, the Oregonian, our newspaper, editorialized that:

Forest biologists searching for signs of the rare mosses listed above ought to look under the backsides of the federal officials managing the forest plan. That seems a relatively undisturbed habitat.

I think it is fair to say that those Forest Service officials knew for years they had to go forward with survey and management in a responsible fashion and haven't done so. So I think the comments that have been made by the chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee, Senator CRAIG, and the chairman of the full committee, with respect to the Forest Service not knowing where it is going, are ones that I largely share.

But where we have a difference of opinion and where I think the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden and the substitute help to bring together colleagues on both sides of the aisle is that the history of the last few years demonstrates very clearly that just spending more money on the timber sale program

doesn't help these rural communities either from an economic standpoint or from an environmental standpoint.

The fact of the matter is, Madam President and colleagues, for the last several years this Congress has authorized a greater expenditure for the timber sale program than the President of the United States has called for.

This Congress has appropriated more funds for the timber sale program, and the fact is the problems in many of these rural communities in the West, from an economic and environmental standpoint, are getting worse.

So I think the notion that throwing more money at the timber sales program is going to address the needs of these rural communities is not borne out by the events of the last few years.

What needs to be done—and what Senator BRYAN and Senator FITZGERALD and I are trying to do—is to put in place a program with real accountability.

My colleague from Idaho talked about the need for accountability of the Forest Service. The chairman of the full Senate Energy Committee has correctly said more emphasis needs to be placed on oversight. The fact of the matter is that under the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment, for the first time the Congress will put in place a program in the survey and management area which has essentially shut down the forests and that will have real accountability. Under our amendment, the survey and management draft environmental impact statement will have to be completed by November 15 of this year, and the final version of that impact statement would have to be published by February 14 of 2000.

That is allowing for public comment. That is accountability. That is giving some direction to the Forest Service on the key issue that has in effect shut down the forests in our part of the country.

So the choice is, do we do business as we have done in the past, which is to throw money, for example, at a particular program, the timber sale program, or do we try, as the Bryan-Fitzgerald-Wyden amendment does, to tie that amendment to dealing with the key concerns that have shut down our forests and put in place real accountability in the process?

Beyond that, I think the only other major difference I have, as some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, is that they have correctly said they don't want the courts to make forest policy. Section 329, as it stands in this bill, is a lawyer employment program. This is going to be a huge bonanza for lawyers as it stands in its present form.

That is why I am hopeful that colleagues, regardless of how they feel about section 329 in its original form, regardless of how they voted on the Robb legislation earlier, will see that the approach that Senator BRYAN and Senator FITZGERALD and I are talking about tries to borrow from the philos-

ophy of both of the approaches that have been debated on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I happen to agree with Senator GORTON and Senator CRAIG that the survey and management program has not worked. The Forest Service has dawdled. They have known what they were supposed to do for some time.

We can read editorials to each other for many hours to compete for who is the toughest on the Forest Service. But the fact is they haven't known where they are going, and we are going to try to get them on track. But this amendment is the very first effort in the Senate to put them on track in a way that locks in the additional money they need with a specific timetable and a blueprint for ensuring accountability.

I think for that reason it is absolutely essential that we pass it. I think it will give us an opportunity to go forward in the days ahead, which is what we are going to try to do in the oversight hearing that Chairman CRAIG is holding on Thursday.

I am very hopeful that those Members of this body who understand how wrong it is for the courts to make forestry policy and how important it is to have a balanced approach that will tie additional funding with accountability—and a recognition that there is more to this than appropriating additional funds for the timber sale program—will support our bipartisan amendment.

I gather we will not have a final vote on this amendment until tomorrow, and perhaps we will hear from some additional colleagues. But I am very hopeful, regardless of how a Member of this body voted on those Robb amendments or felt about the original section 329, the Gorton language, that they will see what Senator BRYAN and Senator FITZGERALD and I are trying to do, which is pull together an approach that will give the Forest Service some direction, give them some accountability, and do it in a responsible fashion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Oregon. We have worked closely together for the last number of months to try to resolve a variety of timber issues and conflicts that have brought some of our rural communities to their knees.

Those are communities that not only in many instances have lost jobs in the sawmills that I have talked about in my opening comments, but these are communities that also lost their monies to run their schools.

My colleague from Oregon has communities that only go to school 4 days out of 5 days of a week because they have no more money to run their buses and to keep their schools open. I have communities in my State that are now debating over whether to put their money in the hot lunch program or

athletics and ask all of their high school and grade school students to brown bag all the time.

You say: What does this have to do with this debate? What does this have to do with cutting trees in the national forests? It has a great deal to do with these communities that are timber dependent because 25 percent of the stumpage fee that comes from a Federal timber sale goes to the local communities for their schools, their county roads, and their bridges.

That is historically what we believe is a fair treatment of those communities that oftentimes house the loggers and the mill employees and the executives of the timber companies and the Forest Service but have no private land base because all of the land around them is public land, and they should share in the revenue flowing from that public land. Those are what we call timber-dependent communities.

The Senator and I worked to try to resolve that issue. We are very close to what I think is some tremendously positive and creative thinking that results from, hopefully, minds coming together out of conflict to bring resolution. I am fearful this amendment does not do that. I say that because while the Senator suggests that he prescribes deadlines by which EISs ought to be done, this administration and this Forest Service isn't talking anywhere near that. They are suggesting the deadline for a draft EIS ought to be in February and that the final ought to be in June for the EISs we are talking about for these sales. Whether you could expedite that, I am not sure.

The one thing we want to be very careful about in light of the environment in which we are doing these kinds of EIS's and studies is that the work be done right. As the Senator from Oregon and I know, the judges and the environmental communities will be like vultures hovering over each one of those efforts to fine pick every bone to make sure the work is done well.

Accelerating some of those studies could put at risk—I am not saying "will," but I think we need to be very cautious at this moment as we try to wrestle through this very difficult policy issue between whether the Eleventh Circuit is right or whether this Congress will finally get aggressive enough to lead in changing the law in a way that we will not have our judges administering forest policy through their own whim, be it law, or, in many instances, be it their politics as applied to the law that causes Eleventh Circuit or Ninth Circuit judges to do what they have done recently that the Senator from Oregon is so worried about, and that I, not only as the Senator from Idaho but as chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, literally go into the tank because the Congress of the United States has been unwilling to lead in this area and establish well-based policy that we can effectively defend and are willing to defend. That is part of

the problem we are dealing with, and I hope the work of the Senator from Oregon and me results in that.

Let me make a final comment to the Senator from Nevada. It was not my intent to make an inaccurate statement. As chairman of the Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee, I have spent the last several years and 45 hearings looking at every aspect of the forest management of our country to try to understand it. I have examined, not in person and not on the ground, but all the studies of the Tahoe Basin problem. I recognize the basin problem is a combination of things, particular to forest density, that has resulted in dead and dying timber and drought environments of the kind discussed. This has created the negative habitat today that changes the character of the lake's water quality because of the runoff. I also understand that this creates phenomenal bug problems with dead and dying trees because the ground cannot support the base.

As the Senator from Nevada and I know in looking at computer models, before European man came to this continent, many of the acreages we are talking about were sparsely timbered and were much more pastoral. That was partly because of fire moving through the habitat, creating a mosaic of young and old alike. The Tahoe Basin changed when we became the stewards of the land and put out the fires.

The Senator from Nevada and I both agree on the condition of the Tahoe Basin. The point I am trying to make: What the Senator is doing is, in fact, taking money away from the ability of the Tahoe Basin to manage itself because the Tahoe Basin money is not a single-line item issue.

Let me explain. The Senator is amending an account that is divided into three categories. I am looking now at Forest Service management program reports. In the timber revenues and expenses, there are three categories. There is the timber commodity program component, there is the forest stewardship program component, and the personal-use program component. Those are the three that make up the account the Senator has amended.

The last report we have is 1997. In that year, in the first account, the timber commodity program account, the Senator is absolutely right, the Tahoe Basin had not one dollar of revenue or expenses because it is not a timber-producing area. In the stewardship area in revenues produced by actions, about \$377,000 and \$1,383,000 spent on stewardship programs—the very kind the Senator wants to see that begins to change the culture, the environment, of the basin area. There was approximately \$39 million in revenues from the personal-use program and about \$181 million in expenses.

I believe I am right. It was not my intent to mislead or to distort the

Record. The Senator and I should clarify this. This is the document from the Forest Service. The account the Senator amends and takes \$34 million from is the account from which the stewardship programs from the Tahoe Basin are funded. There is not a line item specific to the Tahoe Basin that I know or that we can find in any research. If the Senator would clarify that—I think by accident he may well be cutting out the very moneys he has fought so hard to get to begin to ensure the forest health or the improved health of that basin area.

In our stewardship analysis of the basins that are in trouble around the Intermountain West, and primarily the Great Basin environment of the West—because that is where fire is a critical tool—let me read again from the article “One spark from a disaster.”

On adjacent lands just above the national forests the trees remain vigorous and healthy with a similar history of early forest clearing followed by fire suppression. These stands have escaped the bug infestation and the high mortality of the lower basin area [which is Federal land]. These privately owned timber lands were intensively managed to ensure vigor and high productivity. Unlike the Federal forest lands, private timberland managers responded to the bottom line and protected their forest assets over time.

My point is, what the Senator has appropriately advocated in getting into the basin, to change the way it is managed, to bring stewardship programs to do the thinning and to do the selective burn, absolutely has to be done to restore the vigor, to create an ecosystem that is less dependent on moisture, so it can handle itself through the kinds of droughts that we in the West experience—especially those in Great Basin States.

If the Senator could clarify that for me, I would appreciate that. It is my knowledge at this moment that the account his amendment pulls money from is the very account from which the stewardship program for the Tahoe Basin finds its funding.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. Madam President, I thank the floor manager for an opportunity to respond.

When one looks at the totality of problems, they are tall: Runoff, the erosion control, and the declining clarity. These are the primary, but not the exclusive, problems in the basin.

The roads that were cut through many decades ago are in the road maintenance account. As the Senator understands, there is a new construction account; there is a road maintenance account. The appropriators removed \$11.3 million from the road maintenance account. From our perspective, that is the most serious account reduction that would impact what we are talking about. The road maintenance money account has a backlog: \$3.85 billion has been discussed by the Forest Service, or \$431 million. I think it is a matter of priorities. Our priority is to get back the road maintenance account money.

Indeed, with respect to some of the prescribed burn and other forest practices the Senator talks about, I think we are in agreement that clearly there are things that need to be done to thin out some of the underbrush. Those are taken care of in other accounts such as wildlife fire management and a forest land vegetation program.

There are a host of programs that are line item. The two I just mentioned, the wildlife fire management account and the forest land vegetation management program, are where some of the controlled burns and thinning occur. Those are the programs, from our point of view, that have a priority over the Senator's priority which would lead to an increased commercial operation.

That is where the Senator from Nevada comes from.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Senator for responding.

It is important to understand that one third of that fund still goes to stewardship. That is not just commercial activity. That is thinning and cleaning.

Also, it is important for the Senate and the Record to show we increase road maintenance by \$10 million this year over last year. There was a recommendation of \$20 million; we increased it by \$10 million. There has been an actual net increase of \$11 million, and a fair amount goes to the Tahoe Basin.

So the Forest Service is responding. We believe the committee and the appropriators were responsible, going in the right direction. What I think is important to say is that there were no cuts. We did not cut the program. We raised the program by \$10 million. While some suggested it ought to go \$20 million, it is a net increase over last year's funding level of \$10 million.

Mr. BRYAN. If I can respond briefly—I don't want to get into a semantic game—it is a reduction over what the President recommended, I think the Senator will agree. It is a reduction of \$11.3 million over what the President proposed. It may very well be, as the Senator indicates, an increase over what was approved for the last program.

Mr. CRAIG. The Senator knows recommendations are recommendations. I believe his first words were the program has been cut. The program has been increased by \$10 million over last year while some, including the President, suggested it ought to be increased by more.

Mr. BRYAN. I think I did use the term “cut.” What I meant to say, and what I stand by, is the appropriators, in effect, cut this money from the original appropriation of the President. That represents a difference in priorities, the \$431 million annual backlog, with a total backlog of \$3.85 billion. It would be the priority of the Senator from Nevada that the President's recommendation not be reduced as the appropriators did, and I appreciate the chance to clarify that point.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I believe, if I understand Forest Service accounts accurately, the likelihood of increased stewardship activities in the Tahoe Basin by this amendment could be reduced because of the very character of spreading the money, as I think the Senator from Arkansas so clearly spoke to.

Let me yield such time to the Senator from Montana as he should consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, this morning as I returned from Montana and I was listening to the local news, I heard a 30-second spot advising folks to call the White House to stand up, to stop this disappearance of the national forest lands. It was paid for by the Heritage Forest—some group. We have not been able to run it down yet. The message went on to say we have to stop this because our forests will be gone forever.

We can talk about semantics. We can talk about budgets. We can talk about where we apply the money. Let's face it; the \$11 million for road maintenance that we increased is mostly being used for road obliteration.

It seems we fight these little fights every year because there are those who completely do not, and I say this in all disrespect, know one whit about what is a renewable resource and how we are to manage it. It seems to me this is the reason a person on his ranch or farm does not run that ranch or farm by a committee. If we did, we would not get a crop in; we would not grow anything, and we sure would not get a crop harvested. I would say the good Lord above does have a sense of humor. If you want to look at what a committee does, I always thought a horse was a camel put together by a committee. Everything is an afterthought.

Let's dispel some of this myth that seems to be going across our land. In the Flathead National Forest alone, we are growing 120 million board feet of lumber a year. The Forest Service, in their plans, only planned to harvest 19 million. Let me tell you, due to laws and roadblocks and lawsuits, we will be lucky to cut 6 million board feet. This does not include our wilderness areas or recreational areas. These are in managed forest areas. This is about a third of what historically has been responsibly forested and harvested. However, due to litigation and other roadblocks, only 6 million will be harvested.

We cannot survive with that scenario and neither can the forest. Understand that. Neither can the forest. It will burn. Trees are similar to any other renewable crop: they sprout, they grow, they get old, and like every one of us in this building, they will die. What happens to them? They hit the forest floor, there is a fuel buildup, there is infestation by the pine beetle, there is dry weather, there is lightning, and there is fire. I realize that doesn't mean

much to those of us who sit in this 17-square miles of logic-free environment because we get our paycheck every 2 weeks. We are very comfortable. But out there, their paychecks stop right then. Their equipment is burned up. The cycle starts all over again. Is that an environmental benefit to this country? I don't think so.

We have seen what happened in 1988 in Yellowstone National Park, the crown jewel of all parks, we are told. Fire swept across that park; and you should have seen the water that ran from that park for the next 3 years because there was nothing to hold the soil that had been turned sterile by the heat of the fires.

So according to the misinformation thrown around by the self-proclaimed environmentalists, leaving the land to rot, they believe, is best for the environment; the forests are gone forever whenever they are harvested. I wonder if they think it was all a barren land up here until one Friday we got up and, lo and behold, there was a forest. Just like a bolt of lightning, it was there. When you get a haircut, is that head of hair gone forever? To some it might be. Who knows. But I don't think so. Currently, most of our national forests in Montana, and throughout the West, we face a 25-percent tree mortality in the next 15 years. We will lose 25 percent of our forests just to mortality, getting old and dying.

So I am saying land management, proper land management saves our forests. I can take you to one of the worst areas there is in the Forest Service—it happens to be up in northwest Montana—and even the foresters themselves will tell you that we are ashamed of the condition of this forest. But because of litigation, they are powerless to do anything about it. Fuel loads, beetle infestations, it is not a pretty sight.

It is not a pretty sight.

Healthy forests are usually the benefit of good management. Harvesting of timber is healthy, and it is all part of management. That is aside from the faces of the people who live in these forest communities. Two weeks ago, we shut down a mill in Darby, MT. We sold it at auction. Jobs are gone. A tax base is gone. The ability to build roads on private lands, to maintain services, and to build schools—all that revenue is gone.

The opponents of timber production would have you believe we still clearcut entire forests when we do not do that anymore. They would have you believe we have industrial lawn mowers big enough to mow down the great redwoods as we clear swaths from seed to seed, and we do not do that anymore. In fact, there are more trees in this country than during the time of Lewis and Clark. It is hard to believe, isn't it? But it is true.

When we put together this appropriation and this budget, there was balance. It brought balance of wildlife, balance of timber and new timber

growth, balance of timber that we could harvest for the benefit of Americans, for those folks who build homes, and for those folks who work with timber.

If one looks across the Nation right now, not many commodities are making money—gas, oil, no farm commodities. If you look at all the litigation, timber is not making any money either. Anything that comes from mining is not making any money. Why should we do it? Where would those industries move? What other land on this globe will be devastated because we are not allowed to manage our renewable resources?

I can remember dirt under the fingernails and the ability to produce a crop every year was pretty honorable. Madam President, 1.5 million Americans provide all the food and fiber for the other 260 million. That is not bad. We do a pretty good job, and we do it under conditions that are getting more and more difficult all the time.

Modern forestry, of course, with some rules and regulations passed by Congress, is being regulated more and more every day. Environmental laws require foresters to take a look at the impact of what they are doing. It employs independent timber firms that know the land. They are harvesting. All of this costs money, and yet they will say below-cost-timber sales. If we lump all the rules and regulations, all the hoops we have to jump through for one timber sale on a forest, it probably could be called a below-cost-timber sale. Those are hoops we have to jump through. So we increased the budget. It costs more money to complete a timber sale.

We do not clearcut areas with disregard. We spend more time making sure everything we do is done in a responsible manner. Dispel the misinformation, get away from the inflammatory words of growing a commodity and harvesting a commodity. In Montana, the people who harvest timber are the same ones who come back to hunt and fish. They do it every weekend. They recreate all that same forest.

Contrary to the doomsayers, we want our land to be usable. We want healthy wildlife populations, we want clean water, and we want to make sure our native fish are healthy.

Let's talk about this wildlife habitat. Most of the wildlife habitat is found on public land in the summertime. When they have to make it through the winter, do you know where the deer, the elk, the moose winter? On private lands, in my neighbor's hay meadow. Did you know we have to board up our haystacks in the West or the elk and the deer will eat all the hay and leave us none for our own livestock? They do not winter on public lands because there is no water and there is no feed. It is covered up. They have to winter on private lands. So are we so bad? I do not think so. We would not have it any other way because we are all hunters and fishermen and we enjoy the sights

of big game. We want to maintain the habitat. We enjoy seeing those elk. We enjoy this season of the year when they start bugling. Go out and listen. That is what makes my State worth living in.

It costs more money and the timber sale budget offers us an opportunity to feed our Nation's need for raw materials while employing Montanans and making and protecting habitat. We are talking about balance. Someone is buying that lumber or we would not have the demand to harvest it.

Harvesting a crop is not a sin. To the contrary, it keeps this country moving forward. It provides the timber to build our homes, and it provides the paper that often gets shuffled back and forth in this town. Quite simply, a timber sale budget is essential to America for food and fiber by proud producers. That is what it is all about. They do not like to be lied to. They do not even require much support. They ask very little. They ask to grow, to plant, nurture, and harvest. That is what it is all about.

How did those people who work in natural resources and agriculture—and this is agriculture in its highest form—who are responsible for 22 or 23 percent of the Nation's GDP become bad folks? How did we get that way? Because we used the resources around us, and our definition of conservation is the wise use of a natural renewable resource. Think about that. Twenty-three percent of the GDP in this Nation is in the production and the feeding of this country. It is unbelievable how that can be overlooked.

I ask my colleagues to contemplate the alternative. Let's say we quit harvesting trees in America, and that is what some extremist groups want us to do, or they want to make it so expensive we cannot compete on the open market. Do you realize that I have mills in Montana that are hauling logs 500 miles, out of where? Canada. So is your demand for lumber so high that you want to so-called devastate the Canadian land? I do not think so.

Why do people like to visit States such as Montana? No. 1, we are kind of authentic. Because we have done a pretty good job of taking care of it. And it is true of our good neighbors to the west in Idaho. It makes us the friendliest and the nicest people you will ever meet. But our people are starting to get cranky because their livelihood is being taken away from them, their ability to take care of themselves, by the rest of the country in its desire for the food and fiber that it takes for us to subsist.

So if you want to see our forests die in front of us, if you want to see our wildlife choked out of its habitat, and if you want to see our rural communities die, and to see foreign corporate timber production unfettered, fueled by our need for fiber, then vote for the Bryan amendment. That is what it is all about.

But there is balance here. I urge my colleagues to vote to maintain that

balance. We believe in the balance of our forest lands and good stewardship.

If you want to talk about stewardship, we have a stewardship plan that is getting started on a trial basis in Montana that is being participated in by a lot of people, including very small harvesters. So if you say you want a stewardship program, you have one. It is a good one. It is a dandy. It will work. But we cannot make it work unless we have funds to balance the needs of our forests.

I thank the Chair and my chairman and yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on or in relation to the pending amendment No. 1623 at 10 a.m., and the time between 9:30 and 10 a.m. on Tuesday be equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Chair.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. I will take a very short while.

I think the details, the information of this issue have been well discussed. But I rise in strong opposition to what is being proposed based simply on the health of forests.

In Wyoming, of course, we have national forests, as they do in Pennsylvania and other places. These forests need to be managed. I just spent several days in August in Yellowstone National Park. We road for 2 days, and all of it was in burnt forests. I have to tell you, that burn was not even effective because the ground fuel is still there. The trees are dead, but the ground fuel is there.

So all I am saying is, you have to manage this resource. Something will happen to the trees. They will either die or they will be harvested or they will be diseased. So if we are to have healthy forests, certainly they need to be managed.

The proponents of the amendment have said the timber program is wasteful. It was never intended to operate as a commercial tree farm. We have some numbers as to the resources that are provided for communities and the Federal Government. They are substantial.

I am not inclined to take a great deal of time. The chief of the Forest Service has stated there are 40 million acres of national forests which are at risk, either through fire or infestation. This amendment would cripple the Forest Service's ability to use the timber harvest to promote health. The amendment will crush a program that provides significant economic contributions to both the Federal Government and the communities. This amendment is wrong. It is shortsighted. I question

why the Congress would continue to ask the agency to manage this land and then take away their ability to do that.

So I will end by urging Members not to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the time.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. If there is no objection, I would like to amend my immediate past unanimous consent request. It was from 9:30 to 10 a.m. tomorrow morning equally divided. I ask unanimous consent to amend that to be from 9:30 until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania on this most important amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, it isn't often I rise to talk about these kinds of issues because, by and large, these issues generally affect the West, and we in Pennsylvania do not have much direct involvement. But in this case we are directly affected in Pennsylvania.

We have a national forest in Pennsylvania, the Allegheny National Forest. What has been going on in the Allegheny National Forest over the past several years has been a very troubling thing to thousands of residents in my State; it has had a dramatic negative impact on the quality of life for the residents in northwestern and north central Pennsylvania, as the amount of timber harvests have continued to decline.

What we have seen, as a result of that, is a real damaging of the economy. It is a very rural area. Most people think of Pennsylvania and think of big cities and factories, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. But Pennsylvania has the largest rural population of any State in the country. I repeat that. Pennsylvania has the largest rural population of any State in the country.

That rural population, by and large, survives on agriculture and off the natural resources, whether it is coal mining or whether it is quarrying or whether it is timber or whether it is what we consider traditional agriculture.

The Allegheny National Forest is vitally important for several of our smallest counties. We have 67 counties in Pennsylvania. Our smallest county in population, oddly enough, is called Forest County. Forest County has about 4,000 or 5,000 people who live there. The biggest part of it is the national forest, the Allegheny National Forest. But there are other counties surrounding it that have bits and pieces of the national forest in their county: Warren County, McKean County, and Elk County.

In Elk County, PA—aptly named—we have about 600 elk, big ones, that have

come back over the past years and are thriving in our forests, almost to the point of being domesticated in some respects and causing problems. But that is another issue for another day.

But those four counties get a lot of revenue because big chunks of them are national forest areas. They get a lot of revenues from the timber sales that principally support their school districts.

I spoke to students at the Forest County schools a couple of weeks ago. The No. 1 issue that the kids asked me about was, what are we going to do about timber sales? Because they potentially will have to close down one of their schools because of cuts in the Forest Service budget, as well as lawsuits because of the Indiana bat, which, I guess, stays up in the Allegheny National Forest for a couple days a year, so there are all sorts of lawsuits tying up the Allegheny National Forest in harvesting.

The Allegheny National Forest is the single largest area for the harvesting of black cherry timber. You look at your black cherry veneer and you will see a lot of it comes from the largest black cherry stand in the country, which is the Allegheny National Forest.

The Allegheny National Forest, by the way, is a profitable forest. They make a lot of money in their timber sales because of high value trades. So they are not losing any money to anybody. They are making a lot of money. In fact, the less we harvest, the worse off we are financially.

It has been very deleterious to those counties. I will look at the timber receipts for the past several years. Even last year, which was not particularly a great year, we had \$1.6 million for Warren County; \$1.5 million for McKean County; \$1.3 million—\$1.3 million for a county of 4,000 people is a lot of money.

All these other counties range in the area of 20-, 30,000 people; Elk County, 1.26. All of them, every one of those counties, will have their revenues cut by more than half this year, by more than half because of legal roadblocks and cutbacks in the amount of timber sales as a result of Federal legislation.

The problems we confront are not just financial in terms of tax revenue. They are financial, but they are also financial with respect to our economy. Logging is a very important aspect of the way of life. Wood products: Because of our high-value black cherry and other species, we have a lot of high-value processing of that wood, which is resulting in very high unemployment. Many of these areas, in this very strong economy, are experiencing double-digit unemployment, and have consistently for the past couple of years.

We also have another concern which, again, when you go up and talk to the folks who live around the forests, is almost frightening, the kind of misinformation that is out there about our forests and the management of the forests.

I remember going to Gray Towers, which is outside of Milford, PA. Gray

Towers was the home of Gifford Pinchot, who was the Governor of Pennsylvania and was a conservationist. Gifford Pinchot went on to be the first head of the U.S. Forest Service around the turn of the century. The Yale School of Forestry was actually collocated in Milford, PA, at Gray Towers, which was the mansion the Pinchot family lived in. Now it is a museum dedicated to forestry. I was up there looking at old pictures of Pennsylvania. It is remarkable. In picture after picture after picture, Pennsylvania was completely clearcut—clearcut.

I stood on the front porch of Gray Towers and looked out and saw the expanse. You can see literally for miles. I looked at the picture on the portico of roughly 100 years ago. It literally was stumps of trees for as far as the eye could see. Of course, now it is green as far as the eye can see, full of trees.

Pennsylvania is just remarkable. I fly over it all the time in small planes. It is just literally covered with trees, almost all of which, if not all of which—because I have been told it was completely clearcut—were not there 100 years ago. So the regeneration happens. In fact, the Allegheny National Forest is a valuable forest today because it was clearcut and because a shade-resistant strain of black cherry couldn't grow in those old forests. In fact, there are areas that are now dedicated to old growth in the Allegheny National Forest that have a lot less diversity.

People are worried about the health of the forest, environmental diversity. You get to some of these old-growth forests. You take the combination of the old growth and the fact that you have less vegetation, which puts pressure on your deer and everything else—we have a lot of deer. They completely decimate old-growth forests, where it is a desert there because of these high trees. You don't have a lot of younger growth. Whatever does crop up, because there isn't much else around, the deer take it right out.

So we went, in this area called the heart of the forest, when they dedicated it to old growth, from 37 varieties of plants down to 4. I don't know about you, but I am not too sure that is protecting the environment or the health of the environment.

I am an easterner. I am not one of these guys who understands public lands and forests and all that stuff. I grew up around the city of Pittsburgh and didn't know too much about forests. But I remember hearing people say: We have to manage the forest. You say: Forests manage themselves pretty well. What do you mean? Well, yes, forests manage themselves pretty well, but they manage themselves not in a way that you and I would consider them. They manage it through, in a sense, a boom-and-bust cycle, growth and then destruction and then growth and then destruction. That is pretty much how forests grow if you leave them alone. That is OK, I guess. But it

doesn't provide what is, I think, in the best interest of the animal life and the plant life and certainly the community for recreation. The economic resources that are derived from the forest are not maximized when you allow this kind of wild and unmanaged forest generation and regeneration to occur.

I trust the Forest Service. I don't always agree with them, but I trust the Forest Service will work to maintain forests and wisely manage them, using sound science to provide the best environment for stable growth of the forest as well as for the indigenous animal species that are there to feed. It is very serious—it is the No. 1 issue in about 5 or 6 counties in my State—that we allow the timber harvesting program to continue. It is the economic lifeblood of those counties.

I felt compelled to give a little different perspective, as someone who doesn't talk to these issues very much—and maybe it is best I don't—but who has a real sensitivity as to what sounds good. As I have told people about what sounds good in suburban Philadelphia, saying leave these trees alone, we love the trees, don't hurt the trees, a little knowledge is dangerous sometimes and no knowledge is downright lethal. And in the case of dealing with forest management, a lot of folks don't have a darn bit of knowledge. And it is killing people. It is killing their economy. It is killing their school districts. It is killing the forests.

That is not something we should allow to go unchallenged in Congress. Just because it makes a good TV commercial, just because it sounds as if you care more, you don't care more if you understand the facts involved in forest management.

I am an enthusiastic opponent of this amendment. I must tell you, when I first got to Congress, I was not. But the more I have learned about forest management and the impact of timber sales on not only the health of the forest but the health of the economy related to the forest, it is an absolute must for me to stand here and oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, in the few minutes remaining, I wish to add my voice to those in opposition to this amendment. We thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his sensitivity to these issues.

As he correctly said, this amendment could be devastating to the people and to the families who depend on their jobs in many counties across America. I think it is important that we understand this amendment in the context in which it is being proposed. Federal timber sales are in a steep and devastating decline. Since the early 1990s, the timber program has been reduced in America by over 70 percent. Already, more than 75 percent of the National

Forest System is off limits to timber harvests. The Federal timber supply has dropped from 12 billion board feet to the 3 billion board feet being harvested today.

Both the economic and the ecological context created by this reduction are not desirable. More than 80,000 jobs have been lost already, and of the 55,000 jobs that remain, they will be jeopardized by this amendment. That represents over \$2 billion in employment income, mostly in rural parts of America. The families who depend on those jobs are counting on us to understand this issue and to vote correctly.

It is confounding also that these additional cuts are being considered at a time when the industry and those working men and women who depend on it have already been deeply hurt by the critical cuts in the timber program.

In my home State of Idaho, our rural communities continue to suffer devastating reductions in the 25 percent funds from timber sales. Schools are going without needed renovation, and county governments are going without needed support and jeopardizing their basic services because of these steep reductions.

This amendment is also counterintuitive from an environmental perspective. Active forest management, including thinning and other timber harvest, has widely acknowledged benefits. In fact, most timber sales are currently designed to attain other stewardship objectives, in addition to the sales themselves. Timber sales are the most economic and efficient and effective methods available for our managers to treat and control many insect epidemics.

Madam President, each year the National Forest System grows by 23 billion board feet; 6 billion board feet die naturally. Only 3 billion board feet are being harvested. Tree growth in our National Forest System exceeds harvest by 600 percent.

I stand firmly with those who have cast their opposition today against this amendment and encourage my colleagues to reject it.

DEPLORING THE GRANTING OF CLEMENCY—MOTION TO PROCEED—RESUMED

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I rise to express my strong opposition to the President's decision to commute the prison terms of 16 members of the FALN, a Puerto Rican terrorist group. I also strongly support S.J. Res. 33, which expresses the Senate's opposition to this misguided decision.

There is no question that the President has the Constitutional power to do what he did. The President receives thousands of requests per year for a pardon or clemency, and the Department of Justice has a standard procedure under which the Pardon Attorney reviews these requests each year. However, all indications are that the proce-

dures were not followed in these cases, and that these cases were anything but routine.

News reports indicate that the Justice Department did not make a recommendation for or against clemency in these cases like it normally does. There is no excuse for the Department to stand neutral on very significant requests such as these. Also, the terrorists apparently did not personally take the proper steps to seek the relief, given that one of the conditions for clemency was that the prisoners had to sign statements requesting it.

Although the White House says the members were not convicted of committing murder or physical injury, it is clear that these criminals were actively involved in the militant group. Making bombs and transporting firearms designed to carry out the reign of terror, or committing armed robbery to finance the deeds, is not fundamentally different from personally harming innocent victims. They were conspirators in the FALN, a terrorist group, and they received stiff prison terms for good reasons.

News reports indicate that the law enforcement organizations that reviewed the issue, including the FBI and Federal Bureau of Prisons, recommended against it. Also, law enforcement organizations have expressed strong opposition.

The opposition is based on good reasons. America has long had a firm policy of intolerance regarding terrorism. Granting clemency to members of the FALN sends the wrong message about America's commitment to fighting terrorism. In fact, it sends the wrong message about America's commitment to fighting crime at home.

It is telling that the FALN terrorists did not immediately agree to the simple conditions that the President placed on his generous offer. It took them weeks to agree to renounce the use of violence and submit to standard conditions of parole. Indeed, some never did. Moreover, it does not appear that they have even expressed regret or remorse for their crimes. This is clear from one of the members' appearance on a Sunday news program, where he refused to express sorrow or regret for his crimes.

An obvious question we must ask is whether the President will continue to grant clemency in a way contrary to American interests. I sincerely hope the President will not pardon or commute the sentence of convicted Israeli spy Jonathan Pollard. I sent the President a letter last week asking him to clearly affirm that he will not do this.

I hope the Senate today will invoke cloture on the resolution and express our profound opposition and concern regarding this matter.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the Hispanic whose actions and fate I would like the Senate to focus on for action is Richard Paez. Richard Paez has never been convicted of a crime and is not associated with the FALN.

He is not a petitioner seeking presidency clemency. Rather, he is a judicial nominee who has been awaiting consideration and confirmation by the Senate since January 1996—for over 3½ years.

The vacancy for which Judge Paez was nominated became a judicial emergency during the time his nomination has been pending without action by the Senate. His nomination was first received by the Senate almost 44 months ago. This nomination has now been held even longer than the unconscionable 41 months this Senate forced Judge William Fletcher to wait before confirming his nomination last October.

Judge Paez has twice been reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee to the Senate for final action. He is again on the Senate calendar. He was delayed 25 months before finally being accorded a confirmation hearing in February 1998. After being reported by the Judiciary Committee in March 1998, his nomination was held on the Senate Executive Calendar without action for over 7 months, for the remainder of the last Congress.

Judge Paez was renominated by the President again this year and his nomination was stalled without action before the Judiciary Committee until late July, when we were able to have his nomination reported again. The Senate refused to consider the nomination before the August recess. I have repeatedly urged the Republican leadership to call this nomination up for consideration and a vote. If they can make time on the Senate floor for debate and consideration of a Senate resolution commenting on the clemency grant, which is a power the Constitution invested in the President without a congressional role, the Senate should find time to consider the nomination of this fine Hispanic judge.

Judge Paez has the strong support of both California Senators and a "well-qualified" rating from the American Bar Association. He has served as a municipal judge for 13 years and as a federal judge for four years.

In my view Judge Paez should be commended for the years he worked to provide legal services and access to our justice system for those without the financial resources otherwise to retain counsel. His work with the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles, the Western Center on Law and Poverty and California Rural Legal Assistance for nine years should be a source of praise and pride.

Judge Paez has had the strong support of California judges familiar with his work, such as Justice H. Walter Crosby, and support from an impressive array of law enforcement officials, including Gil Garcetti, the Los Angeles District Attorney; the late Sherman Block, then Los Angeles County Sheriff; the Los Angeles County Police Chiefs' Association; and the Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs.

The Hispanic National Bar Association, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, and many, many others have been seeking a vote on this nomination for what now amounts to years.

I want to commend the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his steadfast support of this nominee and Senator BOXER and Senator FEINSTEIN of California for their efforts on his behalf.

Last year the words of the Chief Justice of the United States were ringing in our ears with respect to the delays in Senate consideration of judicial nomination. He had written: "Some current nominees have been waiting a considerable time for a Senate Judiciary Committee vote or a final floor vote. . . . The Senate is surely under no obligation to confirm any particular nominee, but after the necessary time for inquiry it should vote him up or vote him down." Those words resonate with respect to the nomination of Judge Paez.

I trust the American people recognize who is playing politics with the issue of clemency. I disagreed with the President's decision, but it was his to make. He says that he granted clemency with conditions after study and based on a sense of proportion and justice. The calls for clemency in these cases came from Bishop Tutu, Coretta Scott King, other Nobel peace prize winners, a number of churches and religious groups. It has drawn praise in some circles and criticism in others.

I do not agree with the President, but I caution that the overreaching by Republican critics in the Congress on this is worrisome, as well. To contend that this shows a weakness of resolve against international terrorism is both wrong and may itself be creating a dangerous atmosphere.

We ought to be careful when anyone, let alone the Senate and Congress of the United States, start bandying about declarations that accuse the United States Government of making "deplorable concessions to terrorists," "undermining national security" or "emboldening domestic and international terrorists."

Playing politics with this matter and accusing the President of "undermining our national security" or "emboldening terrorists" carries significant risks. Could a potential terrorist somewhere in the world believe this political rhetoric and be "emboldened" by it? This is risky business. I do not believe the short-term political gain to the other party is worth having the Senate endorse a resolution that might itself have precisely that effect.

The Senate cannot find time to vote on the nomination of Judge Richard Paez or that of Bill Lann Lee to head the Civil Rights Division of that of Justice Ronnie White to be a federal

judge in Missouri or any of the scores of other nominees pending before it. The Senate has not completed work on 11 of the 13 appropriations bills that must be passed before October 1. The Republican Congress cannot find time to consider campaign finance reform or pass a real patients' bill of rights or consider raising the minimum wage or reforming Medicare or complete the juvenile crime bill conference, but there is plenty of time for floor debate and on the President's decision to exercise his clemency power. The Senate has had three hearings on judicial nominations all year and the Republican Congress will have that many hearings on the clemency decision this week.

In closing, I ask: If the Senate has the time to debate and vote on this resolution, why does it not have time to vote on the nomination of Judge Richard Paez to the Ninth Circuit?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to address Senate Joint Resolution 33, regarding the President's granting of conditional clemency to certain Puerto Rican prisoners.

Before addressing the merits of this resolution, I must note that I am troubled by the procedure which has been employed for its consideration. Almost two weeks ago, Senator COVERDELL announced that he would hold a hearing on President Clinton's decision in the Terrorism Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, this coming Wednesday, September 15. Last Wednesday, the Judiciary Committee also gave notice of a hearing on this subject for September 15. However, notwithstanding these planned hearings, the Republican leadership filed this resolution condemning the clemency and scheduled a vote related to it for today.

Holding a vote before the hearings is akin to having the verdict first, and then the trial.

Nevertheless, since we must vote, I will address the merits of the President's decision, based upon the information which is available to me before the hearings.

At the outset, let me say that serious, thoughtful people urged the President to offer this clemency. These people include former President Carter; eleven Nobel Peace Prize winners, including Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Coretta Scott King; and dozens of religious leaders and organizations. President Clinton's decision was not a frivolous one, nor did it appear from out of thin air.

However, that having been said, I believe strongly that the decision the President made was the wrong one.

In the post-Cold War era, terrorism presents perhaps the greatest threat to our national security. As Ranking Member of the Terrorism Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, I have done what I can to assist law enforcement in combating terrorism.

These prisoners were terrorists, and granting them leniency is exactly the

wrong thing to do. We have tried in recent years to send a clear, unequivocal message to terrorists: if you plan or commit acts of terrorism against the United States, we will find you, hunt you down, and punish you severely. Until this point, President Clinton's administration carried this message forward forcefully, including, for example, apprehending and punishing the Oklahoma City bombers and taking retaliatory strikes against Osama bin Laden. However, the President's decision last month undermines this message.

Some have described these prisoners as political prisoners. They were not. They were terrorists. Let me describe for a minute some of what they did.

These prisoners were members of the FALN, the Armed Forces for National Liberation, which seeks to make Puerto Rico and independent nation, through violent means. While some of them will not admit it, this was alleged and proven in the trials against them.

According to the FBI, and I quote, "In the past, Puerto Rican terrorist groups struggling for Puerto Rico's independence from the United States have been responsible for the majority of terrorist incidents perpetrated by domestic terrorist groups within the United States." The FBI's Terrorist Research and Analytical Center reported in 1996 that the "FALN has been linked to over 130 bombings which have resulted in over \$3.5 million in damages, 5 deaths, and 84 injuries."

The prisoners who received clemency were active participants in this campaign of terror. For instance, Alejandrina Torres, Edwin Cortes and Alberto Rodriguez were convicted of conspiring to, and I read now from the indictment against them, "oppose by force the authority of the government of the United States by means of force, terror and violence, including the construction and planting of explosive and incendiary devices at banks, stores, office buildings and government buildings . . . It was a further part of the said conspiracy that the conspirators would claim credit in the name of the FALN for certain . . . bombings through either telephone calls or typed communiques." This is classic terrorist activity.

As part of this plot, Torres and Cortes stockpiled dynamite, weapons, blasting caps and bulletproof vests. Together with Rodriguez, they planned to bomb U.S. military facilities in the Chicago, cased the facilities, and reviewed a communique to be published in conjunction with the planned bombings. They built bombs containing 21 pounds of dynamite. They also planned to use explosives to free FALN leader Oscar Lopez (who also was offered clemency by the President) from prison, to rob a Chicago Transit Authority facility to fund FALN operations, and to harbor another FALN leader who had escaped from prison.

Four others who were offered clemency were convicted in connection with

the armed robbery of seven million dollars from a Wells Fargo depot, to fund a similar Puerto Rican revolutionary independence group, Los Macheteros. This is an organization that ambushed a Navy bus and killed two U.S. servicemen and launched a rocket attack at the federal courthouse in Hato Rey, Puerto Rico.

Madam President, building bombs and committing armed robberies on U.S. soil are not political acts. They are crimes, plain and simple, and these people were appropriately locked up for their offenses. It should make no difference that the prisoners had political motivations which some may share. Virtually all terrorists are politically motivated, and many justify their acts in the cause of "national liberation." But terrorism is a cowardly and evil means to achieve such ends, which can never be justified, and which must be punished harshly.

It has been reported that the clemency petition was opposed by the FBI and the Bureau of Prisons. The Fraternal Order of Police has vehemently condemned this offer, calling it a "horrendously bad idea."

Clemency proponents have asserted that these prisoners harmed no one. A former Assistant U.S. Attorney who prosecuted some of these FALN members counters this assertion, noting: "A few dedicated federal agents are the only people who stood in their way. The conspirators made every effort to murder and to maim. It is no small irony that they should be freed under the guise of humanitarianism."

History has shown us that making concessions to terrorists spurs increased terrorism. The President made the wrong decision. I hope and pray that his decision will not have this effect, but I fear it will.

Despite the flawed procedure, I will vote to proceed to Senate Joint Resolution 33, and I will subsequently vote for its passage. Terrorism does not deserve leniency.

• **Mr. HATCH.** Madam President, the President's ill-considered offer of clemency has now been accepted by 12 of the 16 FALN members, many of whom are now back on the street.

These are people who have been convicted of very serious offenses involving sedition, firearms, explosives, and threats of violence. The FALN has claimed responsibility for past bombings that have killed and maimed American citizens. I pray that no one else gets hurt.

This is yet another example of this Administration sending the wrong message to criminals—be they foreign spies, gun offenders, or—in this case—terrorists.

In this case, it appears President Clinton put the interests of these convicted criminals ahead of the interests of victims, the law enforcement community, and the public.

I think we need to know: Did Attorney General Janet Reno do her job?

Media reports suggest that—notwithstanding the strong opposition of pros-

ecutors, the FBI, the Bureau of Prisons, and the victims of crime, the Department of Justice and the Attorney General apparently did not take a formal position on the matter even though the Department's own rules require doing so.

Here we have another example of what people suspect: The Attorney General is asleep at the switch while the White House runs the Justice Department.

As Chairman of the Senate Committee with oversight of the Department of Justice, I have requested copies of all relevant documents, including the Department's memo to the White House. Even our colleague Senator SCHUMER believes we should have these documents. But, so far, the Department has refused to turn over anything.

The Department and the Attorney General are hiding behind their tired, old ploy of studying whether to assert executive privilege. If the President has confidence that his decision was a just one, then he ought to be willing to hold it up to public scrutiny.

I will hold a hearing on the matter next Wednesday, September 15, at which time we will hear from the law enforcement community and those negatively affected by this grant of clemency.

I believe, Madam President, that our entire nation is victimized by terrorism. A bomb at the World Trade Center, the Oklahoma City Federal Building, or a U.S. embassy abroad has an effect on all of us.

This clemency deal is an insult to every American citizen. This clemency deal is not humanitarian; it is not just.

Exactly what is this? A weak moment? Political favoritism? Another foreign policy miscalculation?

I'll tell you what it is—it is wrong. •

CLOTURE MOTION

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Under the previous order, the hour of 5 p.m. having arrived, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The 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 S.J. Res. 33, a joint resolution deploring the actions of President Clinton regarding granting clemency to FALN terrorists:

Trent Lott, Conrad R. Burns, Ted Stevens, Peter Fitzgerald, Jim Bunning, Larry E. Craig, Michael D. Crapo, Chuck Hagel, Fred Thompson, Bill Frist, Michael B. Enzi, Judd Gregg, Craig Thomas, Jesse Helms, Pat Roberts, and Paul Coverdell.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 33, a joint resolution deploring the actions of President Clinton regarding the granting of clemency to FALN terrorists, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), is necessarily absent.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 270 Leg.]

YEAS—93

| | | |
|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Abraham | Edwards | Lugar |
| Akaka | Feingold | Mack |
| Allard | Feinstein | McCain |
| Ashcroft | Fitzgerald | McConnell |
| Baucus | Frist | Mikulski |
| Bayh | Gorton | Moynihan |
| Biden | Gramm | Murkowski |
| Bingaman | Grams | Murray |
| Bond | Grassley | Nickles |
| Boxer | Gregg | Reed |
| Breaux | Hagel | Reid |
| Brownback | Harkin | Robb |
| Bryan | Hollings | Roberts |
| Bunning | Hutchinson | Rockefeller |
| Burns | Hutchison | Roth |
| Byrd | Inhofe | Santorum |
| Campbell | Inouye | Sarbanes |
| Chafee | Jeffords | Schumer |
| Cleland | Johnson | Shelby |
| Cochran | Kennedy | Smith (NH) |
| Collins | Kerrey | Snowe |
| Conrad | Kerry | Specter |
| Coverdell | Kohl | Stevens |
| Craig | Kyl | Thomas |
| Crapo | Landrieu | Thompson |
| Daschle | Lautenberg | Thurmond |
| DeWine | Leahy | Torricelli |
| Dodd | Levin | Voinovich |
| Domenici | Lieberman | Warner |
| Dorgan | Lincoln | Wellstone |
| Durbin | Lott | Wyden |

NOT VOTING—7

| | | |
|---------|----------|------------|
| Bennett | Hatch | Smith (OR) |
| Enzi | Helms | |
| Graham | Sessions | |

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Ms. SNOWE). On this vote, the yeas are 93, the nays are 0. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The 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 amendment No. 1603 to Calendar No. 210, H.R. 2466, the Interior appropriations bill.

Trent Lott, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Gordon Smith of OR, Thad Cochran,

Larry E. Craig, Bill Frist, Michael Crapo, Don Nickles, Craig Thomas, Chuck Hagel, Christopher Bond, Jon Kyl, Peter Fitzgerald, Pete V. Domenici, Phil Gramm, and Slade Gorton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, in view of the fact that seven of our Members are missing, I ask unanimous consent to move the cloture vote to tomorrow following the votes at 10:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. I object. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. Under the previous order, there will now be 5 minutes of debate equally divided between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask if Senator HUTCHISON would like to go first?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I prefer to reserve my time and close.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, may we have order in the Chamber, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point is well taken. Senators will take their conversations to the Cloakroom, please.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I have taken the Senate's time on this matter. Here is why: I simply care about the Senate too much to see it be a party to a deliberate scheme by just 5 percent of the oil companies to underpay their royalty payments to our constituents. The Hutchison amendment allows the situation to continue by stopping the Interior Department from fixing it.

How do we know taxpayers are being cheated? First, there are many whistleblowers, former oil executives, who say under oath they undervalued the oil from Federal lands in order to pay less.

Second, settlements are occurring all over the country whereby these oil companies are paying billions of dollars in back royalties to keep their cases out of court.

Senator HUTCHISON has said the Interior Department wants to raise taxes on the oil companies. Royalties are not taxes; they are legal agreements just as your mortgage or rent is. As USA Today says:

Imagine if one day you decided to lower your rent by 10 percent. No individual could do that. And yet the oil companies are.

You may hear all we need is more time, but this is the fourth rider this Senate has passed, although we have never had a vote on it before. This is the first vote. We have already lost \$88 million from the Department of the Interior because of it. These companies should do what 95 percent of them are already doing, base their royalty payments on fair market value.

Senator HUTCHISON has said the oil companies are suffering now and it is bad timing to fix this. I voted, and most of us did, for a bill to help the oil companies. That is fine. But royalty

payments must be collected and because they are based on fair market value, they do go down when oil prices are depressed. That is a better deal than most Americans get on their mortgages or their rent.

You may hear about a court case in California that the oil companies won. But that had nothing to do with Federal oil royalties; it was about State royalties.

Finally, the Hutchison amendment is not in the House bill because this is an appropriations bill, and the Hutchison amendment will strip another \$66 million out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We need those funds very much. Senator HUTCHISON says it is just \$10 million. Interior and OMB say \$66 million. Regardless, it is a bad rider. I hope you will not vote for cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. BREAU.

Mr. BREAU. Madam President, I thank the Senator for yielding. In just 60 seconds, it is unfortunate we are voting with a number of Senators absent. I guess we will have to do that.

The question is, How do we value oil? The law says the companies owe the Federal Government, taxpayers, one-sixth to one-eighth of the value of the oil. The problem is, how do you determine the value? It is a very complicated rulemaking procedure that is ongoing to try to determine what are the legitimate deductions and transportation costs, in particular, determining what the fair market value of oil is. We can rush this thing through. It will result in years of litigation. Or we can pause for a few moments, which is what we are asking to be done, to try to negotiate out something to which both sides can agree. I think it makes more sense to pause for a few moments, get the groups together and work it out, rather than run the risk of years and years of litigation. We know what is going to happen then. Nobody is going to win. The American public is not going to win.

I urge we support the Hutchison amendment and get it done in a more realistic and fair fashion.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I rise in support of the Hutchison-Domenici amendment because the MMS's procedures are flawed. Department of the Interior employees involved in the writing of the regulations received \$300,000 each from a group that had interests contrary to those of the oil and gas firms.

It is wrong on substance. I will just give one example showing it is flawed. A producer from one oil well producing one kind of oil would be forced to value his oil ten different ways under this MMS proposal.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I strongly support Senator HUTCHISON's amendment to keep the Department of Interior from spending additional money for one year to implement their flawed oil valuation regulation. I am a cosponsor of the amendment.

Our amendment does two things: First, it puts the Senate on record opposing a Value-added Tax proposed by the executive branch. Second, it prevents MMS from implementing a rule that is so corrupt the Interior Department's inspector general and the Department of Justice are currently investigating \$700,000 in payoffs to federal employees involved in the rule.

The CBO scored the impact of this amendment at \$11 million. This is the apparent cost of standing up for Congress' constitutional prerogative to raise revenues.

The domestic oil and gas industry is being driven from our shores. During the oil embargo in 1973, we imported 36 percent of our oil. Today, we import 56 percent of our oil. We will continue to burn oil—in fact, we burn a bit more now than we did in 1973. But our own industry is in a death spiral, caused in part by government actions like this. Over 50,000 American families have lost their jobs in the last two years as companies leave the U.S. for foreign shores—foreign shores where it's cheaper to drill and governments encourage domestic energy production.

Without adoption of the Hutchison amendment, we will be saying: "Go ahead. Raise royalties and taxes. We, the U.S. Senate, yield our power to the Executive." This Senator cannot stand by and watch all power flow to the Executive.

"RENT-A-RULE"—POGO, ETC.

Neither can this Senator stand aside when there are serious allegations of payoffs to government employees involved in the rule.

In May of this year, the press began to report that two federal employees—one at the Department of Interior; the other, retired from the Department of energy—had taken \$700,000 from a self-described "public interest group" as an "award" for their work in the federal government on the rule to raise royalty rates on domestic oil producers. This group, the project on Government Oversight, or POGO, has not been very effective in its membership drive—it has only about 200 subscribers—but it has been very successful attracting trial lawyers as board members. In fact, the trial lawyers on its board have spent years litigating the very cases on oil value that the proposed DOI rule would benefit if the Boxer Amendment is adopted.

The inspector general and the U.S. Department of Justice public Integrity Section are investigating these payments.

In two letters to the Secretary of Interior, Senators DOMENICI, NICKLES, and I have asked the Department to withdraw the proposed rule pending the outcome of the investigations into

whether the employees can take money for "fixing" a rule. The Department has declined to do so twice.

In answering our first letter, DOI said the two had nothing to do with the rule. Senators DOMENICI, NICKLES, and I wrote back, this time providing public documents proving their involvement, and asking them, based upon the evidence, to withdraw the rule.

The response to our second letter was to acknowledge that the two apparently did have some involvement in the rule, but the decision to change the rule was made prior to their official involvement.

The Department's argument is misleading. The two federal employees worked hand-in-glove with POGO to convince the Department to craft a rule to POGO's liking. According to POGO's Executive Director, POGO even arranged for the employees to be specifically requested to testify before a House subcommittee to put pressure on the Department to start a rulemaking.

All the facts suggest that these employees were influential, if not instrumental, in the decision to issue the rule and the content of the rule. After influencing the decision to issue the rule, the employees took part in the public comment phase of the rulemaking. In other words, they were up to their elbows in this issue from start to finish.

A skeptic could conclude that the employees, working with POGO and the trial attorneys who stood to gain from out-of-court settlements, earned their "rewards." POGO, after all, admits they paid them \$350,000 each. The Department's position appears to be that POGO paid the wrong bureaucrats.

The public integrity of the public rulemaking process is at stake, even if Secretary Babbitt fails to see it.

In our nation, federal employees are not paid to push rule changes which benefit one party in a lawsuit. This is a dangerous precedent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, we directed the MMS to simplify the oil royalty payments so that companies would know what their fair share is. This is what MMS has come forward with as a simplification.

Companies still do not know what they will owe. They want to pay their fair share. I want them to pay their fair share. Whether they have in the past is not an issue. We are trying to have a fair setting of taxes.

The question is: Who makes tax policy in this country? Is it Congress or is it unelected bureaucrats who are not accountable to the people? We are talking about a 1-year moratorium so that this can be worked out in a way that is acceptable to Congress.

The Senator from California says this only affects 5 percent of the producers. I have a letter from the California Independent Petroleum Association, representing 450 independent oil and gas producers, which says:

It is false to claim that this rulemaking only affects the top 5 percent of all oil producers. It affects every California producer on Federal land.

Madam President, I urge a vote for cloture so we can have a fair up-or-down vote on this amendment so that Congress will set the policy of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 1603 to H.R. 2466, the Interior appropriations bill, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 271 Leg.]

YEAS—55

| | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Abraham | Fitzgerald | McConnell |
| Allard | Frist | Murkowski |
| Ashcroft | Gorton | Nickles |
| Bingaman | Gramm | Roberts |
| Bond | Grams | Roth |
| Breaux | Grassley | Santorum |
| Brownback | Gregg | Shelby |
| Bunning | Hagel | Smith (NH) |
| Burns | Hutchinson | Smith (OR) |
| Campbell | Hutchison | Snowe |
| Chafee | Inhofe | Specter |
| Cochran | Inouye | Stevens |
| Collins | Jeffords | Thomas |
| Coverdell | Kyl | Thompson |
| Craig | Landrieu | Thurmond |
| Crapo | Lincoln | Voivovich |
| DeWine | Lugar | Warner |
| Domenici | Mack | |
| Enzi | McCain | |

NAYS—40

| | | |
|---------|------------|-------------|
| Akaka | Feingold | Mikulski |
| Baucus | Feinstein | Moynihan |
| Bayh | Harkin | Murray |
| Biden | Hollings | Reed |
| Boxer | Johnson | Reid |
| Bryan | Kennedy | Robb |
| Byrd | Kerrey | Rockefeller |
| Cleland | Kerry | Sarbanes |
| Conrad | Kohl | Schumer |
| Daschle | Lautenberg | Torricelli |
| Dodd | Leahy | Wellstone |
| Dorgan | Levin | Wyden |
| Durbin | Lieberman | |
| Edwards | Lott | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|---------|-------|----------|
| Bennett | Hatch | Sessions |
| Graham | Helms | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 55, the nays 40. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate failed to invoke cloture on the pending Hutchison amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated on the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry.

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

Mr. LOTT. I understand the Chair will now put the question on this nomination.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MARYANNE TRUMP BARRY, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 210, which the clerk will report.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I also indicate that we will be prepared to confirm two further judicial nominations by consent before we close business this evening. Therefore, there will be no further votes this evening, and the next vote will occur at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday in relation to the Bryan forestry amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the confirmation of Maryanne Trump Barry to the Third Circuit—and I predict that she will be confirmed—will bring to 15 the total number of federal judges considered by the Senate all year.

While I am appreciative of this opportunity to consider this nomination, I note that the Republican leadership has chosen to skip over the nominations of Marsha Berzon, Judge Richard Paez, and Ray Fisher to the Ninth Circuit. These nominations have all been on the Senate calendar for as long or longer than that of Ms. Barry. The Republican leadership has, again, skipped over the nomination of Justice Ronnie White for the federal court in Missouri, as well.

All of these nominations could and should have been considered before the August recess. Indeed the nominations of Judge Paez and Justice White, should have been considered when they were first reported last year.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry to the United States Court of Appeals of the Third Circuit.

I commend Senator HATCH for moving forward with this nomination. We must ensure that the federal bench is at full strength so that our citizens will receive justice promptly and fairly. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee deserves thanks from all who believe that our court system is at the core of our precious democratic structure.

Judge Barry's reputation is well known and she has excellent credentials. In 1983, she was nominated to a federal district court judgeship by President Reagan, and since being confirmed for that post she has compiled an impressive record and become a nationally recognized expert on a wide range of criminal and civil law matters.

Her knowledge of criminal law led Chief Justice Rehnquist to appoint her to chair the Committee on Criminal Law of the Judicial Conference of the United States, a position she held from 1993–1996. Additionally, the Federal Judicial Center asked her to make an instructional videotape called "How to Try a Complex Criminal Case" and that tape is played for all new district court judges at their orientation seminar.

In the area of civil law, Judge Barry has issued many important rulings including a decision that Blue Cross was required to pay for a bone marrow transplant for a terminally ill young girl who would have died without the procedure.

New Jersey residents are particularly proud of her decision holding New York City responsible and in contempt for failing to obey a court order designed to prevent garbage and medical waste from New York's Fresh Kills Landfill from drifting onto New Jersey's shore. Not only do her judicial colleagues hold her in high regard, Judge Barry is also well-respected by the many attorneys who have appeared before her. They praise her command of the law, her professional demeanor, and her razor-sharp wit.

As a result of her tenure in the U.S. attorney's office, her 16 years of outstanding service at the district court level, and her legal expertise, Judge Barry is well-prepared for elevation to the circuit court. In fact, she has already sat on the Court of Appeals—by designation—and has written several opinions.

Mr. President, I highly recommend Judge Barry for elevation to the third circuit. As some of my colleagues may know, the third circuit is currently facing a judicial emergency, and the appointment of Judge Barry will help.

To further address this crisis, I hope that the Judiciary Committee will soon take up the nomination of another excellent candidate for the third circuit, Judge Julio Fuentes. I would also be remiss if I did not point out that the elevation of Judge Barry will create another vacancy on the District Court of New Jersey, and so it would be essential that the committee move forward with the nomination of Faith Hochberg to that court.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Judge Maryanne Trump Barry's confirmation to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have followed Judge Barry's nomination closely as it has moved through the confirmation proc-

ess. During this time, I have been impressed by her candor, intelligence, and qualifications for the position. She has moved through the process quickly, and I believe the overwhelming support for her nomination is evidence of her ability to ultimately fulfill the obligations of serving on the Third Circuit.

Those who know Judge Barry, and have had the pleasure of working with her, have spoken openly of her integrity and thorough knowledge of the law. Some have highlighted her decency, while others have focused upon her razor-sharp wit. However, everyone has agreed on one point—Judge Barry has developed a reputation as a skilled jurist with a judgment and temperament that are highly respected by her peers. The other members of the Senate Judiciary Committee agreed with this assessment, and I was pleased that Judge Barry's nomination was passed out of the Committee by voice-vote on July 29th.

For those who are unfamiliar with Judge Barry's distinguished career, she has graduated with Master's and law degrees from Columbia and Hofstra Universities respectively. Judge Barry first worked for the U.S. Attorney's Office in New Jersey and quickly rose through the ranks. She served as Chief of the Appeals Division, and then as a first assistant to the U.S. Attorney. At the time, Judge Barry was the highest-ranking female prosecutor in any major U.S. Attorney's Office in the country.

In 1983, Judge Barry was appointed to the U.S. District Court by President Reagan. For almost 16 years, she has served as a pragmatic and vocal presence on the bench in Newark, New Jersey. As a former President of the Association of the Federal Bar of the State of New Jersey, Judge Barry has had a tremendous impact on policy across the State. She currently serves on its advisory board, and continues to be highly regarded for her insights and opinions. Judge Barry has consistently impressed me as an extraordinary woman, and one who will continue to distinguish herself. I urge my colleagues to support her confirmation to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

The Senator from Washington.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, with respect to the Interior appropriations

bill, there will be a vote on or in relation to the Bryan amendment and the second-degree Wyden amendment tomorrow morning at 10:30.

It may well be that that will be the last contested matter in connection with this appropriations bill other than the disposition of the Hutchison amendment. I am not entirely certain of that at this point. But we are close to having agreed-upon managers' amendments both with respect to legislative matters and with respect to money matters, with the exception of the motion to reconsider the invocation of cloture.

For that reason, this is a notice and a request to Members that if they have other matters they wish debated, or if they have other matters they wish brought to the managers' attention, they should do so very promptly. We will not in the managers' amendment dispose of all the amendments which were reserved, but I think we probably will be able to take care of all of those that look as if they would be otherwise brought up and voted on.

We are tantalizingly close to finishing. But, of course, we will not finish or go to third reading under the present circumstances at least until after disposition of the motion to reconsider the motion to invoke cloture, and that motion will certainly pass, and there will be at least one more vote on cloture itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, thank you very much.

I would just like to comment upon the vote the Senate has just taken on whether to shut down debate on the Hutchison amendment. I thank very much those colleagues who voted against that cloture motion. I think it is very important that the light and the truth be shone upon this matter. I think the way to do it is to have more discussion.

I just want to say to the Senate that when I made my 2½-minute presentation, it is always very difficult to say everything in your heart in 2½ minutes. But I said the reason I am doing this—there is no other reason in the world for me to be delaying a vote on an amendment—is that I love the Senate too much to see it be a party to such a scheme by just 5 percent of the oil companies to essentially rob this Treasury of millions and millions of dollars.

This is the fourth time that Senator Hutchison has attempted to pass this rider. It never had a Senate vote before. This is the first vote in any way about the Hutchison amendment.

By the way, I know that some people who voted aye on the cloture motion will vote with me on the substance. I am looking forward to that.

But the bottom line is, when we look at this closely, we see a number of things—that most of the oil companies are doing the right thing on their royalty payments. Ninety-five percent of

them are doing the right thing. They pay the appropriate royalty when they drill on Federal lands, onshore or offshore, and they send that check over to the taxpayers. You know where the funds go—right into the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Historic Preservation Fund to be used for environmental purposes for the upkeep of our parks and for the upkeep of our historical monuments. We all know from both sides of the aisle that we need to do more for our parks and open space.

As a matter of fact, there are bipartisan proposals to pass legislation to do that. Yet at the same time, too many people seem willing to shut their eyes to a raid on the Treasury that would lower the revenues to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

You have to ask yourself why the oil companies are so interested in this. I think the answer is in the Record. There have been several whistleblowers who have come forward who have stated in the most eloquent of terms that when they were working for the oil companies, the companies purposely undervalued the oil so that they could pay fewer dollars of royalty payments.

As USA Today says, what if we all woke up one day and said: You know, I don't think I am paying a fair amount of rent. Forget about the contract I signed with my landlord. I am just going to cut it back.

It wouldn't be too long before that tenant was out on the street, and rightly so. If he or she signed an agreement, they have to pay it.

What if one of us decided not to pay our mortgage and just say, let's take 10 or 20 percent off the top? The answer is, if we did that on a continual basis, the banker would take over our home, and rightly so, because we signed an agreement.

The oil companies have signed an agreement. They have signed an agreement with the Federal Government, and 95 percent of them are doing the right thing, but 5 percent of them are not.

The Interior Department wants to make sure that those 5 percent do the right thing by clarifying the rules that govern these royalty payments. The Hutchison amendment would stop the Interior Department in its tracks from trying to collect the fair royalties.

I have used another analogy in this debate before. If somebody came running through the Senate Chamber with a big sack of money that he had just stolen from the Treasury, every one of us on both sides of the aisle would stop that individual. Frankly, this is no different.

How do I know that?

The whistleblowers have told us so under penalty of perjury that they sat around and said: Let's undervalue this oil and "wait for the day of judgment." That is what one of the whistleblowers actually said.

How else do we know there is cheating going on?

Look at all the settlements that the oil companies are agreeing to with the various States all throughout our country on this matter. They don't want to go to court. They are afraid they are going to lose because the whistleblowers will get out there—because the facts are there. So they are settling for millions of dollars.

Ironically, Mr. President, I think I even sent it to your office on Friday, two more big oil companies are settling this week for over \$100 million rather than take their weak case to the court.

We know that the posted prices they are paying their royalty on are just made up and they are far less than the market price.

All Interior wants to do is fix the situation.

You will hear the argument: It is a bureaucracy run amok. Let me say this: You could say that about anything. But the facts belie that statement because the Interior Department has held many meetings. By the way, they have opened up their rule for further comment.

All I want to say to my colleagues by way of thanking them for this is that because of your standing with me against this cloture amendment, it means we are going to continue to have the American people focus in on this scam. When they do, they are going to want to know who stood with them or who stood with the vertically integrated oil companies that had been getting away with this robbery.

That is all I want. I don't gain anything out of this. There are lots of oil companies in my State. They are not thrilled. This is not something I do to be popular. But if in your heart you know you are right, and if in your heart you don't want to see the Senate associated with this kind of scam, then you have to stand up and be counted. Many of my colleagues, including Senator DURBIN, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator WELLSTONE, and Senator MURRAY, stood with me and entered statements in the RECORD or stood by my side on the floor of the Senate.

I say to my friend, Senator HUTCHISON, she was the one who wanted a vote on Monday originally. The vote was supposed to be held on Tuesday. I did not object to an earlier vote. A lot of people came back for the vote. Therefore, of course, I insisted we have a vote. We are going to have another vote. This could be from my perspective a very short-lived victory. It is true, they could come up with the 60 votes. But I feel good tonight. We have courage on this floor. This was not an easy vote.

Senator FEINGOLD has taken to the floor. He has shown the biggest contributions have come from oil companies. I understand the power of that. I understand that. It is hard to stand up when these 5 percent—and they are the big ones, the billion-dollar companies—call you on the phone and say: Come on, this is just a procedural matter, stick with us.

What will we have in the end? More delay and a \$66 million loss to the Treasury on top of the \$88 million we have already lost from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I think if the American people will focus on this, they will thank those colleagues who stood with me today. They are all consumers. They all understand this.

There has been a lot of talk on the floor that oil companies are suffering. I was very strongly in support of helping the oil companies and the steel companies that were in trouble. I am the first one to say we need to give them help. But don't allow 5 percent to cheat the taxpayers. That is a different issue. The interesting thing about royalty payments is they go down when there is a depression in all prices.

Wouldn't it be nice if our rent went down if there was a depression or we lost our job? Wouldn't it be wonderful if our mortgage automatically went down if there was a recession? That is what happens with these royalty payments. They are very fair. They are based on the fair market value of the oil. There is no set price because we want to be fair to the oil companies.

It is a privilege to drill on the people's land. It is a privilege, whether it is offshore or onshore. If it is Federal land, the taxpayers, the American people own that land. We want to make sure we work in a cooperative spirit with those who would like to exploit our resources. Make sure, at the same time, that they are good corporate citizens. What stuns me about this debate is that 95 percent of them are and 5 percent of the oil companies are not.

All the Department of the Interior is saying is: Please, let us straighten this mess out with these 5 percent. It is a lot of money to the Treasury, money that is necessary to keep our parks up, preserve our remaining open space, invest in our historical monuments that this great Nation so cherishes. It is a shame to see these 5 percent of the oil companies—and this is the fourth time this rider is before the Senate—walking off with millions of dollars that belong to the American taxpayers.

Senator HUTCHISON says the Office of Management and Budget is wrong when they say it is a \$66 million loss. The Interior Department says it is a \$66 million loss. The CBO tells Senator HUTCHISON it is about \$11 million. I say it doesn't matter if it is \$11 million or \$66 million. Maybe it is somewhere in between. It is the principle here of millions of dollars that belong to the taxpayers not winding up in the Land and Water Conservation Fund to take care of our natural resources.

Whether this is a victory for those who believe in fairness and justice and truth, if it is a victory that lasts 24 hours, so be it. To me it is an important point. We have made our point. This is not a trivial debate. This is not a trivial argument. As a matter of fact, I think the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAIG, was on the floor and said it is a baseless debate. It is far from baseless.

We see that tonight with this vote, however it winds up. This is a divided Senate.

Again, I thank the people who stood for fairness, who stood with the taxpayers, who stood with the environment, who stood with those who say you have to be a good corporate citizen. That is all we are saying. We expect our citizens to be good. Boy, if they don't pay their taxes, we are after them. And don't have the lawyers that the oil companies have on their side to drag out these arguments in court, month after month—ordinary citizens don't have that. If they don't pay their taxes, they have to explain why. If they don't pay their rent, they better explain why. If they don't pay their mortgage, they better tell the bank why.

We shouldn't have a double standard just because an oil company is powerful, just because an oil company can give millions of dollars of contributions, just because an oil company is influential. This day we stood up for the average person. I hope we do it again. For me, it was all worth it.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I think it is very clear that the Senate has seen through all of the rhetoric, through all of the hyperbole, and they have made the right decision on this amendment. I am very proud tonight that if everyone had been here we would have had 60 votes for cloture. As it is, we had 55 votes. The clear will of the Senate is to do the right thing on this issue—not to be led down a path, bringing up issues that are unrelated in order to make a point that isn't relevant to what we are talking about today.

The Senate voted, overwhelmingly, to come to closure and take control of the tax policy of this country. After all, if the Senate doesn't make the tax policy along with our colleagues in the House, are we going to let unelected bureaucrats make decisions that will affect our economy, the jobs of thousands of people, possibly sending them overseas for foreign jobs instead of American jobs? Our Senate colleagues tonight said the Senate of the United States is going to speak on oil and gas tax policy. We spoke very clearly that we want a 1-year moratorium. We hope MMS will do the right thing in giving a simple and fair tax that will be paid by the oil companies for the right to drill on public lands. That is the issue here.

There has been a lot said tonight. First of all, the quote was made from a USA Today article saying that this would be like a lessee saying: I'm not going to pay \$500 a month for this apartment; I'm going to pay \$400 a month even though I agreed to pay \$500 a month.

Actually, it is just the opposite. The oil companies have a contract with the Federal Government. They have met all the criteria that the Federal Government has put down in order to drill

on Federal lands. What the Senator from California has asked that we do is to allow the Mineral Management Service to raise the rent on the apartment in the middle of the month. They are breaking a contract and saying: We are going to raise your taxes right in the middle of the contract.

If we allow that to happen, who will be next? Who is the next person who is going to have a contract and have the price increased in the middle of the contract? Contract rights are part of the basis of the rule of law in this country, and we seem to be blithely going over it as if, "It's a big oil company; we can run over them." That is not the rule of law. We should not be raising taxes in the middle of a contract. It is not right and I hope in the end the Senate will prevail and we will make the tax policy for this country.

No. 2, the Senator from California keeps saying only 5 percent of the oil companies are going to be affected by the MMS-proposed rule. In fact, every company that drills on public lands is affected by this ruling. I want to put in the RECORD the letter that was received on September 13, 1999, by the California Independent Petroleum Association.

Dear Senator HUTCHISON:

The California Independent Petroleum Association represents 450 independent oil and gas producers, royalty owners, and service companies operating in California. We want to set the record straight. The MMS oil royalty rulemaking affects all California producers on federal land. It is false to claim that this rulemaking only affects the top 5 percent of oil producers.

How are California independents affected? The proposed rulemaking allows the government to second guess a wellhead sale. If rejected, a California producer is subjected to an ANS index that adjusts to the wellhead set by the government. Using a government formula instead of actual proceeds results in a new tax being imposed on all producers of federal oil.

I ask unanimous consent the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT
PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION,
Sacramento, CA, September 13, 1999.

Hon. KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

CIPA SUPPORTS YOUR AMENDMENT TO EXTEND
ROYALTY RULEMAKING AN ADDITIONAL YEAR

DEAR SENATOR HUTCHISON: The California Independent Petroleum Association (CIPA) represents 450 independent oil and gas producers, royalty owners and service companies operating in California. CIPA wants to set the record straight. The MMS oil royalty rulemaking affects all California producers on federal land. It is false to claim that this rulemaking only affects the top 5% of all producers.

How are California independents affected? The proposed rulemaking allows the government to second guess a wellhead sale. If rejected, a California producer is subjected to an ANS index that adjusts to the wellhead set by the government. Using a government formula instead of actual proceeds results in a new tax imposed on all producers of federal oil.

It doesn't end, if a California producer chooses to move its oil downstream of the well, the rulemaking will reject many of the costs associated with these activities. Again, to reject costs results in a new tax being levied on the producer.

Senator HUTCHISON, California producers support your amendment to extend the oil royalty rulemaking an additional year. We offer our support not on behalf of the largest producers in the world but instead on behalf of independent producers in the state of California. Your amendment will provide the needed impetus to craft a rule that truly does affect the small producer and creates a new rulemaking framework that is fair and equitable for all parties.

Again, thank you for offering this amendment. We cannot allow the government to unilaterally assess an additional tax on independent producers. After record low oil prices, California producers are barely beginning to travel down a lengthy road to recovery. To assess a new tax at this time could have a devastating effect on federal production and the amount of royalties paid to the government.

Sincerely,

DANIEL P. KRAMER,
Executive Director.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD the very people who are affected are from the home State of the Senator from California, the small producers, the independents who do not have the luxury of big margins. They are very much affected and very concerned about this rule and what it would do to somebody who has a contract, who says: Pull your truck up and I will sell you 1000 barrels of oil. Here is the price, \$12 a barrel.

And the Government says: No, we will not accept the \$12 a barrel, even though they are picking it up right there.

That is exactly what the MMS rule does. So every independent is affected and it is the independents who are having to lay people off in this industry because the oil prices have been so low over the last year that they have not been able to stay in business.

Do you know what happens when somebody shuts down? Every family that is dependent on employment from that small producer no longer has a job, and they may live in a place where it is not easy to find another job. The big oil companies just chose to move overseas where they know what the regulatory environment is. They know it is stable. They do not want to create foreign jobs, but that is what they are forced to do because it is so hard to do business in the United States and especially when an unelected bureaucracy is able to change the taxes in the middle of a contract. That is just not the American way.

I am very proud the people of the Senate spoke clearly tonight, very clearly; 55 Members of the Senate voted to make the tax policy in this country.

Congress did hope we could simplify oil royalty rates. We asked the Mineral Management Service to come forward with a simplified system so everyone would know exactly what the price

would be to drill on Federal lands. Simply, they have failed so far in the proposed rule.

This is the diagram of what will happen if this rule goes into effect against the wishes of Congress that we simplify it so oil companies will know what they owe without question. By the time you go through all of this, how could anyone know for sure what they owed?

Furthermore, the MMS will not allow the ruling for one company on oil royalty rates and the basis for those rates to apply to any other person who is drilling, unlike the IRS, which will give you a ruling letter so you will know this is the precedent, this is the way the IRS will treat this particular fact situation so anyone else with the same fact situation can rely on the precedent and can give IRS that ruling document and know they will be treated the same. That is not the case. The MMS refuses to be bound by the precedents they set themselves, even if the facts happen to be the same. That is not sound policy. That is not fair treatment for the taxpayers and the people doing business and creating jobs in our country.

The Senate has clearly spoken. The question is, Will the Senator from California let the majority rule? Will the Senator from California say 55 Members on both sides of the aisle have voted for Congress to set tax policy and to require the oil companies to pay a fair price for drilling on public lands? That is the question.

The Senate has voted 55, with 5 Members missing—according to the votes that have been taken it will be 60 votes if everyone is here and voting. So we have the vast majority to invoke cloture, and the question is, Will the Senator from California do the honorable thing? She said earlier in this debate she wanted fair treatment of this amendment. Fair treatment means an up-or-down vote on the amendment. So the question is, in the face of the overwhelming majority of the Senate who want to do the right thing, who want fair taxation of our oil and gas industry, will she let the majority rule? She said, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 9:

Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee for being so gracious in preserving my rights. My friend from Texas and I feel equally strongly on the point, just on different sides. I think each of us wants to have justice done on the amendment.

If the Senator from California will stick with her commitment that we would have justice done on the amendment, she will allow the majority to rule. The majority has heard the debate on this issue; they have seen through the rhetoric; they have seen that lawsuits are not a part of making a fair rule. They have seen it is the responsibility of Congress to set policy because we do have accountability. We are accountable to the people.

So if the Senator from California means to do justice by the amendment,

as she stated on September 9 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, she will let us have an up-and-down vote on this amendment and let the majority rule in the Senate.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

THE SITUATION IN EAST TIMOR

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, like many of my colleagues, I was pleased yesterday when President B.J. Habibie of Indonesia agreed to work with the United Nations to allow international peacekeepers to restore peace and stability to East Timor. The reprehensible wave of violence that engulfed East Timor in the week following the announcement of the August 30 referendum was inexcusable, and demands the harshest condemnation by the international community.

But, more importantly, the international community must now work to bring an immediate end to the violence in East Timor, protect refugees, safeguard humanitarian aid for displaced persons, and work with Indonesian troops already in East Timor to see to it that they fulfill their mission of protecting the East Timorese.

On August 30, close to 98 percent of the eligible voters of East Timor went to the polls for the United Nations sponsored vote on East Timor's autonomy. This vote was in keeping with the May 5 agreements between Indonesia, Portugal, and the United Nations regarding the future of East Timor.

On September 4, the Secretary General of the United Nations announced the outcome of the August 30 vote, and the results show that the people of East Timor have spoken with a clear voice: 78.5 percent rejected autonomy in favor of complete independence from Indonesia.

Under the May 5 agreements, if East Timor opted for independence, the Government of Indonesia committed itself to a process of peaceful and constitutional change, in which the United Nations would oversee the transition to independence for East Timor.

Unfortunately, following the Secretary General's announcement of the clear, overwhelming, and freely-expressed choice of the East Timor people, anti-independence militias, backed by the Indonesian military and police, began a systematic and organized campaign of terror, violence and intimidation in an effort to overturn the will of the people of East Timor.

The criminal action undertaken by the militias and their backers in the Indonesian military are reprehensible: mass looting, arson, systematic destruction of infrastructure, and most disturbing of all, murder.

According to the United Nations, hundreds, and possibly thousands, have been killed and more than 200,000 people have been forced to flee their homes. There are also reports of mass killings and a systematic campaign of political assassination.

The May 5 Agreements between the Governments of Indonesia and Portugal and the United Nations mandated the popular vote on the offer of autonomy and clearly delegated responsibility for peace and security before, during and after the ballot process to the Government of Indonesia. And the Government of Indonesia freely agreed to take on that responsibility.

Yet, in the face of widespread violence, the Indonesian army and police forces have stood aside and, worse, assisted the anti-independence militias. I, like many of my colleagues, was startled by the Government of Indonesia's unwillingness or inability to control its own military forces and police in East Timor.

Now that the Government of Indonesia has agreed to work with the United Nations to restore peace to East Timor, there is much work to be done.

First, I am heartened by the willingness of the Australian government to lead peacekeeping efforts to restore peace in security to East Timor, by the willingness of the states of ASEAN to participate in this peacekeeping mission, and by the efforts of the United Nations Security Council to engage the Government of Indonesia to address these issues. The United States, along with our partners in the United Nations and the international community, must be responsive to these efforts and provide appropriate assistance.

Second, I believe that it is essential that the international community condemns the acts of violence that have occurred in East Timor in the past week—as it has in Bosnia, Kosovo, Rwanda, and elsewhere—and urge a complete investigation into any criminal acts with those responsible being brought to justice.

Third, now that the Government of Indonesia has agreed to allow international peacekeepers into East Timor, I am hopeful that it will continue to work with the United Nations to implement the August 30th vote and safeguard East Timor's transition to independence. The United States and the international community must remain engaged and involved with this transition, and strongly encourage the Government of Indonesia to make those changes that the people of East Timor in the August 30 referendum overwhelmingly supported.

Lastly, I believe that President Clinton's decision to review U.S. international financial and military assistance to Indonesia in the context of the violence in East Timor was wholly appropriate, and that Jakarta must understand that as much as we value our relations with the people of Indonesia, future U.S. assistance will depend on

their continued cooperation with the international community in resolving this deplorable situation.

Mr. President, the people of East Timor have made their feelings clear. They want a peaceful transition to independence. The Government of Indonesia has made a commitment that they would grant the people of East Timor independence and oversee a peaceful transition. As the Government of Indonesia has belatedly recognized, it must live up to its commitments. The international community can play a crucial role in providing support and helping guarantee the security of the people of East Timor in this transition to independence. We must not let them down.

EFFECTIVE EXPORT CONTROLS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, as Ranking Member of the Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, I wish to call attention to an important briefing given to Senate staff just prior to the August recess by Administration officials from the U.S. Customs Service and the U.S. Census Bureau on the new Automated Export System (AES).

The AES is a joint venture between the U.S. Customs Service and the Foreign Trade Division of the U.S. Census Bureau. AES provides for the electronic filing of the Shipper's Export Declaration (SED) and electronic filing of the outbound manifest. AES is an information gateway designed to ensure compliance with and enforcement of laws relating to exporting. It will improve the collection of trade statistics and improve customer service. Its goal is a paperless reporting of export information by the year 2002.

I believe the AES will become the centerpiece of efforts to improve the effectiveness of the United States' export control program.

Last June Senator THOMPSON, Chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, held very important hearings on the findings and recommendations of reports issued by the Inspectors General from six U.S. agencies involved in the export control process: namely, the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Energy, State, Treasury (U.S. Customs), and the Central Intelligence Agency. One of the critical recommendations made by several of the Inspectors General was that licensing officials should perform "cumulative effect analysis" of proposed export transactions. The primary tool for this analysis will be information gathered in the AES.

Furthermore, the recent report from the Commission to Assess the Organization of the Federal Government to Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, chaired by former CIA Director John Deutch, entitled "Combating Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction," also highlighted the AES program as a central tool for

improving the overall performance of our export control program. The Deutch Report observed that the AES could be used as a tool to identify trends in shipments of otherwise non-strategic items that might be used by rogue nations pursuing the development of weapons of mass destruction.

Based upon the Deutch Commission's recommendation, Senator SPECTER introduced a bill, S. 1372, entitled "Proliferation Prevention Enhancement Act of 1999." This bill mandates that U.S. companies electronically file Shipper's Export Declarations (SEDs) through AES for exports of items that are on the U.S. Munitions List of the Commerce Control List. I commend my colleague for his efforts to improve the overall effectiveness of our export control program which is so essential to preserving our nation's security. I am a cosponsor of this legislation and urge its support. Our continued oversight of exports of dual-use and munitions list items will help ensure that exports do not go awry to rogue nations or individuals.

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 a treaty and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 56

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein during the calendar year 1998. The report is required by the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 79-264; 22 U.S.C. 287b).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 13, 1999.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:54 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should not have granted clemency to terrorists.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2684. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2587) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

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-5111. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Radioactive Contamination Control Guide" (DOE G 441.1-9), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5112. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to conditional pesticide registrations for 1997 and 1998; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5113. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar years 1996, 1997, and 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-5114. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to personal property furnished to non-Federal recipients; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-5115. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on direct spending or receipts legislation dated August 17, 1999; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-5116. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers", received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5117. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Color Additives for Coloring Bone Cement; FD&C Blue No. 2—Aluminum Lake on Alumina", received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5118. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indirect Food Additives: Adjuncts, Production Aids, and Sanitizers", received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5119. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Application Period for Temporary Housing Assistance; 64 CFR 46852; 08/27/99" (RIN3067-AC82), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5120. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the adequacy of the nation's marine transportation system; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5121. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Public Financing of Presidential Primary and General Election Campaigns", received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-5122. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Chemical Weapons Convention, Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations; States Parties; Licensing Policy Clarification" (RIN0694-AB67), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5123. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Transfers of Capital from Banks to Associations" (RIN3052-AB80), received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5124. A communication from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Stamp Program: Food Stamp Provisions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997" (RIN0584-AC63), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5125. A communication from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule: 1998-Crop Peanuts, National Poundage Quota, National Average Price Support Level for Quota and Additional Peanuts, and Minimum Commodity Credit Corporation Export Edible Sales Price for Additional Peanuts" (RIN0560-AF81), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5126. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "High-Temperature Forced-Air Treatments for Citrus" (Docket No. 96-069-4), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5127. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area" (Docket No. 98-083-6), received September 2, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5128. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Milk in the Southwest Plains Marketing Area—Suspension" (DA-99-06), received September 2, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5129. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Increased Assessment Rate" (FV99-948-1 FR), received September 2, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5130. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Fiscal Period Change" (FV99-955-1 IFR), received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5131. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Changes to Pack Requirements" (FV99-906-3 IFR), received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-348. A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Latimer County, Oklahoma relative to the English language; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LUGAR, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title.

S. 566. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to exempt agricultural commodities, livestock, and value-added products from unilateral economic sanctions, to prepare for future bilateral and multilateral trade negotiations affecting United States agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106-157).

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. MCCAIN:

S. 1577. A bill to assure timely, rational, and complete Federal Communications Commission resolution of all pending proceedings reexamining the current radio and television broadcast stations ownership rules; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. 1578. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ferroniobium; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 1579. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to the provision of counseling and treatment for sexual trauma experienced by veterans; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. KERREY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 1580. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to assist agricultural producers in managing risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 182. A resolution designating October, 1999, as "National Stamp Collecting Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1577. A bill to assure timely, rational, and complete Federal Communications Commission resolution of all pending proceedings reexamining the current radio and television broadcast stations ownership rules; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

BROADCAST OWNERSHIP REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that will make federal radio and television ownership rules Y2K compatible.

When Congress passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996 almost four years ago, we recognized that the forty-year-old rules restricting broadcast station ownership were badly outdated and in need of change. They reflected a mass media industry made up of radio stations, TV stations, and newspapers—and that's all. None of the dominant new multichannel media like cable TV, satellite TV, or the Internet figured in, because they didn't exist.

But they exist now, and they have transformed the way Americans get their news, information, and entertainment. As more and more people turn to cable channels and the Internet as their preferred means of electronic

communications, the audience and revenues of the big TV networks have plummeted, and the number and circulation of daily newspapers have spiraled downward.

The days when Huntley, Brinkley and Cronkite on the air, and the *Times*, the *Post*, and the *Tribune* at the breakfast table dominated our perspectives on the issues are forever gone. In their place are CNN, CNBC, MSNBC, and the innumerable web sites available on the Internet.

Even more important, Americans today are no longer just passive recipients of the news and views doled out by a handful of powerful TV networks and daily newspapers. Today, thanks to the Internet, anyone on line can pose questions and exchange perspectives with anyone else on line.

In other words, the days when network news and big-city newspaper editors were the dominant opinionmakers are long over. But the restrictive ownership rules that were a product of that time aren't over. Like so many federal regulations, they live on, despite the fact that they're as out-of-date as Alice Kramden's ice box.

The proliferation of alternative sources of electronic news, information and entertainment hasn't just made the old ownership rules useless—it's actually made them harmful. Faced with daunting competition from these new media, broadcasters, and especially newspaper owners, must have the opportunity to realize the increased operating economy and efficiency that liberalized ownership rules make possible. If we do not allow this to happen, we place the future of these older media in even greater doubt in today's hypercompetitive market.

Congress recognized all this when it directed the FCC to review all its broadcast ownership rules every two years. Although the Commission recently overhauled some of these rules, it left two others intact—the national network ownership limit and the ban on owning a daily newspaper and a broadcast station in the same market.

That's not consistent with what Congress told the Commission to do, and it isn't fair. We told the Commission to reexamine all the rules precisely because all the rules, not just some of the rules, have been rendered counterproductive by the changes that have taken place in the electronic mass media marketplace. In fact, the rule that's arguably the most hopelessly anachronistic is the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership ban—yet the FCC shows no sign of budging on it.

Mr. President, this bill corrects this situation. With respect to the national TV ownership limits, it follows the approach Congress used in the 1996 Telecommunications Act by raising the national audience reach limitation from 35 to 50 percent, and allows the FCC to raise it further if the public interest warrants it. It eliminates the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership ban, but would allow the FCC to reimpose it

if the Commission can do so by January 1, based on the extensive record that has been pending before them for over three years.

Mr. President, there are lots of policy cobwebs that have kept these rules in place despite the permanent and unmistakable changes the electronic media market has undergone. Some of them spring from the notion that broadcasting, as a free rider on the public's multibillion-dollar spectrum, can and should be subject to regulation over and above that of other media. Others are stubbornly ingrained notions of how powerful the TV networks and newspapers are. Still others—the least worthy—are scars left over from what particular newspapers have had to say on their editorial pages.

Nobody is less sympathetic than I am to the fact that broadcasters, unlike other users of the public's spectrum, pay nothing for the privilege. But subjecting them to anachronistic, even counterproductive, rules isn't a substitute for lost spectrum revenues. And remembrances of things past, whether they be the long-gone days of network TV hegemony or old stories in the local newspaper, are no way to deal with the problems of the present.

Uncle Miltie TV ownership rules don't work in a Chris rock media market. Let's face that fact, shed our outdated notions, and finish the job the FCC didn't.

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. 1577

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 "Broadcast Ownership Reform Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The contemporary electronic mass media market provides consumers with abundant alternative sources of news, information and entertainment, including radio and television broadcast stations, cable television systems, and the Internet.

(2) Due to the advent of digital technology, these alternative sources of electronic news, information and entertainment are converging as well as proliferating.

(3) The simultaneous proliferation and convergence of electronic mass media renders technology-specific regulation obsolete.

(4) The public interest demands that the Federal Communications Commission reexamine its technology-specific regulation of electronic mass media to assure that it retains its relevance in the face of the proliferation and convergence of electronic mass media.

(5) Section 202(h) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 recognized that there is a particular public interest need for the Federal Communications Commission to periodically and comprehensively reexamine its radio and television broadcast ownership rules, which predate the proliferation and convergence of alternative competing electronic sources of news, information and entertainment.

(6) Although the Commission has reexamined and revised its broadcast duopoly and one-to-a-market ownership rules, it has not completed long-pending reexaminations of its national television station ownership restrictions or the newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership prohibition.

(7) The Commission's failure to simultaneously resolve all its pending broadcast cross-ownership rules fails to recognize, as Congress did in enacting section 202(h), that the proliferation and convergence of alternative electronic media implicates the bases of the national television ownership rules and the newspaper broadcast cross-ownership rules no less than the bases of the local radio and television station ownership rules.

(8) The Commission's failure to simultaneously resolve all its broadcast cross-ownership rules will affect all potential buyers and sellers of radio and television stations in the interim, because the current restrictions will prevent networks and newspaper publishers from engaging in station transactions to the extent they otherwise might.

(9) The Commission's failure to simultaneously resolve its pending proceedings on the national television ownership and newspaper/broadcast crossownership restrictions is arbitrary and capricious, because it treats similarly-situated entities—those bound by ownership rules that predate the advent of increased competition from alternative electronic media—differently, without any consideration of, or reasoned analysis for, this disparate treatment.

(10) The increase in the national television audience reach limitation to 35 percent mandated by section 202(c)(1)(B) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 was not established as the maximum percentage compatible with the public interest. On the contrary, section 202(h) of that Act expressly directs the Commission to review biennially whether any of its broadcast ownership rules, including those adopted pursuant to section 202 of the Act, are necessary in the public interest as a result of competition.

(11) The 35-percent national television audience reach limitation is unduly restrictive in light of competition.

(12) The newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership restriction is unduly restrictive in light of competition.

(13) The Commission's failure to resolve its pending proceedings on the national television ownership and newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership restrictions simultaneously with its resolution of the proceedings on the duopoly and one-to-a-market rules does not serve the public interest.

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN NATIONAL TELEVISION AUDIENCE REACH LIMITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Communications Commission shall modify its rules for multiple ownership set forth in section 73.3555(e) of its regulations (47 C.F.R. 73.3555(e)) by increasing the national audience reach limitation for television stations to 50 percent.

(b) FURTHER INCREASE.—The Commission may modify those rules to increase the limitation to a greater percentage than the 50 percent required by subsection (a) if it determines that the increase is in the public interest.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF NEWSPAPER/BROADCAST CROSS-OWNERSHIP RULE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule under section 73.3555(d) of the Federal Communication Commission's regulations (47 C.F.R. 73.3555(d)) shall cease to be in effect after December 31, 1999, unless it is reinstated by the Commission under subsection (b) before January 1, 2000.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 1579. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to the provision of counseling and treatment for sexual trauma experienced by veterans; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

VETERANS SEXUAL TRAUMA TREATMENT ACT

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Veterans Sexual Trauma Treatment Act, legislation authorizing a program within the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) which will offer counseling and medical treatment to veterans who suffered from sexual abuse while serving in the armed forces.

I have nothing but the utmost respect for those who have served or are currently serving their country in uniform. Countless men and women, and their families, have served this country with courage, honor and distinction. Today, as they have throughout this proud nation's history, they stand ready to answer the call to duty, and they deserve, at the very least, to serve free from the threat of sexual abuse and harassment. And yet, an estimated 35 percent of all female veterans report at least one incident of sexual harassment during their military service. That is why I am introducing this legislation today.

The Veterans Sexual Trauma Treatment Act, which is similar to legislation introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative GUTIERREZ, will enable former military personnel who were subjected to sexual harassment or abuse while in the military to receive proper medical and psychological care. The legislation does so by extending and improving the VA's abuse counseling initiatives.

The bill makes permanent a program to require the VA to provide counseling to veterans to overcome psychological trauma resulting from a physical assault or battery of a sexual nature, or from sexual harassment, which occurred during active military service. Under current law the program authorizing such counseling expires in 2001.

The bill authorizes the program to include appropriate treatment, and requires a VA mental health professional to determine when such counseling and treatment is necessary. Currently, the VA Secretary makes this determination.

The bill also calls for the dissemination of information concerning the availability of counseling services to veterans, through public service and other announcements. It also calls for a report on joint DOD/VA efforts to ensure that military personnel are informed upon their separation from service about available sexual trauma counseling and treatment programs.

Most importantly, the bill eases restrictions under the existing program. I find it very troubling, for example, that women with fewer than two years of service are not eligible for counseling, even if they separated from the military due specifically to incidents of harassment or abuse.

According to the DOD, over 5 percent of female active duty personnel have been sexually assaulted while in the service. And a recent survey conducted for the Pentagon found that between 1988 and 1995, the percentage of active duty women who reported that they had received uninvited or unwanted sexual attention stood at 55 percent, while the percentage for men stands at 14 percent.

The survey also reported that 78 percent of female respondents said they had experienced one or more specific types of unwanted behaviors from a range of specified inappropriate behaviors.

Eighty eight percent of females said the harassment occurred on a base; 74 percent said the harassment occurred at work; 77 percent said it occurred during duty hours; 44 percent said that military coworkers of equal rank were the perpetrators; and 43 percent said the perpetrator was of a higher rank.

These findings are very disturbing. The data illustrates just how widespread this problem is, and indicates the need for a program to treat victims upon separation from active duty service. I credit the DOD with working to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment in the military. However, as long as there is harassment and abuse in the military, it is vital that victims have access to counseling while on active duty and after separation from the service as well.

We expect active duty servicemen and women to make extraordinary sacrifices to safeguard the democracy we cherish. We should not expect them to accept abuse and harassment while they serve.

The legislation I am introducing today is aimed specifically at ensuring that veterans have access to abuse counseling after they leave the military. It has the backing of the VFW, Vietnam Veterans of America, the American Legion, and AMVETS.

I urge my colleagues to join me in a strong show of support for this legislation.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. KERREY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 1580. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to assist agricultural producers in managing risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

RISK MANAGEMENT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce on behalf of myself, Senator KERREY of Nebraska, and a bipartisan group of 17 of our colleagues—including a majority of the members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, the "Risk Management for the 21st Century Act."

This legislation represents a significant step in improving the risk management tools available to producers throughout the United States.

In early March, Senator KERREY and I joined to introduce S. 529, the "Crop Insurance for the 21st Century Act." At the time, we stated that we did not necessarily believe it was "the bill," but that we hoped it would serve as the starting point for a discussion that would lead to the introduction of a comprehensive piece of legislation to improve the risk management tools available to producers throughout the U.S. and which could be supported by a majority of our colleagues.

I believe this is that bill. Going back to last fall and through this spring and summer, we have been involved in literally hundreds of hours of discussions with producers, commodity and farm organizations, insurance providers, insurance agents, and Members of the House and Senate regarding what needs to be done to improve the risk management tools available to our farmers and ranchers.

The bill we introduce today is the product of these many discussions.

This bill includes many of the provisions included in the original Roberts/Kerrey legislation, but it also includes many new provisions recommended during our discussions with Members and agricultural organizations. These include:

An inverted subsidy structure.

An equal level of subsidy for revenue insurance products.

APH adjustments for producers suffering multiple years of crop losses.

APH adjustments for new and beginning farmers, those farming new land, and those rotating crops.

Instructions to undertake alternative rating methodologies for low risk producers and regions and crops with low participation percentages and to then implement this new rating system. This at the request of many of our southern colleagues.

Changes in prevented planting and incentives to encourage producers to take additional risk management measures. Similar to car insurance, if you take drivers education classes you get an additional discount on your premium. Under our legislation, producers who take additional risk management steps will also receive a bonus discount on their premiums.

Authority for several pilot programs, placing special emphasis on policies to explore coverage for livestock and to expand the quality and levels of coverage available to specialty crops.

Mr. President, in addition to the many changes mentioned above, our legislation also provides for major changes in the Risk Management Agency (RMA) and the regulatory process governing the crop insurance program.

We change the members of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's Board of Directors to include:

Four Farmers from geographic regions to be determined by the Secretary.

One member active in the crop insurance industry.

One member with reinsurance expertise.

The Undersecretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, the Undersecretary for Rural Development, and the USDA Chief Economist.

Make the FCIC the overseer of RMA.

Create an Office of Private Sector Partnership to serve as a liaison between private sector companies and the FCIC Board of Directors.

Allow companies to charge minimal fees to other companies selling their products, in order to allow the recovery of research and development costs.

Mr. President, our legislation also focuses on several areas that I want to place special emphasis on because they are areas that I know are of interest to many of my colleagues and which some often think those of us in the Midwest and Plains States tend to ignore.

The first deals with program compliance. We have heard complaints from some of our colleagues and specific commodity groups that fraud exists in several areas of the country. Let me make clear, Senator KERREY and I oppose any attempts to defraud the crop insurance program.

To prevent this fraud, the legislation calls for penalties of up to \$10,000 for producers, agents, loss adjusters, and approved insurance providers that attempt to defraud the program. It also allows for USDA to remove producers from eligibility for all USDA programs if they have defrauded the program. Furthermore, agents, loss adjusters, and approved companies that do business in the program could be banned from participation for up to five years if they have committed fraud.

Mr. President, these provisions are strong and they are clear—those who attempt to defraud the program and taxpayers will be punished.

Mr. President, another concern that Senator KERREY and I have heard repeatedly is the lack of emphasis and prioritization for specialty crops and development of new crop insurance and risk management tools for these crops. We have included many provisions in our legislation to address these concerns.

These specialty crop provisions include:

Changes in the Noninsured Assistance Program that we believe will make it easier to obtain assistance and funding through changes in which commodities can be covered and by allowing payments in some instances regardless of an area trigger occurring.

Several pilot projects geared specifically towards looking at the feasibility of Gross Revenue and Whole Farm Revenue policies that include coverage for specialty crops.

Requiring the newly created Office of Private Sector Partnership to include staff with specialty crop expertise.

Allow RMA to spend up to \$20 million per year to create partnerships with Land Grant Universities, the Agricul-

tural Research Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and other qualified entities to develop and implement new specialty crop risk management options.

Requires 50 percent of RMA's research and development funds to go to specialty crop products development. Additionally, 50 percent of these R&D funds must be contracted out to organizations and entities outside RMA.

Reaffirms the authority of the Specialty Crops Coordinator in RMA. The bill also allows the Specialty Crops Coordinator to make competitive grants for research and development of new products in the specialty crops area.

Contains provisions regarding sales closing dates and the issuance of new policies.

Orders the Specialty Crops coordinator and the FCIC to study the feasibility of offering cost-of production, Adjusted Gross Income (AGI), quality-based policies, and an intermediate coverage level (higher than current CAT coverage) for specialty crops.

Requires the Board to annually review and certify that specialty crops are adequately covered. If insufficient coverage is available for a commodity, the Board can require RMA to undertake R&D activities.

Provides mechanisms whereby the Secretary must take steps to improve participation in the program when total participation for a crop in an individual state falls below 75 percent of the national participation average.

Mr. President, these changes for specialty crops are significant and we believe they give important attention to a group of producers that has often felt neglected in U.S. agricultural policy. I hope that our colleagues will agree and that they will join us in supporting this legislation.

Mr. President, let me also state that I realize some will argue that specific provisions should have been included in this legislation that currently are not. I understand these concerns, but as we developed this bill, we had to determine the priorities of each agricultural region and commodity groups. There is something from this bill that all of us would like to see included, including Senator KERREY and myself, but as a whole it is I believe the best package available.

I also realize that some in this body claim that crop insurance is not necessary and that we do not need to act on this legislation this year. I could not disagree more.

Mr. President, every year our producers put the seed in the ground and believe that with a little faith and luck they will produce a crop. But, sometimes the creeks do rise and the multiple perils of drought, flood, fire, hail, blizzard, pests, and disease get the better of our producers. They must have the tools to manage these risks.

The agricultural and lending communities have spoken loudly, and they all have continually expressed the need to improve the risk management tools

available to producers throughout the U.S. It is time for us to move towards action on this issue. The House Agriculture Committee approved legislation prior to the August recess. It is time for the Senate Agriculture Committee to do the same. A majority of the Committee has said as much by supporting our legislation.

Mr. President, we know there are many disagreements within members of the Senate in regards to specific agricultural policy. In fact, Senator KERREY and I have disagreements of our own on the underlying Farm Bill. However, we all agree that our producers today cannot be successful without access to new, improved, and adequate risk management tools. This legislation accomplishes these needs, and I urge my colleagues to join us in working towards an improved crop insurance program and risk management tools.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 37

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) were added as cosponsors of S. 37, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the restriction on payment for certain hospital discharges to post-acute care imposed by section 4407 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to remove the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. KERREY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 391, a bill to provide for payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to improve the National Writing Project.

S. 562

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 562, a bill to provide for a comprehensive, coordinated effort to combat methamphetamine abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require pension plans to provide adequate notice to individuals whose future benefit accruals

are being significantly reduced, and for other purposes.

S. 690

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 690, a bill to provide for mass transportation in national parks and related public lands.

S. 693

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 693, a bill to assist in the enhancement of the security of Taiwan, and for other purposes.

S. 765

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 765, a bill to ensure the efficient allocation of telephone numbers.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 805, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide for the establishment and operation of asthma treatment services for children, and for other purposes.

S. 882

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 882, a bill to strengthen provisions in the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974 with respect to potential climate change.

S. 1023

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1023, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to carve out from payments to Medicare+Choice organizations amounts attributable to disproportionate share hospital payments and pay such amounts directly to those disproportionate share hospitals in which their enrollees receive care.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1025, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the proper payment of approved nursing and allied health education programs under the medicare program.

S. 1153

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.

1153, a bill to establish the Office of Rural Advocacy in the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 1268

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1268, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide support for the modernization and construction of biomedical and behavioral research facilities and laboratory instrumentation.

S. 1322

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1322, a bill to prohibit health insurance and employment discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of predictive genetic information or genetic services.

S. 1325

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1325, a bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to add Hickman, Lawrence, Lewis, Perry, and Wayne Counties, Tennessee, to the Appalachian region.

S. 1332

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Father Theodore M. Hesburg, in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to civil rights, higher education, the Catholic Church, the Nation, and the global community.

S. 1399

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1399, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that pay adjustments for nurses and certain other health-care professionals employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be made in the manner applicable to Federal employees generally and to revise the authority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make further locality pay adjustments for those professionals.

S. 1463

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1463, a bill to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 1466

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1466, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide

for congressional review of rules establishing or increasing taxes.

S. 1473

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1473, a bill to amend section 2007 of the Social Security Act to provide grant funding for additional Empowerment Zones, Enterprise Communities, and Strategic Planning Communities, and for other purposes.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHN-SON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1500, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an additional payment for services provided to certain high-cost individuals under the prospective payment system for skilled nursing facility services, and for other purposes.

S. 1528

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1528, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to clarify liability under that Act for certain recycling transactions.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 33

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 33, a joint resolution deploring the actions of President Clinton regarding granting clemency to FALN terrorists.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 53

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 53, a concurrent resolution condemning all prejudice against individuals of Asian and Pacific Island ancestry in the United States and supporting political and civic participation by such individuals throughout the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 92

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 92, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that funding for prostate cancer research should be increased substantially.

SENATE RESOLUTION 108

At the request of Mr. BREAU, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms.

SNOWE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 108, a resolution designating the month of March each year as "National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month."

SENATE RESOLUTION 133

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 133, a resolution supporting religious tolerance toward Muslims.

SENATE RESOLUTION 163

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 163, resolution to establish a special committee of the Senate to study the causes of firearms violence in America.

SENATE RESOLUTION 179

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 179, a resolution designating October 15, 1999, as "National Mammography Day."

SENATE RESOLUTION 182—DESIGNATING OCTOBER, 1999, AS "NATIONAL STAMP COLLECTING MONTH"

Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 182

Whereas over 150 years ago, United States commemorative stamps began honoring the people, places, and events that have shaped our Nation's history;

Whereas in 1999, more than 22,000,000 Americans, including children, collect and learn about our Nation through stamps, making stamp collecting one of the most popular hobbies in our Nation and the world;

Whereas as we stand on the threshold of the 21st century, it is important that we pause to reflect on our Nation's history;

Whereas stamps honor statesmen and soldiers who fought for freedom and democracy, recognize our Nation's scientific and technological achievements, pay tribute to our Nation's artistic legacy, and celebrate the strength of our Nation's diversity;

Whereas starting October 1, 1999, "National Stamp Collecting Month" will transform more than 100,000 schools, libraries, and post offices into learning centers where our Nation's young people can honor the past and celebrate the future through stamps;

Whereas the founders and participants of "National Stamp Collecting Month" include

millions of adult and youth collectors, thousands of teachers and schools, the American Philatelic Society, and the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the people, places, and events shaping America today will be United States commemorative stamps tomorrow;

Whereas "National Stamp Collecting Month" will help empower our Nation's children and future generations to study and learn from our Nation's history; and

Whereas as our Nation's children learn the lessons of the past, the children will be better prepared to guide our Nation in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates October, 1999, as "National Stamp Collecting Month".

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

BRYAN (AND WYDEN) AMENDMENT NO. 1623

Mr. BRYAN (for himself, and Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1588 proposed by Mr. BRYAN to the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; as follows:

Beginning on page 1, line 3, strike "\$1,216,351,000" and all that follows through "management" on page 2, line 4, and insert "\$1,225,351,000 (which shall include 50 percent of all moneys received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 in accordance with section 4(i) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(i))), to remain available until expended, of which \$33,697,000 shall be available for wildlife habitat management, \$22,132,000 shall be available for inland fish habitat management, \$24,314,000 shall be available for anadromous fish habitat management, \$28,548,000 shall be available for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species habitat management, \$196,885,000 shall be available for timber sales management, and \$10,000,000 shall be available for survey and manage requirements of the Northwest Forest Plan Record of Decision, for which the draft supplemental environmental impact statement is to be completed by November 15, 1999, and the final environmental impact statement is to be published by February 14, 2000".

On page 2, line 6, strike "\$371,795,000" and insert "\$365,795,000".

On page 2, line 11, strike "\$122,484,000" and insert "\$116,484,000".

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, PRODUCTION AND REGULATION

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production and Regulation.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on past and present worker safety issues in DOE facilities at the Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Paducah, Kentucky.

The hearing will take place on Monday, September 20, 1999 from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in the Paducah Community College Fine Arts Auditorium in Paducah, Kentucky.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production and Regulation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC, 20510-6150.

For further information, please call Kristin Phillips, Staff Assistant, or Colleen Deegan, Counsel, at (202) 224-8115.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Water and Power.

The purpose of the hearing is to conduct oversight on the practices of the Bureau of Reclamation regarding operations and maintenance costs and contract renewals.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, September 29, 1999 at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC, 20510-6150.

For further information, please call Kristin Phillips, Staff Assistant, or Colleen Deegan, Counsel, at (202) 224-8115.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary requests unanimous consent to conduct a hearing on Monday, September 13, 1999, beginning at 9:15 a.m. in the Ceremonial Court Room of the Federal Court Building, Philadelphia, PA.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CLIFF GULLICKSON

• Mrs. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Cliff Gullickson family and a group of North-Central Montana farmers that pulled together

in true Montana tradition this harvest season.

Cliff Gullickson was killed in a farm accident when the grain truck he was driving to Big Sandy rolled on August 8. Neighbors rallied together the way only agricultural folks can to harvest the Gullickson's grain.

Some of the combines came from 50 miles away for the harvest and all started the day with a prayer for their safety and for Cliff Gullickson. In four hours the remaining 170 acres were harvested.

Don Jenkins, who lives on the northeast border of the Gullickson's farm said, "This is what you do when there's a tragedy. This is their bread and butter. This is their livelihood sitting out in this field." That statement summarizes the attitude and depth of feeling prevalent in farming and ranching.

I extend my deepest sympathies to the Gullickson family for the loss of a fine person who dedicated his life to agriculture and also commend them for their hard work and dedication to the agricultural community.

Additionally, I commend each and every neighbor who lent a helping hand this harvest season in the face of a tragedy.●

NATIONAL ASSISTED LIVING WEEK

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to draw the Senate's attention to National Assisted Living Week. The National Center for Assisted Living is sponsoring National Assisted Living Week this week to highlight the significance and the hope that this type of service can provide seniors.

Assisted living is a long term care alternative for seniors who need more assistance than is available in retirement communities, but do not require the heavy medical and nursing care provided by nursing facilities. Approximately one million of our nation's seniors have chosen the option of assisted living in this country. This demonstrates a tremendous desire by seniors and their families to have the kind of assistance that they need in bathing, taking medications or other activities of daily living in a setting that truly becomes their home.

This year's theme of National Assisted Living Week is "A Community of Families" and I think that is appropriate because assisted living encourages the involvement of families in the lives of the residents of assisted living facilities, and because this option can mean so much for seniors and their families.

Oregon has led our nation in pioneering the concept of assisted living and the state spends more state health dollars to provide assisted living services than any other state in our nation. Assisted living has taken different directions in different states and I believe providing these choices for consumers is important to provide security, dignity and independence for seniors.

Assisted living will become even more important as an option of seniors and their families as our nation experiences the tsunami of aging baby boomers. It is important for us to continue to support options that allow seniors and their families a choice of settings in order to assure that they get the level of care that they need.●

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL PAYROLL WEEK 1999

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of National Payroll Week 1999, which has been designated as September 13-17.

National Payroll Week was founded by the American Payroll Association in 1996 to honor the men and women whose tax contributions support the American Dream and the payroll professionals who are dedicated to processing those contributions.

In particular, the Susquehanna Valley Chapter of the American Payroll Association represents 200,000 residents and 25 businesses in Pennsylvania. These taxpayers contribute millions of dollars to the federal and state treasuries through payroll taxes each year. These taxes help pay for important civic projects including roads, schools, crime prevention, and national defense. In addition, taxpayers and payroll professionals are partners in maintaining the Social Security and Medicare systems.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commending the taxpayers and payroll professionals who, through the payment, collection, and reporting of payroll taxes, have helped make our nation great.●

CONGRATULATING DR. SUPACHAI PANITCHPAKDI

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I congratulate Dr. Supachai Panitchpakdi of Thailand on his selection to serve as Director General of the World Trade Organization. Dr. Supachai, Thailand's Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Commerce, has been an unfailing advocate for the principles of free trade and is an excellent choice to lead this organization. I am very pleased that our faithful friend and ally, the Royal Kingdom of Thailand, will have one of their citizens guiding an international organization.

The agreement reached will split the next term between Dr. Supachai and Michael Moore, the former Prime Minister of New Zealand. As many of my colleagues know, the process for selecting a new Director General was at a standstill for months. Renato Ruggerio of Italy, the first and very successful Director General, finished his term and stepped down at the end of April. Despite the fact that his departure was known well in advance, no consensus on a successor was formed and the post remained vacant at a critical time—the Seattle round of trade talks being on the immediate horizon. Most of the

countries of Europe and Asia have been united in their support of Dr. Supachai while the administration has supported Mr. Moore. The agreement reached by the member nations will permit Mr. Moore to serve a three year term to be followed by a three year term for Dr. Supachai.

For those of you unfamiliar with Dr. Supachai's work, as Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Commerce, his most pressing responsibility has been developing policy to guide his country through their current economic challenges. This included taking a significant role in shepherding important banking and regulatory reforms through the Thai Parliament that are important to the sound economic foundation of his country. The IMF has reported good news for Thailand on the economic front. After experiencing an economic contraction of 8% in 1997, their economy is expected to grow this year by 2-3% with an expected growth rate of 5% in 2000. Their currency, the baht, has stabilized and the government has rebuilt reserves to higher than pre-crisis levels. This is very good news and a positive sign for an economic recovery for all of Asia.

Dr. Supachai was also one of the architects of the economic policies that led his country to merge as a dynamic economic engine in Asia and experience several years of phenomenal economic growth. As Minister of Commerce he has been active in opening the business sector to foreign participation and improving transparency. He helped create the country's Export-Import Bank and has worked very closely with the countries of Southeast Asia in creating the ASEAN free trade zone. In Thailand, he was a strong voice in forging public acceptance of the Uruguay round of trade talks and guiding ratification of the treaty through the Parliament. Throughout the economic crisis, Dr. Supachai's support for free trade has not wavered. His credentials on the issues important to leadership at the WTO speak volumes.

I believe it is important that an individual representing Asia and a developing economy has an important role in a prominent international organization, as Dr. Supachai will have. There are over 400 million people living in Southeast Asia alone, this region will soon be the second largest market for our exports. This region and all of Asia are growing in importance to our economy and security. A strong voice representing the Asian economies is overdue.

The economic collapse in Asia, Russia and other nations did not simply stifle growth of U.S. exports, it put millions of people out of work in these countries, exacerbated the poverty level and in some cases led to social upheaval. Unfortunately, it caused policy makers in many foreign nations to question the pace of globalization and in some cases question the wisdom of globalization. Many countries believe that they have little to gain through

expanding trade and everything to lose and that their stake in trade negotiations is limited. I do not agree. Increasing fair trade has contributed greatly to improving the standard of living of Americans and sustaining the growth of our economy and it holds the same potential for our trading partners.

While this is an unfortunate development, it is not one without a solution. The solution is working with individuals like Dr. Supachai who believe in expanding trade and working to improve the role and the economies of developing nations. Rather than being an after thought, we must begin to work with more nations if more are to believe that they have a role in globalization. For the global trading structure to succeed and prosper, all countries must have faith in the trading system and faith that trade deals are being reached to the benefit of all member nations rather than just the most powerful. Dr. Supachai is uniquely suited to facilitate such change and his increased role in the international stage is a very positive development for the World Trade Organization.

Finally, I believe the people of Thailand could have been treated better by the United States in this process. They are our good friends and faithful allies. We on the other hand were slow in selecting a candidate and did not do a good job in forging a compromise. Despite Dr. Supachai's strong advocacy of the principles of free trade, we actively worked against him. Fortunately, groups such as the US-ASEAN Business Council and companies like Boeing were outspoken on Dr. Supachai's strong record on trade issues. This lack of leadership does not enhance the credibility of the WTO and needlessly strains relationships with our friends. But I am confident that the new leadership, Mr. Moore and Dr. Supachai, can overcome these obstacles and look forward to working with them on these issues.

So once again, I congratulate Dr. Supachai on his appointment. He is very strong on promoting expanded trade and I am confident that a leadership role for a representative of a Southeast Asian nation is a positive development for the World Trade Organization. I would like to commend the people of Thailand for their persistence and not backing down in their support of their candidate. I would also like to congratulate Mr. Moore and wish him the best; he is taking control of the organization at a critically important time. I look forward to working with both of these gentlemen on the issues that are important to advancing free and fair trade around the world.●

THE ARAB AMERICAN CULTURAL AND COMMUNITY CENTER, HOUSTON, TEXAS.

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to express my sincere congratulations to the Arab American Cultural and Community Center in Houston,

Texas. The Center will be hosting its Fourth Annual Gala "Unity of Friendship" in Houston on October 16, 1999, and it is worthy of recognition.

Mr. President, I commend those who have strived so hard to build this Center and make it a vibrant part of the community in Texas. This is an important effort which has advanced and demonstrated the continuing positive contributions of Arab-Americans. This Center has served as a cultural resource center for all nationalities in Houston, but is a special place where Arab-American culture, art, and language can be preserved and carried on for generations to come. It has assisted the children in the Arab American community by teaching them about their ancestors' impressive history and heritage.

I am pleased to recognize the efforts of those involved in this year's banquet and to note that they are generously donating a portion of the proceeds to help very worthwhile humanitarian projects. They are to be commended for their efforts and foresight, and I am pleased to acknowledge them in the United States Senate.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO WHP-AM 580

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate WHP-AM 580 in Harrisburg, PA as they celebrate their 75th anniversary as a prominent news leader in Central Pennsylvania.

For 75 years, WHP has covered the biggest news stories of the day, including the holocaust, Pearl Harbor, the Korean War, Vietnam, Watergate and the fall of the Berlin Wall.

As the owner of the radio news franchise in the Capitol region, WHMP reaches more than 100,000 people a week. The unique talent at WHP along with their exceptional news coverage and distinct personalities, have contributed to the station's listener loyalty and enthusiasm.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in congratulating WHP on their 75th anniversary and on their commitment to excellence in their news coverage to Pennsylvania and the Capital region.●

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, September 10, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,652,191,549,114.70 (Five trillion, six hundred fifty-two billion, one hundred ninety-one million, five hundred forty-nine thousand, one hundred fourteen dollars and seventy cents).

One year ago, September 10, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,545,658,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred forty-five billion, six hundred fifty-eight million).

Fifteen years ago, September 10, 1984, the Federal debt stood at \$1,572,266,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred seventy-two billion, two hundred sixty-six million).

Twenty-five years ago, September 10, 1974, the Federal debt stood at \$479,580,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-nine billion, five hundred eighty million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,172,611,549,114.70 (Five trillion, one hundred seventy-two billion, six hundred eleven million, five hundred forty-nine thousand, one hundred fourteen dollars and seventy cents) during the past 25 years.●

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Executive Calendar Nos. 211 and 212. I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations were considered and confirmed, as follows:

THE JUDICIARY

David N. Hurd, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

Naomi Reice Buchwald, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

MODIFICATION OF LIST OF CONFEREES—H.R. 2670

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of conferees for the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill be modified to add Senator LEAHY.

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

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 106-9

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following convention transmitted to the Senate on September 13, 1999, by the President of the United States: Tax Convention with Slovenia, Treaty Document No. 106-9.

I further ask unanimous consent that the convention be considered as having been read the first time, that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the

President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for Senate advice and consent to ratification the Convention Between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Ljubljana on June 21, 1999. Also transmitted is the report of the Department of State concerning the Convention.

This Convention, which is similar to tax treaties between the United States and OECD nations, provides maximum rates of tax to be applied to various types of income and protection from double taxation of income. This Convention also provides for resolution of disputes and sets forth rules making its benefits unavailable to residents who are engaged in treaty-shopping or with respect to certain abusive transactions.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to this Convention and that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 13, 1999.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1999

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, September 14. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume debate on the Bryan second-degree amendment No. 1623 to H.R. 2466, the Interior appropriations bill.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

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

PROGRAM

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the Bryan second-degree amendment regarding the forest system budget at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday. By previous consent, a vote on the pending Bryan

amendment will occur at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow. Further amendments to the Interior appropriations bill are expected throughout tomorrow's session. Therefore, Senators can expect votes throughout the day in anticipation of completing action on the bill.

In light of today's cloture vote on S.J. Res. 33, the Senate will have limited debate on the resolution with a vote on final passage during tomorrow's session at a time to be determined by the two leaders.

For the remainder of the week, the Senate is expected to begin consideration of the transportation appropriations bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, 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 6:52 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 14, 1999, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 13, 1999:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JOHN F. POTTER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 1, 2005, VICE T. BURTON SMITH, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

ROGER WALTON FERGUSON, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ALICE M. RIVLIN, RESIGNED.

ROGER WALTON FERGUSON, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2000. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WILLIAM B. BADER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS). (NEW POSITION)

SIM FARAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIFTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSIONED TEACHING STAFF OF THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 188:

To be lieutenant commander

KURT A. SEBASTIAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271:

To be captain

ERNEST J. FINK, 0000
ALAN L. PEEK, 0000
JAMES S. ANGERT, 0000

GERALD R. WHEATLEY, 0000
MARK P. THOMAS, 0000
MICHAEL B. KARR, 0000

JOHN J. O'BRIEN, 0000
KEITH D. CAMERON, 0000
BARRY A. HARNER, 0000
ROBERT C. LORIGAN, 0000
PATRICK A. HARRIS, 0000
JONATHAN D. SARUBBI, 0000
DONALD B. THOMPSON, 0000
BENJAMIN A. WATSON, 0000
WILLIAM M. MOORE, 0000
JOSEPH J. COCCIA, 0000
KEVIN B. SMITH, 0000
RAYMOND J. MILLER, 0000
KENNETH G. THYSSELL, 0000
JOSEPH J. SABOE, 0000
JACK R. SMITH, 0000
MARK J. KERSKI, 0000
TEDRIC R. LINDSTROM, 0000
RONALD T. HEWITT, 0000

ROBERT W. DUFREY, 0000
DOUGLAS C. CONNOR, 0000
JEFFREY A. KAYSER, 0000
WILLIAM G. DAVIDSON, 0000
CURTIS B. ODOM, 0000
RICHARD B. CUSSON, 0000
MARK J. SIKORSKI, 0000
MARK H. LANDRY, 0000
PETER J. DINICOLA, 0000
KEVIN P. CARPENTIER, 0000
MASON K. BROWN, 0000
MARK L. MILLER, 0000
CLINTON S. GORDON, 0000
WAYNE N. COLLINS, 0000
JAMES A. WATSON, 0000
BRIAN J. O'KEEFE, 0000
WILLIAM P. LAYNE, 0000
WILLIAM J. WAGNER, 0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES H. COOLIDGE, JR., 0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 9333(B):

To be colonel

THOMAS G. BOWIE, JR., 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be colonel

JAMES W. BOST, 0000
JEAN C. COMBAU, 0000
LOREN M. JOHNSON, 0000

RICHARD L. STAHLMAN, 0000
JAMES K. WRIGHT, 0000

To be lieutenant colonel

PETER A. BAUER, 0000
EVA T. BERRO, 0000
CATHERINE E. BERSACK, 0000
MARK W. BOWYER, 0000
WILLIAM M. CAMPBELL, 0000
GEORGE W. CHRISTOPHER, 0000
GARY D. CROUCH, 0000
DAVID L. DAWSON, 0000
STEPHEN E. GARNER, 0000
DAN R. HANSEN, 0000
JAMES H. HERIOT, 0000
ROBERT R. IRELAND, 0000
MOON Y. JEU, 0000
PHILIP T. KLAZYNSKI, 0000
JAMES R. KNOWLES, 0000
JAMES R. LITTLE, 0000
ABUBAKR A. MARZOUK, 0000

JAMES S. MOELLER, 0000
SUSAN W. MONGEAU, 0000
RANDALL J. MOORE, 0000
EMMANUEL D. NAVAL, 0000
PAUL A. PHILLIPS, 0000
ODES B. ROBERTSON, JR., 0000
MARC S. ROBINS, 0000
JOSE E. RODRIGUEZVAZQUEZ, 0000
WILLIAM M. ROGERS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER SARTORI, 0000
ROBERT E. SMITH, II, 0000
LAWRENCE W. STEINKRAUS, JR., 0000
KATHLEEN S. TAJIRI, 0000
JEFFREY M. THOMPSON, 0000
JAY A. WINZENRIED, 0000
GROVER K. YAMANE, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED PERSON FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT A. VIGERSKY, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203 AND 1552:

To be colonel

MICHAEL V. KOSTIW, 0000
DAVID T. ULMER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS (MC) AND MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS (MS) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT S. ADAMS, 0000 MC

To be major

JEFFREY P. STOLROW, 0000 MS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS AND CHAPLAINS AND FOR REGULAR (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) APPOINTMENT UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, 624, 628, AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JON A. HINMAN, 0000 MC

To be major

MARTIN P. CURRY, 0000 MC
LISA M. L. PARKER, 0000 MC
*GLENN R. SCHEIB, 0000 CH

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, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JAMES E. COBB, 0000
 AUGUSTUS L. COLLINS, 0000
 JOHN E. DAVOREN, 0000
 ALBERT E. FRANK, III, 0000
 DANIEL J. MCCORMACK, 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, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

HERBERT J. ANDRADE, 0000
 SUSAN M. CHESHER, 0000
 THOMAS C. COBURN, 0000
 MICHAEL FITZPATRICK, 0000
 JIMMY R. GOMEZ, 0000
 RICHARD E. HENS, 0000
 THOMAS R. LAMONT, 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, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

RICHARD P. ANDERSON, 0000
 LARRY D. BARTTELBORT, 0000
 HERBERT W. BEAM, 0000
 MICHAEL L. BOYD, 0000
 CHARLES A. CHAMBERS, IV, 0000
 RICHARD D. FINDLAY, 0000
 ROBERT LEROY FINN, 0000
 JORGE B. GONZALEZ, 0000
 JOHN A. GOODALE, 0000
 JOHN L. GRONSKI, 0000
 KATHLEEN A. MORRISSEY, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE MEDICAL CORPS (MC) AND DENTAL CORPS (DE) (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

*RODNEY H. ALLEN, 0000
 EDWARD D. ARRINGTON, 0000
 *THOMAS P. BAKER, 0000
 *JOHN M. BALAS, JR., 0000
 *ITALO M. BASTIANELLI, 0000
 *JOHN J. BAUER, 0000
 *AMY E. BENSON, 0000
 *ELIZABETH A. BLAIR, 0000
 *JODIE L. BOLT, 0000
 *STEPHEN L. BOLT, 0000
 *OTTO F. BONETA, 0000
 *SHERI Y. BOYD, 0000
 *GEORGE T. BRANDT, 0000
 THOMAS D. BRESLEY, 0000
 *GEORGE BROUGHTON II, 0000
 *MICHAEL E. BROWN, 0000
 *WILLIAM T. BURNS, 0000
 JOHN CAMPBELL, 0000
 ANTHONY J. CANFIELD, 0000
 *MARY L. CANNON, 0000
 *JOHN N. CAREY, 0000
 *BRIAN E. CAVALLARO, 0000
 *PAUL S. CHANG, 0000
 *DARREN C. CHAPMAN, 0000
 *GREGORY E. CHOW, 0000
 *LARRY D. CHRISTOPHER, 0000
 *LAWRENCE E. CLAPP, 0000
 GARY W. CLARK, 0000
 *JOSEPH Y. CLARK, 0000
 HEIDI L. CLOSE, 0000
 *JOSE J. CONDE, 0000
 *NORVELL V. COOTS, 0000
 *BRIAN E. COTHERN, 0000
 *TALLEY F. CULCLASURE, JR., 0000
 JAMES A. DAHL, 0000
 *ALEXANDER K. DEITCH, 0000
 *CHRISTOPHER A. DILLON, 0000
 *THEODORE A. DORSAY, 0000
 *KENNETH N. DUNN, 0000
 ANNETTE DUSSEAU, 0000
 *JOHN R. EKSTAND, 0000
 SUSAN EMANUEL, 0000
 *JOHN W. ETZENBACH, 0000
 LILIA A. FANNIN, 0000
 GERALD L. FARBER, 0000
 *JEFFREY A. FAULKNER, 0000
 LOIS A. FIALA, 0000
 *DAVID K. FIASCHETTI, 0000
 *ROGER S. FIEDLER, 0000
 *STEPHEN F. FLAHERTY, 0000
 *DAVID T. FLOYD, 0000
 THOMAS B. FRANCIS, 0000
 *BARTON K. GEORGE, 0000

*SEAN D. GHIDELLA, 0000
 *BENJAMIN N. GILBERT, 0000
 *BRUCE E. GOECKERITZ, 0000
 *MONICA B. GORRANDT, 0000
 *PAUL E. GOTT, 0000
 WAYNE E. HACHEY, 0000
 NELSON A. HAGER, 0000
 *STEVEN W. HAMMOND, 0000
 JON A. HINMAN, 0000
 *WILLIAM K. HIROTA, 0000
 DAVID P. HOCHSCHILD, 0000
 *ROBERT L. HOLMES, 0000
 *DUANE R. HOSPENTHAL, 0000
 *WILLIAM T. HUMPHREY, JR., 0000
 RAYMOND G. HYNSON, 0000
 *JEFFREY L. JACKSON, 0000
 JAMES R. JEZIOR, 0000
 KAREN B. JOHANSEN, 0000
 LUTHER B. JOHANSEN, 0000
 BARBARA JOSLOW, 0000
 *BYRON D. JOYNER, 0000
 *LISA W. KEEP, 0000
 *KENNETH R. KEMP, 0000
 KEVIN L. KENWORTHY, 0000
 *JOHN S. KITZMILLER, 0000
 *ERIK J. KOBLARZ, 0000
 JOSEPH R. KOLB, III, 0000
 *MARK G. KORTEPETER, 0000
 DAVID A. KRISTO, 0000
 *KEVIN M. KUMKE, 0000
 WILMA I. LARSEN, 0000
 JEFFREY A. LAWSON, 0000
 *LAWRENCE S. LEPLER, 0000
 *THOMAS E. LEVOYER, 0000
 *ANGELA D. LEVY, 0000
 EDWARD B. LUCI, 0000
 JEFFREY S. MACINTIRE, 0000
 ANDREW J. MACLELLAN, 0000
 *FRANCIS J. MALONE, 0000
 *JOHN R. MAYER, 0000
 DONALD R. MCCLELLAN, 0000
 *SHANNON S. MCGEE, 0000
 *JAMES W. MCCLANE, 0000
 WILIS A. MCVAY, 0000
 *COLIN K. MILLER, 0000
 *JERRY J. MILLER, 0000
 *RICKY C. MYHAND, 0000
 *SRIDHAR NATARAJAN, 0000
 ROBERT J. OGLESBY, 0000
 *COLIN K. OHRT, 0000
 FREDERICK V. PALMQUIST, 0000
 *MARY F. PARKER, 0000
 *ANTHONY J. PARKER, 0000

*GEORGE D. PATRIN, 0000
 *GEORGE E. PEOPLES, JR., 0000
 GREGORY W. PETERMANN, 0000
 *RONALD J. PLACE, 0000
 ALBERT V. PORAMBO, 0000
 MARY E. PORISCH, 0000
 *STEVEN J. POSNICK, 0000
 LAURA L. PRATT, 0000
 *BRADLEY P. PRESNAL, 0000
 KELLY D. PRIDGEN, 0000
 *WILLARD F. QUIRK, 0000
 *KENDALL L. RAY, 0000
 *JAY A. RIDDLE, 0000
 RANDAL D. ROBINSON, 0000
 *JEFFREY E. RODZAK, 0000
 WALTER F. RONGEY, 0000
 *BRADLEY J. ROTH, 0000
 *MICHAEL J. ROY, 0000
 *STEVEN P. RUBCZAK, 0000
 *MICHAEL B. RUSSO, 0000
 GLENN D. SANDBERG, 0000
 *DARRELL K. SCALES, 0000
 *CRAIG K. SETO, 0000
 JOHN M. SHEPHERD, 0000
 *NEAL I. SHPARAGO, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MICHAEL J. DELLAMICO, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHARLES S. DUNSTON, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be Lieutenant Commander

ANIBAL L. ACEVEDO, 0000
 JOHN J. ADAMETZ, 0000
 BRIAN K. ADAMS, 0000
 DAWN E. ADAMS, 0000
 KEITH N. ADAMS, 0000
 LAURA M. ADAMS, 0000
 LYNNE B. AHN, 0000
 JOHN C. ALBERGHINI, 0000
 CARLA M. ALBRITTON, 0000
 THOMAS C. ALEWINE, 0000
 CATHERINE R. ALLEN, 0000
 CONNIE J. ALLEN, 0000
 JANE D. ALLEN, 0000
 TONY L. AMMONS, JR., 0000
 TERESA A. ANDERSEN, 0000
 DONALD W. ANDERSON, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL L. ANDERSON, 0000
 YVONNE ANDERSON, 0000
 MICHAEL J. ANGERINOS, 0000
 JEFFREY G. ANT, 0000
 PAUL T. ANTONY, 0000
 DANAE M. APLAS, 0000
 LORIMEL F. ARABE, 0000
 MONICA J. ARELLANO, 0000
 ANTHONY A. ARITA, 0000
 ADAM W. ARMSTRONG, 0000
 THOMAS S. ARMSTRONG, 0000
 VERONICA G. ARMSTRONG, 0000
 ELIZABETH A. G. ASHBY, 0000
 CHRIS ATKINS, 0000
 HOWARD A. AUPKE, JR., 0000
 CHARLES R. BAILEY, 0000
 JOEL L. BALDWIN, 0000
 SUSAN BARNES, 0000
 CARL R. BARR, 0000
 JAMES R. BARRON, 0000
 BRADLEY E. BARTH, 0000
 JAMES BASS, 0000
 BARRY J. BAUGHMAN, 0000
 CATHERINE A. BAYNE, 0000
 PAUL E. BEDSOLE, 0000
 BRIAN E. BEHARRY, 0000
 CARMEL M. BELANGER, 0000
 AMY M. BELFORD, 0000
 ANGELA BELL, 0000
 DEBRA A. A. BELL, 0000
 BRODERICK C. BELLO, 0000
 MARK BENTON, 0000
 LAMONT S. BERG, 0000
 ERIK W. BERGMAN, 0000
 RICHARD D. BERGTHOLD, 0000
 STEPHANIE A. BERNARD, 0000
 GARTH B. BERNINGHAUS, 0000
 BRIAN BERRYMAN, 0000
 GEOFFREY B. BETSINGER, 0000
 VALERIE J. BEUTEL, 0000

BORIS J. SIDOW, 0000
 *CHRISTOPHER K. SINHA, 0000
 *CURTIS M. SORESENSEN, 0000
 *DAVID B. SPROAT, 0000
 *JOHN J. STASINOS, 0000
 *KEITH D. STEWART, 0000
 *ALEXANDER STOJADINOVIC, 0000
 *THOMAS R. TEMPEL, JR., 0000
 *HEIDI P. TERRIO, 0000
 *JAMES D. TERRIO, 0000
 *SONJA M. THOMPSON, 0000
 *GLEN E. TOMKINS, 0000
 *BRIAN K. UNWIN, 0000
 *DAVID A. VINCENT, 0000
 *BRAD E. WADDELL, 0000
 *PAUL J. WARDEN, 0000
 *ROBERT A. WASCHER, 0000
 *PETER J. WEINA, 0000
 *GARY A. WHEELER, 0000
 *SCOTT C. WILLIAMS, 0000
 *MARK R. WITHERS, 0000
 *GLENN W. WORTMANN, 0000
 *JOHN S. XENOS, 0000
 *CLIFTON E. YU, 0000

JEFFREY J. CAVENDISH, 0000
 DANIEL C. CELESKI, 0000
 THERESE S. CERMAK, 0000
 JOSE CERVANTES, 0000
 WALTER M. CHANNELL, 0000
 NORMAN F. J. CHARBONEAU, 0000
 JAMES T. CHEEK, 0000
 JAMES G. CHRISTENSON, 0000
 MARLIN L. CHRISTIANSON, 0000
 CHARLES E. CHURCHWARD, 0000
 ALFRED J. CIUZZO, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER R. CLAPP, 0000
 WILBURN A. CLARKE, 0000
 JEFFREY C. CLARY, 0000
 BRIAN D. CLEMENT, 0000
 DAVID T. CLONTZ, 0000
 PATRICK W. CLYDE, 0000
 GEORGE W. COLE, JR., 0000
 PETER C. COLELLA, 0000
 JOELLE M. COLETTA, 0000
 MICHAEL A. COLSON, 0000
 CANDACE L. COLSTON, 0000
 LUNDY W. COLVERT, 0000
 FERNANDO T. CONDE, 0000
 AVAMARIE S. CONLIN, 0000
 BYRON F. CONNER, 0000
 MARK J. CONRAD, 0000
 LEONARD W. W. COOKE, 0000
 RONALD A. COOLEY, 0000
 KEVIN J. COOLONG, 0000
 JAMES F. COONEY, 0000
 KIM CORLEY, 0000
 PATRICIA CORLEY, 0000
 MICHAEL E. CORSEY, 0000
 ANTHONY A. CORSINI, 0000
 ALLISON J. COSTE, 0000
 SCOTT A. COTA, 0000
 KENNETH D. COUNTS, 0000
 RICHARD COWAN, JR., 0000
 BENJAMIN M. CRANDALL, 0000
 JOHN L. CRAPO, 0000
 GERALD L. CREECH, 0000
 SAMUEL D. CRITIDES, JR., 0000
 GILBERT M. CSUJA, 0000
 THOMAS B. CULLEN, 0000
 ROBERT CUNARD, 0000
 MARY F. DALESSANDRO, 0000
 ELIZABETH V. DANG, 0000
 CHRIS J. DARRUP, 0000
 SURJYA P. DAS, 0000
 RAYMOND B. J. DAUGHERTY, 0000
 STEPHEN S. DAVIS, 0000
 STEVEN W. DAVIS, 0000
 PATRICIA K. DAY, 0000
 ROBERT P. DAY, JR., 0000
 TONY F. DEALICANTE, 0000
 HONEY L. DEARMOND, 0000
 SCOTT M. DEEDS, 0000
 DIRK R. DEHAAS, 0000
 MICHAEL W. DELANEY, 0000
 NANCY R. DELANEY, 0000
 DANIEL J. DELAURENTIS, 0000
 EFRAIN DELEON, 0000
 JOHN P. DEMCHAK, 0000
 PAUL J. DEMIERI, 0000
 JAMES T. DENLEY, 0000
 DANE A. DENMAN, 0000
 DAWN DENNIS, 0000
 JAMES S. DEROSA, 0000
 ROBERT P. DEVINE, 0000
 JUAN J. DEZENGOTTITA, 0000
 FLORENCIO A. DICTADO, 0000
 DARIN L. DINELLI, 0000
 STACY K. DIPMAN, 0000
 JOSEPH DIVINO, 0000
 DEMETRIO L. DOMINGO, 0000
 GERALD F. DONOVAN, 0000
 WADE E. DOSCH, 0000
 BRAD H. DOUGLAS, 0000
 BRADLEY K. DRAPER, 0000
 BRIAN J. DREW, 0000
 BARBARA J. DROBINA, 0000
 THOMAS M. DUGGAN, 0000
 DEBRA L. DUNCAN, 0000
 MARGARET T. DUPREE, 0000
 GREGORY D. EBERHART, 0000
 MARK K. EDELSON, 0000
 JOEL E. EDMERMAN, 0000
 MASOUD EGHTEHARI, 0000
 MARK S. EICH, 0000
 KURT R. EICHENMULLER, 0000
 DENISE J. EICHER, 0000
 REBEKAH J. EID, 0000
 CARL C. EIERLE, 0000
 SAMY M. ELHALAWANI, 0000
 CHAD R. ELLER, 0000
 THOMAS M. ELLIOTT, 0000
 ROBERT P. ENGLERT, 0000
 KENNETH W. EPPS, 0000

ANDREW C. ESCRIVA, 0000
 JOSEPH B. ESSEX, 0000
 ROBERT M. FAIRBANKS, 0000
 DEANN J. FARR, 0000
 MARC J. FARRAY, 0000
 TRISHA L. FARRELL, 0000
 MAURICE F. FAULK, JR., 0000
 JOHN F. FERGUSON, 0000
 KRISTIN M.H. FIELDING, 0000
 MARTIN F. FIELDS, JR., 0000
 ASHLEY W. FISH, 0000
 DAN E. FISHER, 0000
 BRIAN T. FITZGERALD, 0000
 ELLEEN M. FITZGERALD, 0000
 GEOFFREY M. FITZGERALD, 0000
 DEREK R. FLEITZ, 0000
 EUGENE H. FLETCHER, 0000
 TIFFANY A. FLORES, 0000
 ROBIN E. FONTENOT, 0000
 DONNA J. FORBES, 0000
 LEE A. FORDYCE, 0000
 KIM M. FORMAN, 0000
 ROBERT T. FRANKS, 0000
 ILIANA FREDMIRANDA, 0000
 ADRIENNE M. FRENCH, 0000
 ELIZABETH J. FRENCH, 0000
 WILLIAM C. FREUDENTHAL, 0000
 JOHN J. FROIO, 0000
 EDDIE G. GALLION, 0000
 DIONISIO S. GAMBOA, 0000
 WALTER G. GARNER, 0000
 ADOLPH C. GARZA, 0000
 KIRK P. GASPER, 0000
 JENNIFER M. GEDDES, 0000
 ERIC M. GESSLER, 0000
 VINCENT F. GIARDINO, JR., 0000
 MATTHEW J. GIBBONS, 0000
 ROBIN D. GIBBS, 0000
 CYNTHIA L. GIBSON, 0000
 GUSTAVO GIERBER, 0000
 MARCIA L. GILL, 0000
 ELIZABETH K. GILLARD, 0000
 GREGG D. GILLETTE, 0000
 LAURA G. GILLIS, 0000
 REGINA M. GOBOUT, 0000
 CARLOS D. GODINEZ, 0000
 MARK R. GOHL, 0000
 MICHAEL D. GOLIGHTLY, 0000
 THOMAS J. GORMAN, JR., 0000
 JAMES C. GOUDREAU, 0000
 ROBERT A. GRAMZINSKI, 0000
 JAMES A. GRAPES, 0000
 MICHAEL R. GREEN, 0000
 MICHAEL L. GREENWALT, 0000
 ROBIN C. GREGORY, 0000
 HERBERT L. GRIFFIN, JR., 0000
 ROWDY C. GRIFFIN, 0000
 JEFFREY T. GRILL, 0000
 JONATHAN C. GROH, 0000
 IAN R. GROVER, 0000
 JAMES M. GRUESKIN, 0000
 ANNA M. GRUETZMACHER, 0000
 CARLOS GUEVARRA, 0000
 PEDRO G. GUZMAN, 0000
 DONNA M. HAASE, 0000
 CLYDE A. HAIG, 0000
 ANNE R. HALEY, 0000
 ERIC R. HALL, 0000
 SANDRA M. HALTERMAN, 0000
 FRANCES K. HAMMAN, 0000
 ROBERT J. HAMMOND, 0000
 WILLIAM C. HANCOCK, 0000
 BRYAN HANPTWURZEL, 0000
 ALAN M. HANSEN, 0000
 ERIC L. HANSON, 0000
 JULIE C. HANSON, 0000
 GREGORY P. HARBACH, 0000
 CHRISTINA A. HARDAWAY, 0000
 JOHN W. HARDAWAY, 0000
 NADJMEH M. HARIRI, 0000
 DALE R. HARMAN, 0000
 TIMOTHY J. HARRINGTON, 0000
 JAMES HARRIS, 0000
 MARK K. HARRIS, 0000
 BARRY L. HARRISON, 0000
 BRADLEY J. HARTGERINK, 0000
 ROSANNE I. HARTLEY, 0000
 LEE P. HARTNER, 0000
 JEFFREY J. HAWKER, 0000
 GENE A. HAWKS, 0000
 RICHARD D. HAYDEN, 0000
 RUSSELL B. HAYS, JR., 0000
 J.P. HEDGES, JR., 0000
 JOHN W. HEDRICK, 0000
 RICHARD D. HEINZ, 0000

JOE H. HEMENWAY, 0000
 ROY L. HENDERSON, 0000
 MARK R. HENDRICKS, 0000
 TODD B. HENRICKS, 0000
 CARL R. HERRON, 0000
 BRIAN M. HERSHEY, 0000
 KATHLEEN E. HEWITT, 0000
 JEFFREY D. HICKS, 0000
 LAWRENCE D. HILL, JR., 0000
 VINCENT T. HILL, 0000
 EDWARD J. HILYARD, 0000
 MICHAEL C. HOLIFIELD, 0000
 KEITH G. HOLLEY, 0000
 KARINE M. HOLLISPERRY, 0000
 KATRINA M. HOOD, 0000
 MATTHEW T. HORVATH, 0000
 LINDA J.A. HOUE, 0000
 BRUCE A. HOUGESEN, 0000
 KURT J. HOUSER, 0000
 JOHN P. HOWARD, 0000
 STUART D. HUBBARD, 0000
 STEVEN J. HUDSON, 0000
 BARBARA L. HUFF, 0000
 KAREN A. HUBBARD, 0000
 THOMAS R. HUNT, JR., 0000
 HEIDI K. HUPP, 0000
 THOMAS L. HUSTED, 0000
 CHRIS B. HYUN, 0000
 BRAD R. IDONE, 0000
 ARISTIDES ILIAKIS, 0000
 ROBERT D. JACKSON, 0000
 MARGARET A. JACOBSEN, 0000
 ALAN D. JACOVICH, 0000
 RICHARD H. JADICK, 0000
 GLADYS L. JAFFARI, 0000
 JAMES JAWORSKI, 0000
 STEVEN M. JEFFES, 0000
 TRACY A. JENKINS, 0000
 DENISE JOHNSON, 0000
 ERIC JOHNSON, 0000
 JAMES M. JOHNSON, 0000
 KENNETH E. JOHNSON, 0000
 ROBERT JOHNSON, 0000
 ROBERT F. JOHNSON, 0000
 JOHN W. JOHNSTON, 0000
 ATHANASE J. JONES, JR., 0000
 DAVID E. JONES, 0000
 KARAN V. JONES, 0000
 KEVIN M. JONES, 0000
 JOSEPH P. JORDAN, 0000
 SUSAN A. JORDAN, 0000
 ETHAN B. JOSIAH, 0000
 MICHAEL JURGENS, 0000
 PETER M. KADILE, 0000
 DAVID H. KAO, 0000
 GLORIA S. KASCAK, 0000
 ERIC J. KASOWSKI, 0000
 MICHAEL D. KAZEL, 0000
 JANET R. KEAIS, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER A. KELLY, 0000
 SEAN R. KELLY, 0000
 LISA A. KELTY, 0000
 DAVID M. KENNE, 0000
 EDWARD M. KENNEDY, 0000
 TERRI KEPPINGER, 0000
 MARK L. KIEFER, 0000
 ROBERT J. KIELIUS, 0000
 MARY J. KINSELLA, 0000
 STANLEY A. KLOSS, 0000
 STEVEN T. KNAUER, 0000
 TAMMY L. KOCH, 0000
 NEVANNA I. KOICHEFF, 0000
 CHRISTINA M. KOONCE, 0000
 MARK KRSTIC, 0000
 CARMEN KRETZMER, 0000
 KRISTIN L. KRUSE, 0000
 ALLEN R. KUSS, 0000
 RICKY A. KUSTURIN, 0000
 MICHELLE E. LADUCA, 0000
 ALBERT LAFERTY, 0000
 GARY E. LAMB, 0000
 JOHN A. LAMBERTON, 0000
 ROBERT B. LANCIA, 0000
 TAMARA L. LANE, 0000
 LENORA C. LANGLAIS, 0000
 GRAINGER S. LANNIAU, JR., 0000
 BRIAN C. LANSING, 0000
 MARCUS S. LARKIN, 0000
 JONATHAN LARSEN, 0000
 MARK A. LARUSSO, 0000
 CLYDA L. LAURENT, 0000
 ROBERT S. LAWRENCE, 0000
 SCOTT P. LAWRY, 0000
 CATHERINE L. LAWSON, 0000
 LORI J. LEARNEDBURTON, 0000
 CARLOS I. LEBRON, 0000
 REES L. LEE, 0000
 RONNELL R. LEFTWICH, 0000
 KAREN M. LEHEW, 0000
 JOSE R. LEMA, 0000
 LINDA L. LEMASTER, 0000
 STEVEN L. LENGUA, 0000
 DAVID S. LESSER, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER T. LEWIS, 0000
 TINA T. LIEBIG, 0000
 DAVID A. LIFSET, 0000
 JAMES LILLY, 0000
 MATTHEW L. LIM, 0000

ARTHUR H. LOGAN, 0000
 FRANK J. LORENTZEN, 0000
 JOHN W. LOVE, 0000
 SCOTT W. LOWE, 0000
 JAMES M. LOWTHER, 0000
 GREGORY D. LUNSFORD, 0000
 SCOTT A. LUZI, 0000
 MICHAEL P. LYNN, 0000
 SYLVIA A. LYON, 0000
 ANN E. MACKIE, 0000
 MICHAEL J. MAGUIRE, 0000
 MARIA MAHMOODI, 0000
 GARY M. MAJOR, 0000
 RICHARD E. MAKARSKI, 0000
 JOHN MALLOY, 0000
 GEORGE C. MANSFIELD, 0000
 DAVID A. MARCH, 0000
 LOUIS J. MARCHIORI II, 0000
 TIMOTHY R. MARKLE, 0000
 KATHLEEN A. MARKS, 0000
 THOMAS R. MARZALEK, 0000
 RONALD R. MARTEL, 0000
 BETH A. MARTIN, 0000
 JOEL E. MARTIN, 0000
 PAUL E. MARTIN, 0000
 JULIE MAUREL, 0000
 CHERYL L. MAUZY, 0000
 SHIRLEY A. MAXWELL, 0000
 TODD J. MAY, 0000
 KEITH L. MAYBERRY, 0000
 JOHN P. MAYE, 0000
 MICHAEL T. MAZUREK, 0000
 JEROME F. MCCABE, 0000
 BRIAN L. MCCANN, 0000
 PATRICK J. MCCLANAHAN, 0000
 TROY M. MCCLELLAND, 0000
 CATHY M. MCCRARY, 0000
 DENISE K. MCCLOWNEY, 0000
 SEAN K. MCELHANEY, 0000
 ROBERT K. MCGAHA, 0000
 KEVIN A. MCKENNEY, 0000
 KENNETH W. MCKINLEY, 0000
 DANIEL J. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
 LAURA J. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
 DAVID B. MCLEAN, 0000
 MARY A. MCMAKIN, 0000
 BRYAN T. MCNAMARA, 0000
 BRYON K. MCNEIL, 0000
 DWAYNE R. MEEKER, 0000
 JAMES E. MEEKINS, 0000
 JAMES W. MELONE, 0000
 JIM S. MEONI, 0000
 BOSARUP P. MERRELL, 0000
 THOMAS V. MESSE, 0000
 DREW C. MESSER, 0000
 WENDELL Q. MEW, 0000
 TERLING A. MEZA, 0000
 CONNIE S. MICEK, 0000
 JOSEPH B. MICHAEL, 0000
 MARTHA J. MICHAELSON, 0000
 AMY C. MICHALSKI, 0000
 ADAM S. MICHELS, 0000
 WILLIAM D. MILAM, 0000
 DEAN J. MILLER, 0000
 JONATHAN A. MILLER, 0000
 RONALD P. MILLER, 0000
 ROLAND A. MINA, 0000
 KIRILAN L. MITCHELL, 0000
 EDWARD T. MITCHELL, 0000
 MOLDENHAUER, 0000
 JOSEPH M. MOLNAR, 0000
 NANCY L. MONTAGOT, 0000
 JOHN P. MOON, 0000
 DANIEL H. MOORE, 0000
 JULIE C. MOORE, 0000
 RODNEY M. MORE, 0000
 CYNTHIA E. MOOREFIELD, 0000
 ELIZABETH A. MORAN, 0000
 KENNETH F. MORSE, 0000
 SANDRA M. MORFORD, 0000
 SCOTT J. MOSES, 0000
 DONALD R. MOSS, 0000
 MEDGAR M. MOYA, 0000
 MICHAEL G. MUELLER, 0000
 SUSAN K. MUELLER, 0000
 JEFFREY P. MUENCH, 0000
 DAVID D. MULLARKEY, 0000
 JAMES J. MURRAY, 0000
 BENFORD O. NANCE, 0000
 KEVIN T. NAPIER, 0000
 CRUC T. NAPIER, 0000
 CUONG T. NGUYEN, 0000
 KHANH K. NGUYEN, 0000
 MARK M. NGUYEN, 0000
 THOMAS T. NGUYEN, 0000
 DANIEL J. NOLL, 0000
 MICHAEL K. NORDBECK, 0000
 MARY J. P. NORDMANN, 0000
 BARBARA E. NOSEK, 0000
 LORRAINE N. NUDD, 0000
 ROBERT E. O'BRECHT, 0000
 REBECCA M. O'BRIEN, 0000
 DENNIS M. O'DELL, 0000
 PAUL J. ODENTHAL, 0000
 DIANNE M. OKONSKY, 0000
 MARK V. OLCOTT, 0000

GREGORY J. O'LEARY, 0000
 EDWARD OMRON, 0000
 KEVIN R. O'NEIL, 0000
 BENJAMIN L. ORCHARD, 0000
 CARLOS B. ORTIZ, 0000
 PETER D. PANAGOS, 0000
 CHRISTINA G. PARDUE, 0000
 PETER J. PARK, 0000
 LORI A. PARKER, 0000
 ROBIN J. PARKER, 0000
 ALBERT W. PARULIS, JR., 0000
 STEVEN R. PATTON, 0000
 MARK D. PENNINGTON, 0000
 LUIS M. PEREZ, 0000
 SHELLEY K. PERKINS, 0000
 KYLE PETERSEN, 0000
 PATRICIA L. PETTIT, 0000
 BRADLEY B. PHILLIPS, 0000
 HOMER C. PHILLIPS, 0000
 MICHAEL L. PHILLIPS, 0000
 MICHAEL L. PICIO, 0000
 JOSEPH J. PICKEL, 0000
 MARK R. PIMM, 0000
 DEW S. PINILLA, 0000
 MATTHEW M. POGGI, 0000
 WILLIAM F. POLITO, 0000
 MICHAEL J. POLIZZOTTO, 0000
 TANYA M. PONDER, 0000
 MAY B. PORCUNCULA, 0000
 GARY J. POWE, 0000
 CRAIG J. POWELL, 0000
 DAVID E. PRATT, 0000
 ANDREA M. PRINCE, 0000
 JACQUELINE FRUITT, 0000
 TEJASHRI S. PUROHITSHEH, 0000
 ARMAND T. QUATTLEBAUM, 0000
 GARY E. RAFFEL, 0000
 MICHAEL D. RAMOS, 0000
 JOE F. RAY, 0000
 SANDRA H. RAY, 0000
 WILLIAM S. REAMER, 0000
 KAY R. REED, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER H. REED, 0000
 JENNIFER L. REED, 0000
 JESSICA D. REED, 0000
 PAUL L. REED, 0000
 EDWARD REEDY, 0000
 KEVIN J. REGAN, 0000
 LAURA G. REILLY, 0000
 FRANK M. REINHOLD, 0000
 MICHAEL L. RENEGAR, 0000
 CHARLES R. REUNING, 0000
 STEPHEN K. REVELAS, 0000
 ORLANDO RICCI, 0000
 MICHAEL D. RICHARD, 0000
 ANDREA M. RIES, 0000
 TRACY V. RIKER, 0000
 MARCIA A. RILEY, 0000
 PAUL B. ROACH, 0000
 RONALD R. ROBINSON, 0000
 LOUETTE T. ROBINSON, 0000
 MIRTA C. ROE, 0000
 CORAZON D. ROGERS, 0000
 LORI M. ROGERS, 0000
 DAL M. ROHRBACH, 0000
 KIMBERLY W. ROMAN, 0000
 JAMES E. ROMINE, 0000
 LOUIS ROSA, 0000
 PATRICK ROSATO, 0000
 DEBORAH E. ROY, 0000
 KEVIN L. RUCH, 0000
 MARK A. RUCH, 0000
 MICHAEL J. RUNDELL, 0000
 ANDREW A. RUSNAK, 0000
 GLORIA A. RUSSELL, 0000
 GREGORY G. RUSSELL, 0000
 MICHAEL B. RUSSO, 0000
 HERMAN M. SACKS, 0000
 DEIDRE I. SALL, 0000
 ROSE M. SALUKE, 0000
 JOSE E. SANCHEZ, 0000
 DAVID D. SANDERS, 0000
 FLOYD I. SANDLIN, III, 0000
 JEFFREY N. SAVILLE, 0000
 MCHUGH L.A. SAVOLA, 0000
 KELLY K. SAWYER, 0000
 JON D. SCHAAZ, 0000
 JAMES W. SCHAFFER, 0000
 THOMAS R. SCHLUETER, 0000
 MARK A. SCHMIDHEISER, 0000
 KATHRYN SCHMIDT, 0000
 MICHELLE M. SCHMODE, 0000
 DYLAN D. SCHMORROW, 0000
 GEORGE B. SCHOEELER, 0000
 WILLIAM C. SCHORGL, 0000
 RICHARD SCHUSTER, 0000
 ANN T. SCHWARTZ, 0000
 ERIK J. SCHWEITZER, 0000
 BRENT W. SCOTT, 0000
 KIRBY J. SCOTT, 0000
 PETER F. SEEF, 0000
 CRAIG S. SELF, 0000
 GREGORY J. SENGSTOCK, 0000
 JEOSALINA N. SERRAS, 0000
 ERIC M. SERGIENKO, 0000
 DAVID SHAPIRO, 0000
 AMIT SHARMA, 0000
 RANDY L. SHARP, 0000

DAVID A. SHEALY, 0000
 MARIA T. SHELDRAKE, 0000
 GLENN A. SHEPPARD, 0000
 CRAIG D. SHEPPS, 0000
 WILLIAM T. SHIMEALL, 0000
 ALFRED F. SHWAYHAT, 0000
 LESLIE K. SIAS, 0000
 CYNTHIA S. SIKORSKI, 0000
 DORANEA L. SILVA, 0000
 RACHEL M. SILVER, 0000
 DANIEL S. SIMPSON, 0000
 STEVEN L. SIMS, 0000
 PETER SINGSON, 0000
 GLENDA D. SINK, 0000
 PATRICK L. SINOPOLE, 0000
 ROBERT F. SKJONSBY, 0000
 ALMAZ A. SMITH, 0000
 CLIFFORD L. SMITH, 0000
 GREGORY J. SMITH, 0000
 JONATHAN M. SMITH, 0000
 RICHARD Q. SMITH, 0000
 MICHAEL L. SMITH, 0000
 STUART D. SMITH, 0000
 CAROL SOLOMON, 0000
 DANIEL J. SOLOMON, 0000
 JOHN D. SOLARCO, 0000
 KAREN A. SORIA, 0000
 BRETT V. SORTOR, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER T. SOSA, 0000
 DEBBY R. SOYK, 0000
 JONATHAN M. STAHL, 0000
 ALISSANDRA L. STAMEGA, 0000
 AARON K. STANLEY, 0000
 SUSAN A. STEINER, 0000
 LAURA M. STERLING, 0000
 MICHAEL L. STITTELY, 0000
 KAREN A. STOVER, 0000
 BRIAN H. STUBBS, 0000
 SEAN D. SULLIVAN, 0000
 TERRY M. SUDRICK, 0000
 GEORGE N. SUTHER, 0000
 JOANNE M. SUTTON, 0000
 TIMOTHY M. SWAN, 0000
 TRACY B. SWANSON, 0000
 FREDERIC R. SYLVIA, JR., 0000
 AMY M. TARBAY, 0000
 GARY A. TAVE, 0000
 ERIC R. TAYLOR, 0000
 RICHARD C. TAYLOR, 0000
 FRANK L. TENGASANTOS, 0000
 ELIZABETH A. H. TEWELL, 0000
 THOMAS A. THOMAS, 0000
 KEVIN C. THOMAS, 0000
 CHARLOTTE A. THOMPSON, 0000
 JOHN C. THOMPSON, 0000
 JANET E. THORLEY, 0000
 ERIK THRETT, 0000
 MARY A. TILLOTSON, 0000
 MARK A. TITLES, 0000
 WILLIAM D. TITLES, 0000
 ERIC R. TIVONZOZZI, 0000
 PETER P. TOLAND, JR., 0000
 WENDY J. TOLE, 0000
 DEVORAH L. TORIAN, 0000
 JOSUE TORO, 0000
 MEHUL TRIVEDI, 0000
 JEFFREY C. TROWBRIDGE, 0000
 DAVID A. TUBLEY, 0000
 BARBARA D. TUCKER, 0000
 DEAN A. TUFTS, 0000
 DERRICK T. TURNER, 0000
 DALE H. TYLOR, 0000
 LINDA C. ULRICH, 0000
 KEN H. UYESUGI, 0000
 HAROLD W. VALENTINE, 0000
 ANASTASIA F. VALENZUELA, 0000
 JAMES B. VANDENBERG, 0000
 STRATHEN M. R. VANDER, 0000
 ANDREW F. VAUGHN, 0000
 KEITH K. VAUX, 0000
 ALCHRISTIAN C. VILLARUZ, 0000
 CAMERON L. WAGGONER, 0000
 DAWN M. WAGNER, 0000
 GREGORY S. WAGNER, 0000
 LORI A. WAGNER, 0000
 TODD A. WAGNER, 0000
 LORINDA C. WAHOTO, 0000
 GARY J. WALKER, 0000
 PETER D. WALL, 0000
 THOMAS J. WALSH, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER L. WALTON, 0000
 JULIA R. WARD, 0000
 ROBYN C. WARD, 0000
 KAREN E. WARNER, 0000
 CHARLES R. WARREN, 0000
 TERESA M. WATSON, 0000
 JAMES E. WATTS, 0000
 DAVID K. WEBER, 0000
 TIMOTHY H. WEIGER, 0000
 MICHAEL B. WEIGER, 0000
 STEVEN WEINSTEIN, 0000
 NEIL WEISMAN, 0000
 KARIN C. WELLS, 0000
 KENNETH WELLS, 0000

JEFFREY G. WEYENETH, 0000
 DEREK S. WHEELER, 0000
 MARK S. WHEELER, 0000
 THOMAS C. WHIPPEN, 0000
 JOHN D. WHITE, 0000
 CATHERINE E. WIDMER, 0000
 BARRY E. WILCOX, II, 0000
 CYNTHIA A. WILKES, 0000
 ROBERT A. WILLIAMS, 0000
 CHARLES E. WILSON, 0000
 JEFFREY WINEBRENNER, 0000
 DIANA B. WISEMAN, 0000
 COLLEEN R. WITHERELL, 0000
 PETER J. WITUCKI, 0000

POLLY S. WOLF, 0000
 CAROL J. WOMACK, 0000
 JENNIFER L. WOMELDORPH, 0000
 DONALD P. WOODMANSE, JR., 0000
 ROWLAND WU, 0000
 ADORADO B. YABUT, 0000
 NOBORU YAMAKI, 0000
 JOSHUA S. YAMAMOTO, 0000
 MIL A. YI, 0000
 DOUGLAS YIM, 0000
 LINDA D. YOUNBERG, 0000
 EDWARD L. ZAWISLAK, 0000
 TARA J. ZIEBER, 0000
 STEVEN T. ZIMMERMAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DANIEL A. ABRAMS, 0000
 KEVIN H. ADAMS, 0000
 PAUL M. AGUILAR, 0000
 JULIE C. ALBANUS, 0000
 BRIAN N. ALBRO, 0000
 JOSEPH A. ALCORN, 0000
 NATHAN J. ALLEN, 0000
 THOMAS H. ALLEN, 0000
 WILLIAM B. ALLEN, 0000
 DAVID R. ALLISON, 0000
 ANTHONY L. ALLOU III, 0000
 RICHARD B. ALSOP, 0000
 JILL C. ALSTON, 0000
 TINA M. ALTON, 0000
 JEFFREY M. ALVES, 0000
 MICHAEL D. AMROZOWICZ, 0000
 SAUNDRA L. AMSDEN, 0000
 TROY A. AMUNDSON, 0000
 ERIC L. ANDALIS, 0000
 EDWARD L. ANDERSON, 0000
 EMORY A. ANDERSON III, 0000
 GREGORY L. ANDERSON, 0000
 RANDALL G. ANDERSON, 0000
 JOSEPH C. ANDREATTI, 0000
 ANTHONY J. ANGLIN, 0000
 JASON L. ANSLEY, 0000
 MICHAEL R. ARMSTRONG, 0000
 THOMAS W. ARMSTRONG, 0000
 LOUIS W. ARNY IV, 0000
 JAMES F. ARRIGHI, 0000
 DAVID A. ARTEGA, 0000
 LAWRENCE J. ARTMAN, 0000
 MONTY G. ASHLIN, JR., 0000
 CRAIG R. BACON, 0000
 MICHAEL G. BADORF, 0000
 MARK O. BAILEY, 0000
 JOHN M. BAILLO, 0000
 KIM W. BALDWIN, 0000
 WALTER L. BANKS, 0000
 DANIEL J. BARBER, 0000
 TIMOTHY C. BARKDOLL, 0000
 ERIC S. BARKER, 0000
 HERBERT C. BARKER, 0000
 KENNETH L. BARKER, 0000
 JEFFREY T. BARNABY, 0000
 DANIEL M. BARRETT, 0000
 TERRY S. BARRETT, 0000
 JAMES A. BARTELLONI, 0000
 AARON C. BARTLETT, 0000
 SUZANNE I. BASALLA, 0000
 DONALD A. BASDEN, 0000
 KENNETH D. BATES, 0000
 ARTHUR J. BAYER, 0000
 JAMES B. BEARD, 0000
 ROBERT E. BEAUCHAMP, 0000
 DOUGLAS B. BECKER, JR., 0000
 KENNETH R. BECKER, 0000
 VANCE A. BECKLUND, 0000
 PHILIP J. BECKMAN, 0000
 RICHARD S. BEGGS, 0000
 MARK D. BEHNING, 0000
 ALICE E. BELLAFORE, 0000
 LAURA L. BELLOS, 0000
 BASILIO D. BENA, 0000
 PAUL T. BENNETT, 0000
 KATHLEEN A. BENSE, 0000
 SHAWN M. BENTLEY, 0000
 PETER D. BERARDI, 0000
 HAROLD BERGE, 0000
 LEIF E. BERGEY, 0000
 BRODERICK V. BERKHOUT, 0000
 JOHN G. BERNARD, 0000
 JOSE M. BERNARDO, 0000
 BRENDAN D. BERRY, 0000
 WILLIAM J. BILLINGSLEY, 0000
 VICTOR P. BINDI III, 0000
 DWAYNE V. BLACK, 0000
 WILLIAM D. BLACKBURN, 0000
 BRADFORD A. BLACKWELDER, 0000
 ROCK E. BLAIS, 0000
 CRAIG R. BLAKELY, 0000
 JOHN H. BLALOCK, JR., 0000
 JEFFREY E. BLANKENSHIP, 0000
 LARRY D. BLAYLOCK, II, 0000
 TIMOTHY A. BOCHARD, 0000
 TODD S. BOCKWOLDT, 0000
 ROBERT W. BODVAKE, 0000
 BOBBY C. BOLT, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER C. BONE, 0000
 RICK D. BONEAU, 0000
 BARTEL J. BOOGERD, III, 0000
 BRIAN W. BOOKER, 0000
 JOSEPH D. BORGIA, 0000
 MICHAEL D. BOSLEY, 0000
 JAMES E. BOSWELL, 0000
 DENNIS R. BOYER, 0000
 STEVEN J. BRACKETT, 0000
 CHARLES J. BRADY, III, 0000
 JON N. BRADY, 0000
 MICHAEL G. BRADY, 0000
 REGINALD T. BRAGGS, 0000
 JAMES M. BRANDT, 0000
 KEITH A. BRANNER, 0000
 GUNTER I. BRAUN, 0000
 RALPH R. BRAUND, III, 0000
 DONALD J. BREEN, 0000
 SCOTT E. BRES, 0000
 BRENT M. BREINING, 0000
 BENJAMIN H. BRESLIN, 0000
 MARK O. BRINKERHOFF, 0000
 STEPHEN J. BROKENS, 0000
 CHAD D. BROWN, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER H. BROWN, 0000
 LINWOOD L. BROWN, III, 0000
 WILLIAM A. BROWN, 0000
 WOODS R. BROWN, II, 0000
 PUTNAM H. BROWNE, 0000
 MARK C. BRUNTING, 0000
 ANTHONY C. BRUNER, 0000
 DANIEL J. BRUNK, 0000
 DANIEL W. BRYAN, II, 0000
 MICHAEL L. BRYANT, 0000
 EDWARD A. BUERO, 0000
 FRANK V. BULGES, 0000
 WILLIAM A. BULIS, 0000
 PAUL R. BUNNELL, 0000
 ANDREW D. BURDEN, 0000
 DAVID J. BURDICK, 0000
 MARK A. BURGESS, 0000
 BARBARA M. BURGETT, 0000
 JOHN N. BURK, 0000
 CARL A. BURNS, 0000
 EDWIN J. BURNS, 0000
 MICHAEL P. BURNS, 0000
 JASON B. BURROWS, 0000
 ANGELO D. BURSTON, 0000
 DERRICK J. BUSSE, 0000
 ARTHUR D. BUSIERE, 0000
 EDWARD L. BUTTS, 0000
 RICHARD P. BYRNES, JR., 0000
 AARON M. CADENA, 0000
 THOMAS M. CALLENDER, 0000
 ARLENE L. CAMP, 0000
 JANE E. CAMPBELL, 0000
 MATTHEW G. CAMPBELL, 0000
 MICHAEL S. CAMPBELL, 0000
 NICOLE R. CANDELA, 0000
 EUGENE C. CANFIELD, 0000
 ERIC S. CARL, 0000
 ROBERT B. CARLSON, 0000
 DANIEL P. CARRIGG, 0000
 JAMES A. CARROLL, 0000
 DAVID B. CARSON, 0000
 DAVID M. CARSTEN, 0000
 GUY N. CARUSO, 0000
 LOUIS A. CARVALHO, 0000
 ALDEN E. CARVER, 0000
 MATTHEW O. CASE, 0000
 FRANCIS X. I. CASTELLANO, 0000
 ROLAND M. CASTRO, 0000
 KENNETH C. CAVES, 0000
 THOMAS G. CAVLEY, 0000
 FRANK K. CERNEY, 0000
 THOMAS CHABY, 0000

ANNE L. CHAPMAN, 0000
 WILLIAM E. CHASE, III, 0000
 ERIC D. CHENEY, 0000
 WILLIAM C. CHINWORTH, 0000
 DANIEL J. CHISHOLM, 0000
 HEDONG CHOI, 0000
 JOHN J. CHOI, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER A. CHRISLIP, 0000
 STEVEN J. CHRISTIAN, 0000
 JAMES L. CHRISTIE, 0000
 CYNTHIA L. CHURBUCK, 0000
 CYNTHIA C. CLARK, 0000
 ROBERT J. CLARK, 0000
 CARLTON T. CLEVENGER, 0000
 MICHAEL CLIFFORD, 0000
 MARY F. CLOE, 0000
 RICHARD F. CLOUGH, 0000
 DOUGLAS A. COCHRAN, 0000
 ROBERT B. COCO, 0000
 JAMES W. COFFMAN, 0000
 HEATHER C. COLE, 0000
 VERNON C. COLE, 0000
 ROBERT J. COLLES, JR., 0000
 KEVIN P. COLLING, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER N. COLLINS, 0000
 TIMOTHY R. COLLINS, 0000
 DANIEL M. COLMAN, 0000
 WILLIAM M. COMBES, 0000
 MICHAEL D. CONKEL, 0000
 MICHAEL A. CONNEL, 0000
 JOHN P. CONSIDINE, 0000
 JAMES M. CONWAY, 0000
 WILLIAM K. COOKE, 0000
 MICHAEL G. COONAN, 0000
 WALTER A. COPPEANS, II, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER M. CORGNATI, 0000
 RENEE R. CORNETT, 0000
 ALBERT R. COSTA, 0000
 BRETT M. COTTRELL, 0000
 MICHAEL R. COUGHLIN, 0000
 GREGORY E. COUPE, 0000
 PETER T. COURTNEY, 0000
 STEVEN P. COUTE, 0000
 NELL B. COVINGTON, 0000
 JOHN M. COX, JR., 0000
 JOHN COYNE, 0000
 STEVEN E. CRABB, 0000
 ROBERT W. CRAIG, JR., 0000
 MARK A. CREASEY, 0000
 DENNIS R. CREWS, 0000
 GARY W. CROW, 0000
 SPENCER J. CRISPPELL, 0000
 DAVID C. CRISSMAN, 0000
 PATRICIA A. CROWN, 0000
 WAYNE A. CROSS, 0000
 DAVID R. CROWE, 0000
 TIMOTHY M. CULLEN, 0000
 MARCUS CULVER, 0000
 JOANNE T. CUNNINGHAM, 0000
 ROGER L. CURRY, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL R. CURTIS, 0000
 DONALD E. J. CZARAPATA, 0000
 JEFFREY J. CZEREWKO, 0000
 WILLIAM A. DAHL, 0000
 JENNIFER A. DANIELS, 0000
 MICHAEL R. DARGEL, 0000
 JOSEPH R. DARLAK, 0000
 RACHEL E. DARE, 0000
 KEITH B. DAVIDS, 0000
 LANCE G. DAVIDSON, 0000
 SCOTT D. DAVIES, 0000
 CARL P. DAVIS, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER S. DAVIS, 0000
 DERRICK M. DAVIS, 0000
 RICHARD W. DAVIS, 0000
 TRACY S. DAX, 0000
 ALAN D. DEAN, 0000
 JAMES P. DEAN, 0000
 JOSEPH C. DEGRANDI, 0000
 RUSSELL J. DELANEY, 0000
 RAYMOND R. DELGADO, III, 0000
 MARK F. DEMERS, 0000
 DAVID A. DEMOULPIED, 0000
 THOMAS W. DENT, JR., 0000
 ROBERT J. DENTON, 0000
 TIMOTHY A. DERNBACH, 0000
 BRUCE L. DESHOTEL, 0000
 DAVID W. DEUTERMANN, 0000
 MICHAEL K. DEVAUX, 0000
 EDWARD W. DEVINNEY, II, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER T. DEWEY, 0000
 ROBERT A. DEWS, JR., 0000
 BRUCE A. DICKEY, 0000
 NICHOLAS J. DIENNA, 0000
 KAMRAN A. DIL, 0000
 DAVID L. DILLENSYDER, 0000
 JERRY B. DISMUKE, 0000
 JOHN A. DISSINGER, 0000
 THOMAS C. DISY, 0000
 DAVID J. DITALLO, 0000
 DANNY J. DOBBINS, 0000
 WILLIAM A. DODGE, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL J. DODICK, 0000
 LEONARD C. DOLLAGA, 0000
 JOHN H. DONEY, IV, 0000
 WILLIAM P. DONNELLY, JR., 0000
 ALAN D. DORRBECKER, 0000
 MICHAEL E. DOUGLASS, 0000
 THOMAS R. DOWDLE, 0000
 JOHN S. DOWNEY, 0000
 EUGENE J. DOYLE, 0000
 RICHARD M. DOYLE, 0000
 STEVEN E. DRADZYNSKI, 0000
 PATRICK J. DRAUDE, 0000
 TIMOTHY D. DREW, 0000
 JEFFREY B. DRINKARD, 0000
 RICHARD J. DROMERHAUSER, 0000
 TIMOTHY E. DRY, 0000
 BEAU V. DUARTE, 0000
 DOUGLAS R. DUCHARME, 0000
 JAMES A. DUFFORD, 0000
 JAY R. DUHADWAY, 0000
 CHARLES H. DUNAVANT, JR., 0000
 GRADY D. DUNN, 0000
 PHILIP D. DUQUETTE, 0000
 KENNETH E. DURBIN, 0000
 JOHN A. DUVAL, III, 0000
 STEPHEN DYORNIK, 0000
 ROBERT P. DYE, 0000
 ANTHONY G. DYER, 0000
 JAMES C. DYKEMA, 0000
 DAVID B. EDWARDS, 0000
 MARK A. EDWARDS, 0000
 TAYLA M. EDWARDS, 0000
 PAUL F. EINHORN, 0000
 RONALD W. ECKHOFF, 0000
 DONALD E. ELAM, 0000
 DANIEL F. ELEUTERIO, 0000
 JOHN D. ELLIOT, 0000
 ERNEST ELLIOTT, 0000
 MICHAEL E. ELMSTROM, 0000
 JAIME W. ENGDAHL, 0000
 ROBERT J. ENGELHARDT, 0000
 JOHN E. ERICKSON, JR., 0000
 TIMOTHY J. ERICSEN, 0000
 THOMAS M. ERTTEL, 0000
 PAUL A. ESQUIBEL, 0000
 JAMES M. ESQUIVEL, 0000
 HILARIO A. ETZTRADA, 0000
 ERIC C. ETZ, 0000
 MICHAEL J. EURELL, 0000
 SCOTT A. EVANS, 0000
 STEVEN T. EVERARD, 0000
 RICK E. EYMAN, 0000
 DAVID C. FADLER, 0000
 SEAN P. FAGAN, 0000
 ANDREW R. FALKENBERG, 0000
 GARRETT J. FARMAN, 0000
 JOHN M. FARWELL, 0000
 ANDREW I. FATA, 0000
 GERARD R. FEAGLES, 0000
 HANS J. FEDTMANN, 0000
 JAMES A. FELTY, 0000
 MICHAEL W. FENLEY, 0000
 HORACIO FERNANDEZ, 0000
 JUAN G. FERNANDEZ, II, 0000
 RODOLFO FERNANDEZ, 0000
 SCOTT P. FIELDS, 0000
 JACQUELINE R. FINCH, 0000
 NANCY J. FINK, 0000
 STEVEN J. FINNEY, 0000
 ERIK R. FINO, 0000
 EDWARD J. FIORENTINO, 0000
 MICHAEL R. FISHER, 0000
 MATTHEW G. FLEMING, 0000
 DENNIS E. FLORENCE, 0000
 MICHAEL O. FLORENCE, 0000
 DAVID M. FLOWERS, 0000
 MARK A. FONDREN, 0000
 KEVIN S. FORD, 0000
 DAVID L. FORSTER, 0000
 SUSAN J. FORSTER, 0000
 MARGA A. FORTNEY, 0000
 LAUREN FOX, 0000
 DEREK L. FRANKLIN, 0000
 GEORGE F. FRANZ, 0000
 BRYAN P. FRATELLO, 0000
 BRETT D. FRAZIER, 0000
 FREDERICK P. FREELAND, JR., 0000
 RONALD W. FREITAS, 0000
 MARGARET R. FRIERY, 0000
 DEREK K. FRY, 0000
 PIERRE A. FULLER, 0000
 JOHN V. FUNN, 0000
 WALLACE J. GABER, JR., 0000
 GEOFFREY S. GAGE, 0000
 ANGELITO R. GALICINAO, 0000
 JANET A. GALLAGHER, 0000
 TYSON J. GALLANDER, 0000
 PETER G. GALLUCH, 0000
 EDWARD M. GALVIN, 0000
 TIMOTHY L. GAMACHE, 0000
 LAWRENCE M. GARCIA, 0000
 JOSEPH L. GARDINER, III, 0000
 ROBERT T. GARRETTSON, 0000
 BRIAN M. GARRISON, 0000
 WILLIAM P. GARRITY, JR., 0000
 JOSEPH T. GARRY, 0000
 MELVIN C. GATES, 0000
 DOMINIC C. GAUDIN, 0000
 JASON L. GEIGER, 0000
 KENDALL GENNICK, 0000
 BRENT K. GEORGE, 0000
 BRIAN E. GEORGE, 0000
 REBECCA M. GIACOMAN, 0000
 ARTHUR GIBB, III, 0000
 ALAN E. GIBSON, 0000
 ROBERT J. GIBSON, JR., 0000
 MARK S. GILBERT, 0000
 MICHAEL W. GILES, 0000
 DONALD H. GILL, III, 0000
 HOWARD J. GILLESPIE, 0000
 CHARLES R. GILLUM, JR., 0000
 DAVID T. GLENISTER, 0000
 WALTER H. GLENN, JR., 0000
 DOUGLAS K. GLESSNER, 0000
 JEFFREY L. GOERGES, 0000
 CHARLES P. GOOD, 0000
 RICHARD A. GOODWIN, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER L. GORDON, 0000
 DANA R. GORDON, 0000
 ROBERT M. GORDON, 0000
 JOHN R. GORMAN, 0000
 RONALD P. GORMAN, JR., 0000
 WILLIAM E. GOSSETT, 0000
 BRIAN J. GOSZKOWICZ, 0000
 RICHARD S. GOURLEY, 0000
 RAYMOND D. GOYET, JR., 0000
 GLEN D. GRAEBNER, 0000
 DAVID E. GRAEFEN, 0000
 SCOTT A. GRAHAM, 0000
 BRIAN S. GRAY, 0000
 EDWARD J. GRAY, 0000
 JEFFREY J. GRAY, 0000
 JEFFREY W. GRAY, 0000
 ROBERT J. GRAY, 0000
 RICHARD A. GREEN, 0000
 ROBERT A. GREEN, 0000
 CONSTANCE M. GREENE, 0000
 JAMES M. GREENE, 0000
 GEORGE D. GREENWAY, JR., 0000
 DAVID S. GRENNER, 0000
 JEFFREY M. GRIMES, 0000
 GEOFFREY M. GRINDELAND, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER E. GRONBECH, 0000
 TIMOTHY T. GRUNDEN, 0000
 WILLIAM J. GUARINI, JR., 0000
 CORNELIUS M. GUINAN, 0000
 ANDREW J. GWYER, 0000
 RICHARD J. J. HABERLIN, 0000
 GARY L. HACKADAY, 0000
 MICHAEL W. HADER, JR., 0000
 JOHN A. HAGA, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER J. HAGEN, 0000
 JAMES E. HAIGH, 0000
 HENRY J. HAIGLER, 0000
 WILLIAM B. HALE, 0000
 MICHAEL J. HALL, 0000
 JOHN H. HALTOM, 0000
 HARRIS B. HALVORSON, II, 0000
 JEFFREY HALVORSON, 0000
 JACKIE D. HAMILTON, 0000
 MARK D. HAMILTON, 0000
 KRIS B. HANCOCK, 0000
 MICHAEL J. HANNAN, 0000
 ANTHONY P. HANSEN, 0000
 BENJAMIN B. HANSEN, 0000
 CRAIG M. HANSON, 0000
 DAVID K. HARDEN, 0000
 WILLIAM T. HARDER, 0000
 RHONDA K. HARDERS, 0000
 WALTER O. HARDIN, 0000
 REBECCA L. HARPER, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER A. HARRIS, 0000
 DANIEL A. HARRIS, 0000
 DAVID J. HARRIS, 0000
 ROY HARRISON, 0000
 ANGELA K. HART, 0000
 JOSEPH M. HART, 0000
 MICHAEL T. HART, 0000
 STEPHEN J. HARTUNG, 0000
 PAUL HARVEY, 0000
 HERBERT S. HASSELL, 0000
 JAMES E. HASSETT, JR., 0000
 DENNIS L. HASSMAN, 0000
 DAVID A. HAWKINS, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER T. HEBERT, 0000
 DAVID D. HEBERT, 0000
 JONATHAN D. HECKER, 0000
 CHRISTINE Y. HEISER, 0000
 KURT A. HELGERSON, 0000
 JOSEPH B. HENDERSON, 0000
 STEVEN R. HENDRICKS, 0000
 PAUL A. HERBERT, 0000
 GERALD R. HERMANN, 0000
 REBECCA S. HERRINGTON, 0000
 JEFFREY W. HICKOX, 0000
 GEOFFREY T. HICKS, 0000
 GREGORY L. HICKS, 0000
 JOEL T. HICKS, 0000
 EDWARD F. HILER, 0000
 ROBERT R. HILL, JR., 0000
 LYLE E. HOAG, 0000
 ROBERT T. HOAR, JR., 0000
 SCOTT P. HOARD, 0000
 DAVID W. HODGES, 0000
 JAMES E. HODGES, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER P. HOFFER, 0000
 BRIAN M. HOFFMANN, 0000
 PATRICK J. HOGAN, 0000
 SHAUN D. HOLLENBAUGH, 0000
 ANN E. HOLLENBECK, 0000
 FRANK O. HOLLEY, 0000
 CRAIG A. HOLTSLANDER, 0000
 WILLIAM F. HOMAN, 0000
 JOHN G. HONER, 0000
 GLENN M. HOPSON, 0000
 DARYL S. HORNE, 0000
 JENNIFER P. HORNE, 0000
 STEVEN L. HORRELL, 0000
 KEITH W. HOSKINS, 0000
 DAVID M. HOUFF, 0000
 MICHAEL D. HOUSTON, 0000
 BRIAN W. HOWARD III, 0000
 HUGH A. HOYT, 0000
 ROBERT F. HUBBARD, 0000
 JAY C. HUCK, 0000
 DAVID S. HUDSON, 0000
 DAVID C. HUGHES, 0000
 ADAM L. HUNT, 0000
 DAVID S. HUNT, 0000
 MARK M. HUNT, 0000
 GEORGE K. HUNTER, 0000
 MICHAEL A. HURNI, 0000
 GREGORY A. HUSMANN, 0000
 MARIA T. ILLINGWORTH, 0000
 ERIK K. ISAACSON, 0000
 MARK D. JACKSON, 0000
 TROY S. JACKSON, 0000
 BRIAN K. JACOB, 0000
 BARRY C. JAMES, 0000
 ROBERT B. JAMES, 0000
 KAMLE W. JENKS, 0000
 KYLE E. JENSEN, 0000
 MICHAEL L. JENSEN, 0000
 MICHAEL H. JOHANSSON, 0000
 BRENT L. JOHNSON, 0000
 ERIK O. JOHNSON, 0000
 KEVIN B. JOHNSON, 0000
 MARK H. JOHNSON, 0000
 MICHAEL C. JOHNSON, 0000
 MICHAEL D. JOHNSON, 0000
 GEORGE S. JOHNSTON, 0000
 MARK A. JONES, 0000
 DOREN M. JONES, 0000
 EDWARD D. JONES, 0000
 ERIC R. JONES, 0000
 JOHN M. JONES, 0000
 STANLEY C. JONES, 0000
 LARRY L. JORDAN, 0000
 JEFFREY L. JOYNT, 0000
 LETITIA D. JUBERT, 0000
 BLAND D. JULIAN, 0000
 MICHAEL JUNGE, 0000
 FREDERICK W. KACHER, 0000
 EDWIN D. KAISER, 0000
 JOSEPH Y. K. KAN, 0000
 KYLE G. KARSTENS, 0000
 DAVID L. KAYEA, 0000
 FRANTZ E. KEBREAU, 0000
 JOHN J. KEEGAN, 0000
 JOHN A. KEETON, 0000
 STANLEY O. KEEVE, JR., 0000
 SEAN P. KELLY, 0000
 THOMAS M. KEMPER, 0000
 HERBERT L. KENNEDY, III, 0000
 DAVID A. KENNETT, 0000
 MARK C. KESTER, 0000
 ROBERT E. KETTLE, 0000
 MUHAMMAD M. F. KHAN, 0000
 QUINTEN M. KING, 0000
 RICHARD T. KING, 0000
 JEFFREY R. KINSMAN, 0000
 JAMES A. KIRK, 0000
 LISA A. KIRKPATRICK, 0000
 LISA A. KIRKPATRICK, 0000
 RICHARD L. KIRMISS, 0000
 LESA J. KIRK, 0000
 DONALD E. KLEIN, 0000
 BRYAN J. KLIR, 0000
 MARY J. B. KLUG, 0000
 GRANT W. KLUG, 0000
 KENN M. KNITTEL, 0000
 KEITH A. KNUTSEN, 0000
 RAYMOND E. KOCHY, 0000
 STEVEN F. KOENIG, 0000
 DAVID K. KOHNKE, 0000
 ALAN L. KOLACKOVSKY, 0000
 NILS C. KONIKSON, 0000
 ERIK A. KOONCE, 0000
 BRETT J. KORADE, 0000
 MATTHEW A. KOSNAR, 0000
 MICHAEL A. KOSTIUK, 0000
 WILLIAM P. KRONEN, 0000
 DEBORAH S. KRONARD, 0000
 WILLIAM R. KRONZER, 0000
 JEFFREY R. KRUSLING, 0000
 BRIAN W. KUDRNA, 0000
 BRIAN S. KULLEY, 0000
 JOHN G. KURTZ, 0000
 MICHAEL A. KUYPERS, 0000
 DARRELL D. LACK, 0000
 NANCY S. LACORE, 0000
 DAVID A. LADERER, 0000
 PATRICK B. LAFONTANT, 0000
 ANDREW S. LAMBLEY, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER F. LAMOUREAUX, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER J. LANDIS, 0000
 DOUGLAS M. LANGLOIS, 0000
 JULIE M. LAPONT, 0000
 RUSSELL C. LARRATT, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER M. LATHEM, 0000
 JEROME P. LAVELY, JR., 0000
 THOMAS A. LAVERGHETTA, 0000
 CARLTON L. LAVINDER, 0000
 FREDERICK B. LAWRENCE, 0000
 CRAIG P. LAWS, 0000
 MORGAN D. LEAKE, 0000
 JAMES H. LEE, 0000
 JAMES S. LEE, 0000
 KWAN LEE, 0000
 MICHAEL J. LEHMAN, 0000
 JEFFREY B. LEHNERTZ, 0000
 MICHAEL W. LEIGH, 0000
 CURTIS C. LENDERMAN, 0000
 DEREK J. LENNEY, 0000
 DARRYL J. LENHARDT, 0000
 KEVIN P. LENOX, 0000
 TIMOTHY G. LEONARD, 0000
 BRADLEY J. LEONHARDT, 0000
 ROGER J. LERCH, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL LESHCHINSKY, 0000
 GLEN S. LEVERETTE, 0000
 MARY E. LEWELLYN, 0000
 ERIC M. LEWIS, 0000
 JONATHAN A. LEWIS, 0000
 LLEWELLYN D. LEWIS, 0000
 MICHAEL D. LEWIS, 0000
 RONALD T. LEWIS, 0000
 THERESA A. LEWIS, 0000
 TODD A. LEWIS, 0000
 WARREN N. LIPSCOMB, III, 0000
 JOSEPH A. LISTOPAD, 0000
 MATTHEW J. LITTLETON, 0000
 KEVIN F. LIVOLSI, 0000
 ADAM C. LOCHMANN, 0000
 JANET E. LOMAX, 0000
 KENNETH S. LONG, 0000
 RUSSELL G. LONGLEY, 0000
 BARBARA L. LOPEZ, 0000
 ERNESTO LOZANO, 0000
 EDGAR LUCAS, 0000
 TIMOTHY C. LUND, 0000
 JOHN A. MACDONALD, 0000
 ALVAH B. MACDOUGALL, JR., 0000
 CORAL L. MACINTOSH, 0000
 TERRENCE MACK, 0000
 RANDY N. MACTAL, 0000
 PAUL J. MAGOON, 0000
 JANET K. MAHN, 0000
 RICHARD D. MAHONE, JR., 0000
 FERNANDO MALDONADO, 0000
 CHARLES W. MALONE, 0000
 SHAWN P. MALONE, 0000
 MICHAEL J. MANGIAPANNE, 0000
 JEFFREY S. MANNING, 0000
 PETER M. MANTZ, 0000
 STEVEN J. MARINELLO, 0000
 MATTHEW J. MARONE, 0000
 DAVID J. MARTAK, 0000
 EUGENE T. MARTIN, III, 0000
 MICHIO K. MARTIN, 0000
 STEPHEN D. MARTIN, 0000
 MARK M. MARTY, 0000
 CATHERINE M. MASAR, 0000
 MARK D. MASKIELL, 0000
 KENT R. MATHES, 0000
 ALAN L. MATHIS, 0000
 GARY L. MATHIS, 0000
 KEVIN M. MATULEWICZ, 0000
 THOMAS E. MAURER, 0000
 DAVID M. MAXWELL, 0000
 DONALD G. MAY, 0000
 SEAN C. MAYBEE, 0000
 TODD A. MAYFIELD, 0000
 RAYMOND C. MCBROOM, 0000
 JOHN P. MCCALLEN, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER M. MCCARTHY, 0000
 MICHAEL A. MCCARTNEY, 0000
 JEFFREY W. MCCAULEY, 0000
 ROBERT A. MCCORD, 0000
 RICHARD C. MCCORMACK, 0000
 RUSSELL S. MCCORMACK, 0000
 ALLEN H. MCCOY, 0000
 ANTOINETTE MCCrackEN, 0000
 MARY J. O. MCCREA, 0000
 DENNIS W. MCCADDEN, 0000
 KEVIN C. MCGOFF, 0000
 JAMES T. MCGOVERN, 0000
 KEVIN MCGOWAN, 0000
 JAMES P. MCGRATH, III, 0000
 JOHN P. MCGRATH, 0000
 WILLIAM C. MCKINNEY, 0000
 VAN P. MCCLAWHORN, 0000
 RICHARD A. MCLEAN, 0000
 MARK W. MCMAUS, 0000
 MICHAEL M. MCMILLAN, JR., 0000
 PAUL R. MCMULLEN, 0000
 THOMAS E. MCNERNEY, III, 0000
 SCOTT G. MCWETHY, 0000
 TYLER L. MEADOR, 0000
 DAVID A. MEECHAN, 0000
 ROBERT L. MEEKER, JR., 0000
 DAVID G. MELONSON, 0000
 PORFIRIO MENDOZA, JR., 0000
 JOHN V. MENONI, 0000
 GREGORY C. MERK, 0000
 KURT C. MERKLING, JR., 0000
 KEVIN D. MEYERS, 0000
 KYLE T. MICHAEL, 0000
 PATRICK M. MIDDLETON, 0000
 WADE R. MIKULLA, 0000
 JIMMIE L. MILLER, 0000
 ROBERT C. MILLER, 0000
 WILLIAM G. MILLER, 0000
 WILLIAM K. MIMS, 0000
 DALE R. MINICH, 0000
 ALLEN R. MINICK, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER C. MISNER, 0000
 ABRAHAM K. MITCHELL, 0000
 CLELAN R. MOFFITT, 0000
 JOHN C. MOHN, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL F. MONAGLE, 0000
 DEBORAH R. MONROE, 0000
 GEORGE T. MOODY, 0000
 RONALD F. MOODY, 0000
 KEITH G. MOORE, 0000
 MICHAEL R. MOORE, 0000
 SCOTT D. MORAN, 0000
 KIMBERLY S. MOREIRA, 0000
 WILLIAM K. MORENO, 0000
 REECE D. MORGAN, 0000
 DAVID N. MORIN, 0000
 KEVIN R. MORRISON, 0000
 SHENAE Y. MORROW, 0000
 DARREN V. MORTON, 0000
 JON T. MOSTYN, 0000
 BRIAN C. MOUM, 0000
 ALBERT G. MOUSSEAU, JR., 0000
 JOSEPH A. MOYER, 0000
 PATRICK T. MOYNIHAN, 0000
 PATRICK R. MUELLER, 0000
 EDWARD D. MURDOCK, 0000
 JOHN S. MURGATROYD, 0000
 GERALD D. MURPHY, 0000
 JOHN B. MUSTIN, 0000
 SERDAR M. MUTLU, 0000
 BARBARA J. MYTYCH, 0000
 KENNETH E. NAFRADA, 0000
 JOSEPH P. NAMAN, 0000
 MICHAEL D. NASH, 0000
 ANDREW W. NEAL, 0000
 JEFFREY W. NEGUS, 0000
 JOHN D. NELL, 0000
 RICHARD M. NELMS, JR., 0000
 DAVID A. NELSEN, 0000
 JAMES R. NELSON, 0000
 KARLA J. NEMEC, 0000
 CLINTON A. NEUMAN, 0000
 PAUL V. NEUZIL, 0000
 JOHN P. NEWCOMER, 0000
 RICHARD P. NEWTON, 0000
 KENNETH A. NIEDERBERGER, 0000
 DAN A. NIGHTINGALE, 0000
 MICHAEL A. NIKOLICH, 0000
 DAVID H. NORMAN, 0000
 MICHAEL K. NORTIER, 0000
 STEVEN D. NORTON, 0000
 YVONNE D. NORTON, 0000
 DEVON C. NUGENT, 0000
 TODD M. NUNNO, 0000
 HAROLD O. OAKLEY, 0000

JOHN M. O'BRIEN, 0000
SEAN P. O'BRIEN, 0000
STEPHEN F. O'BRYAN, JR.,
0000
RICHARD F. O'CONNELL,
0000
JAMES S. OGAWA, 0000
ANTHONY L. OHL, 0000
KLAS W. OHMAN, 0000
MICHAEL J. O'KEEFE, 0000
HAL S. OKEY, 0000
JOHN A. OKON, 0000
PETER S. OLEP, 0000
EDWARD OLEYKOWSKI, 0000
CHRISTOPHER V. OLSON,
0000
JON R. OLSON, 0000
MICHAEL N. OLUVIC, 0000
JULIE O'ROURKE, 0000
PEDRO J. ORTIZ, 0000
MICHAEL J. OSBORN, 0000
RAYMOND B. OTT, 0000
JAMIE R. OTTO, 0000
JOHN F. OUELLETTE, 0000
CLARK J. OVERBAUGH, 0000
JOE V. OVERSTREET, 0000
CHARLES L. OWENS, 0000
PATRICK M. OWENS, 0000
HOWARD PACE, 0000
DAVID M. PADULA, 0000
DONALD F. PAGLIARO, 0000
MELODIE S. PALMER, 0000
ROBERT D. PALMER, 0000
STEPHEN E. PALMER, 0000
JOHN S. PAMER, 0000
JAMES M. PARISH, 0000
JAMES P. PARSIGEN, 0000
JOHN J. PARK, 0000
GREGORY J. PARKER, 0000
MARCUS L. PARKER, 0000
SCOTT A. PARVIN, 0000
LAURENCE M. PATRICK, 0000
MICHAEL D. PATTERSON,
0000
WAYNE M. PAULETTE, 0000
LAURA J. PEARSON, 0000
DAREN R. PELKIE, 0000
MARK E. PELTON, 0000
WILLIAM P. PENNINGTON,
0000
MICHAEL J. PERRY, 0000
STEFAN PERRY, 0000
JOHN A. PESTOVIC, JR., 0000
AARON S. PETERS, 0000
RANDALL V. PETERS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L.
PETERSON, 0000
MICHAEL C. PETERSON, 0000
TRAVIS A. PETERSON, 0000
TIMOTHY H.
PFANNENSTEIN, 0000
JESSICA PFEIFFERKORN,
0000
DANIEL M. PFEIFF, 0000
TUAN N. PHAM, 0000
TUNG X. PHAM, 0000
MICHAEL W. PHARES, 0000
CLIFTON T. PHILLIPS, 0000
CURTIS K.M. PHILLIPS, 0000
PETER C. PHILLIPS, 0000
ERIC R. PHIPPS, 0000
THOMAS C. PICKETT, JR.,
0000
MICHAEL R. PIERCE, 0000
DAVID A. PIERSON, 0000
MICHAEL E. PIETRYKA, 0000
NOEL A. PITONIAK, 0000
DARREN R. PLATH, 0000
MICHAEL A. POLIDORO, 0000
PHILLIP W. POLIQUIN, 0000
BRYAN P. PONCUP, 0000
WILLIAM R. POPE, 0000
MALCOLM H. POTTS, 0000
DOUGLAS A. POWERS, 0000
MICHAEL S. PRATHER, 0000
CHARLES A. PRATT, 0000
MATTHEW S. PREGMON, 0000
PERRY D. PREUETT, 0000
MICHAEL J. PREWITT, 0000
ERIC K. PRIME, 0000
MARK A. PROKOPIUS, 0000
KEVIN J. PROTZMAN, 0000
ROBERT S. PRYCEJONES,
0000
JOHN A. PUCCIARELLI, 0000
ROBERT J. PUDLO, 0000
JOSEPH P. PUGH, 0000
GERARD F. QUINLAN, 0000
PAUL D. QUINN, 0000
CHARLES E. QUINTAS, 0000
DAVID A. QUIRK, 0000
JOSEPH V. QUIRK, 0000
HERBERT R. RACE, JR., 0000
NICK C. RADNEY, 0000
SALVATORE P.
RAFANELLO, 0000
JAMES R. RAIMONDO, 0000
DAVID C. RAINE, 0000
THOMAS A. RAINVILLE, 0000
TIM RAINWATER, 0000
BRUCE C. RASCHIE, 0000
JAMES J. RASMUSSEN, JR.,
0000
EUGENE R. RATHGEBER,
0000
JAMES D. RAULSTEN, 0000

DEAN T. RAWLS, 0000
JOSEPH P. REASON, JR., 0000
KENNETH L. REBER, 0000
DOUGLAS E. RECKAMP, 0000
CHARLES V. RED, JR., 0000
CARL S. REED, 0000
LEONARD E. REED, 0000
ROBERT M. REEVES, 0000
ANGUS P. REGIER, 0000
PHILIP N. REGIER, 0000
MICHAEL R. REIN, 0000
DENNIS W. REINHARDT, 0000
BARON V. REINHOLD, 0000
MARK W. RENAUD, 0000
CURT A. RENSHAW, 0000
GREGORY A. REPPAR, 0000
JAY S. RICHARDS, 0000
TIMOTHY P. RICHARDT, 0000
TIMOTHY E. RIEGLE, 0000
DALE C. RIELAGE, 0000
KIM H. RIGAZZI, 0000
DENNIS B. RICHIE, 0000
WILLIAM M. ROACH, 0000
DION A. ROBB, 0000
DONALD A. ROBERTSON,
0000
JOHN D. ROBINSON, 0000
JOSEPH R. ROBSON, JR., 0000
MICHAEL R. ROCHELEAU,
0000
CINDY M. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
HECTOR L. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
JOSEPH A. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
BRENDAN P. ROGERS, 0000
NESTOR E. ROMERO, 0000
BRAN K. ROSGEN, 0000
MARK E. RUSK, 0000
DONALD W. RUSSELL, 0000
TED M. RUSSELL, 0000
MICHAEL D. RUSSO, 0000
MICHAEL L. RUSSO, 0000
DAVID M. RUTH, 0000
STEVEN M. RUTHERFORD,
0000
MICHAEL S. RYAN, 0000
RICHARD J. RYAN, 0000
JOHN A. SAGER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. SAINDON,
0000
ANTHONY W. SAMER, 0000
DAVID A. SAMPLES, 0000
DOUGLAS A. SAMPSON, 0000
BENNIE SANCHEZ, 0000
THOMAS E. SANCHEZ, 0000
MATTHEW R. SANDBERG,
0000
DAVID P. SANDERS, 0000
JOHN R. SANDERSON, IV,
0000
MALACHY D. SANDIE, 0000
GREGORY M. SANDWAY, 0000
JOHN P. SANFORD, 0000
ANTONIO P. SANJOSE, JR.,
0000
EUGENE A. SANTIAGO, 0000
DAVID D. SANTOS, 0000
CARLOS A. SARDIELLO, 0000
STEPHEN K. SAULS, 0000
CHARLES SAUTER, 0000
MICHAEL A. SCHACHTER,
0000
KEITH E. SCHAFFLER, 0000
LOUIS J. SCHAGER, JR., 0000
PHILIP M. SCHEFE, 0000
FRANK M. SCHENK, JR., 0000
GREGORY J. SCHMEISER,
0000
KENT R. SCHRADER, 0000
CHARLES W. SCHREIBER,
0000
KARAN A. SCHRIVER, 0000
THOMAS S. SCHUMACHER,
0000
MARK C. SCOTT, 0000
SHARIL L. SCOTT, 0000
STEPHEN D. SCOTTY, 0000
KARLA W. SCROGGINS, 0000
SCOTT R. SENAY, 0000
ROBERT N. SEVERINGHAUS,
0000
SEAN T. SEXTON, 0000
BRYAN P. SHEEHAN, 0000
THAD M. SHELTON, 0000
STEVEN B. SHEPARD, 0000
MICHAEL E. SHERWIN, 0000
LEONARD M. SHETLER, 0000
RANDALL B. SHOCKEY, 0000
DENNIS A. SHOOK, 0000
KIRSTINA D. SHORE, 0000
JOHN J. SHRIVER, 0000
MICHAEL L. SHUMBERGER,
0000
DENNIS W. SICKEL, 0000
TODD M. SIDDALL, 0000
EDWARD A. SIMILA, 0000
DONALD B. SIMMONS, II,
0000
KEVIN S. SIMOES, 0000
DAVID C. SIMS, 0000
GREGORY J. SINGERLE, JR.,
0000
MICHAEL J. SINGLETON,
0000
JOHN P. SIPES, JR., 0000
JAMES G. SIRES, 0000
DAVID M. SLIGER, 0000

JAMES F. SLOAN, III, 0000
WAYNE F. SLOCUM, 0000
TIMOTHY B. SMEETON, 0000
JEFFREY E. SMITH, 0000
MARY E. SMITH, 0000
TOMMIE C. SMITH, 0000
WESLEY A. SMITH, 0000
WESLEY S. SMITH, 0000
JOHN J. SNIEGOWSKI, 0000
ERIN G. SNOW, 0000
TAMARA L. SNYDER, 0000
MARK W. SORTINO, 0000
MICHAEL J. SOWA, 0000
ROBERT J. SPANE, II, 0000
CHARLES C. SPARKS, II, 0000
PAUL C. SPEDERO, JR., 0000
JOHN M. SPERDELOZZI,
0000
TIMOTHY W. SPITSER, 0000
PAUL B. SPOHN, 0000
TIMOTHY W. STAATS, 0000
RICHARD M. STACPOOLE,
0000
BRETTON C. STAFFORD, 0000
DORA U.L. STAGGS, 0000
DAVID J. STAMM, 0000
DOUGLAS H. STANFORD,
0000
ROBERT W. STANLEY, 0000
WILLIAM F. STARR, 0000
RICHARD B. STEELE, 0000
KIRK A. STEFFENSEN, 0000
LEIP E. STEINBAUGH, 0000
EHRICH W. STEINMETZ, 0000
JOSEPH S. STENAKA, 0000
LEE C. STEPHENS, 0000
MARC A. STERN, 0000
BENJAMIN J. STEVENS, 0000
MICHAEL J. STEVENS, 0000
WILLIAM C. STEWART, 0000
CHRISTOPHER STEYN, 0000
RONALD J. STINSON, 0000
EDWARD J. STOCKTON, 0000
JAMES G. STONEMAN, 0000
MARK R. STOOPS, 0000
KIRK A. STORK, 0000
HAROLD W. STOUT, 0000
SHELBY STRATTON, 0000
DAVID A. STREIGHT, 0000
LAWRENCE J. STROBEL,
0000
MICHAEL O. STUART, 0000
LYLE D. STUFFLE, 0000
WILLIAM C. SUGGS, 0000
JERRY L. SULLIVAN, 0000
DAVID P. SUPPLE, 0000
JOSEPH A. SURETTE, 0000
PARKER W. SWAN, 0000
SCOTT H. SWORDS, 0000
ROBERT M. SYMULESKI,
0000
JAMES S. TALBERT, 0000
JAMES B. TANNAHILL, 0000
CHRIS E. TAYLOR, 0000
GUY A. TAYLOR, 0000
JAMES E. TAYLOR, 0000
DEREK L. TEACHOUT, 0000
MICHAEL W. TEMME, 0000
THOMAS R. TENNANT, 0000
HENRY J.M. THAXTON, 0000
RICHARD A. THIEL, JR., 0000
JOHN J. THOMPSON, 0000
KENT F. THOMPSON, 0000
PAUL A. THOMPSON, 0000
RICHARD W. THOMPSON,
0000
MARK E. THORNELL, 0000
MICHAEL L. THRALL, 0000
DARCEY J. THURESON, 0000
MARIE A. THURMAN, 0000
BRADLEY S. TIDWELL, 0000
KEITH G. TIERNAN, 0000
KATHRYN E. TIERNEY, 0000
RODNEY P. TISHNER, 0000
JAMES T. TOBIN, 0000
EDWIN TOBON, 0000
WILLIAM E. TOEPPE, 0000
CHARLES J. TOLEDO, 0000
ERIC T. TOOKE, 0000
RAYMOND M. TORTORELLI,
0000
THOMAS A. TRAPP, 0000
TARA K. TRAYNOR, 0000
THOMAS J. TREACY, 0000
BRETT H. TREESE, 0000
GEORGE F. TRICE, JR., 0000
DAVID M. TRZECIAKIEWICZ,
0000
JAMES M. TURECEK, 0000
PHILLIP H. TURNER, 0000
TROY J. TWOREK, 0000
ROGER R. ULLMAN, II, 0000
MONTE L. ULMER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 5582:

To be lieutenant commander

MARC E. ARENA, 0000
SCOTT A. CURTICE, 0000
KENNETH C. EARHART, 0000
JOHN G. ESAREY, 0000
PRESTON S. GABLE, 0000
TAMARA J. HOOVER, 0000

CHRISTINA L. ULSES, 0000
BART J. UMENTUM, 0000
LOUIS T. UNREIN, 0000
RAJAN VAIDYANATHAN,
0000
JOHN L. VALADEZ, 0000
SALLY A. VANHORN, 0000
JEFFREY T.
VANLOBENSELS, 0000
ANDREW B. VARNER, 0000
MICHAEL S. VARNEY, 0000
PETER G. VASELY, 0000
JOSEPH A. VASILE, 0000
RONALD E. VAUGHT, 0000
MICHAEL VERNAZZA, 0000
GENE B. VETTER, 0000
CHARLES H. VICKERS, 0000
CLARO W. VILLAREAL, 0000
TRACY A. VINCENT, 0000
BRADLEY E. C. VOLDEN,
0000
PAUL E. VOLLE, 0000
SUZANNE H. VONLUHRTE,
0000
JOHN F. WADE, 0000
WILLIAM E. WALDIN, 0000
WILLIAM C. WALKER, II, 0000
DOUGLAS H. WALKER, 0000
JEFFREY J. WALKER, 0000
JOEL R. WALKER, 0000
PATRICK J. WALKER, 0000
JEROME WALLACE, JR., 0000
RICKEY D. WALLY, 0000
MICHAEL E. WALLIS, 0000
JOSEPH E. WALTER, JR.,
0000
JON D. WALTERS, 0000
DAVID E. WARD, 0000
JOHN M. WARD, 0000
MARGARET M. WARD, 0000
ROBERT J. WARE, 0000
DENNIS J. WARREN, 0000
DAVID H. WATERMAN, 0000
TODD M. WATKINS, 0000
JILL C. WATSON, 0000
STEVEN H. WATSON, 0000
STEVEN D. WEBER, 0000
TIMOTHY R. WEBER, 0000
ROY T. WEDGEWOOD, 0000
WILLIAM A. WEEDON, 0000
KENNETH L. WEEKS, III, 0000
ANDREW J. WEGMAN, 0000
EVAN W. WEINTRAUB, 0000
MARK W. WEISGERBER, 0000
STEVEN G. WELDON, 0000
RICHARD T. WELHAM, 0000
DANIEL A. WELLS, 0000
DEAN E. WENGE, 0000
PAUL G. WERRING, JR., 0000
THOMAS L. WESTER, 0000
EDWARD J. WETZEL, 0000
CRAIG M. WEVLEY, 0000
CHARLES R. WHEELER, 0000
JEFFREY P. WHETMAN, 0000
MICHELLE K. WHISENHANT,
0000
DAVID A. WHITE, 0000
ERASMUS D. WHITE, 0000
WILLIAM S. WHITE, 0000
SCOTT E. WHITMORE, 0000
MICHAEL V. WIECZOREK,
0000
ERIC S. WIESE, 0000
JAMES W. WIGGS, 0000
GEORGE M. WIKOFF, 0000
DEAN R. WILL, 0000
PAT L. WILLIAMS, 0000
RACQUEL M. WILLIAMS, 0000
ROBERT A. WILLIAMS, 0000
SUSAN M. WILLY, 0000
ANHTUAN N. WILSON, 0000
DEAN A. WILSON, 0000
HAROLD M. WILSON, 0000
DAVID G. WIRTH, 0000
ANDREW V. WITHERSPOON,
0000
THOMAS A. WOLFE, 0000
CYNTHIA M. WOMBLE, 0000
WILLIAM P. WOOD, 0000
HAROLD T. WORKMAN, 0000
DANIEL C. WORRA, 0000
JOSEPH W. WORTHINGTON,
0000
BRYAN R. WRIGHT, 0000
KEITH B. YAUGER, 0000
STEPHEN C. YEAGER, 0000
DONNA M. YOUNG, 0000
FORREST YOUNG, 0000
MARK V. ZABOLOTNY, 0000
CHRISTIAN W. ZAUNER, 0000
MICHAEL L. ZIEGLER, 0000
KEVIN D. ZIOMEK, 0000
JOHN M. ZUZICH, 0000

IVAN K. LESNIK, 0000
EDWIN T. LONG, 0000

To be lieutenant

SETH D. ABBOTT, 0000
JAMES R. ACKERMAN II,
0000
CHRISTINE N. ACTON, 0000
PAUL R. ALLEN, 0000
ROBERT W. ANDERSON, 0000
VANESSA D. ANJARD, 0000
CARLOS A. ARANDA, 0000
JOSEPH J. ARRIOLA, 0000
MARTIN F. ARRIOLA, 0000
ELIZABETH A. ASHBY, 0000
BRANTLEY F. BAIN, 0000
ANDREW B. BAKER, 0000
JONATHAN G. BAKER, 0000
JOHN M. BARRETT, 0000
GREGORY R. BART, 0000
DONNA M. BARTEE, 0000
WILLIAM H. BAXTER, 0000
JEFFREY S. BELISO, 0000
AIDA S. BERNAL, 0000
JEFFREY J. BERNASCONI,
0000
VALERIE J. BEUTEL, 0000
KRISTEN M. BIRDSONG, 0000
KAREN H. BUSIGNO, 0000
WALTER D. BRAFFORD, 0000
AARON G. BRODSKY, 0000
REGINALD C. BROWN, 0000
BRADLEY D. BUCHANAN,
0000
KAREN J. BUENGER, 0000
JASON A. BURNS, 0000
BRENT A. BUSHY, 0000
VIRGINIA L. BUTLER, 0000
RONNIE M. CANDILORO, 0000
ANN M. CASE, 0000
MATTHEW CASE, 0000
JEROME J. CHRISTENSEN,
0000
JEFFREY CLARK, 0000
LORI J. CLAYTON, 0000
SCOTT O. CLOYD, 0000
TIMOTHY A. COAKLEY, 0000
MICHAEL L. COE, 0000
LAURA K. COMSTOCK, 0000
GREGORY W. COOK, 0000
CHERYL J. COSTA, 0000
ANDREW B. CRIGLER, 0000
ROBERT J. CROW, 0000
JOHN M. DANIELS, 0000
CASSANDRA
DARDENBARNES, 0000
BRADLEY S. DAVIS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER D.
DECLERCQ, 0000
KRISTA J. DELLAPINA, 0000
FARIA DIAZ, 0000
THOMAS L. DORWIN, 0000
BARBARA J. DROBINA, 0000
JOEL D. DULAH, 0000
GARETT E. EDMONDS, 0000
KAREN L. EGGLESTON, 0000
JOHN W. EJNIK, 0000
DANIEL E. ELDRIDGE, 0000
LORRAINE A. ENGLISH, 0000
TODD M. EVANS, 0000
BRADLEY A. FAGAN, 0000
KRISTIN M. FERER, 0000
GERRY M. FERNANDEZ, JR.,
0000
GLENN S. FISCHER, 0000
BARBARA H. FLETCHER,
0000
JOSEPH P. FLOTT, 0000
DAVID R. FOSTER, 0000
SHELLY V. FRANK, 0000
THERESA L. FRITH, 0000
ORLANDO J. FUGARO, 0000
IVAN R. GARCIA, 0000
EUGENE K. GARLAND, 0000
JOSEPH R. GARNER, 0000
BARTON J. GARRISON, 0000
MARY B. GERASCH, 0000
DAVID G. GIBBONS, 0000
ROBERT W. GNEITING, 0000
MARY P. GREER, 0000
DARRELL S. GREGG, 0000
DANIEL W. GRIPPO, 0000
DEBORAH D. HALVORSEN,
0000
LAURA E. HAMILTON, 0000
SHANNON K. HAMILTON,
0000
BARBARA T. HANNA, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. HANSEN,
0000
JONATHAN M. HARTIENS,
0000
JOSEPH M. HENRIQUEZ, 0000
WILLIAM E. HENRY, JR.,
0000
MARIO P. HERRERA, 0000
LARRY W. HERTER, 0000
KATHLEEN E. HEWITT, 0000
SHEILA HEWITT, 0000
STEPHEN F. HIGUERA, 0000
LAURA J. M. HOBBS, 0000
DENISE L. HOFFMAN, 0000
EMILIE R. HOOK, 0000
DEREK O. HOOKS, 0000

ANTHONY C. MILLER, 0000
EILEEN SCANLAN, 0000
PGAYLE D. SHAFFER, 0000

WILLIAM J. HUGHES, IV,
0000
JULIE A. HUNT, 0000
CHARLES E. HURST, 0000
LEON R. JABLOW, IV, 0000
RONNY L. JACKSON, 0000
JEFFREY J. JAKUBOSKI,
0000
CHRISTINA A. JAMIESON,
0000
ALBERT S. JANIN, IV, 0000
KARON V. JONES, 0000
ULETHA M. JONES, 0000
PAUL C. KAPFER, 0000
STEPHANIE A. KAPFER, 0000
FRANK T. KATZ, 0000
DUANE M. KEMP, 0000
SHARI D. KENNEDY, 0000
YOLANDA KERN, 0000
ANDREW S. KIM, 0000
KEVIN E. KING, 0000
TROY L. KING, 0000
REBECCA A. KISER, 0000
MARK F. KLEIN, 0000
MARCI C. LABOSSIERE, 0000
SUSAN D. LABOY, 0000
WILLIAM S. LARAGY, 0000
CINDY L. LASWELL, 0000
VERONICA A. LAW, 0000
KATRINA M. LEEK, 0000
DENISE M. LEVELING, 0000
ANDREW D. LEVITZ, 0000
MICHAEL LIBERATORE, 0000
BRIAN R. LOMAX, 0000
KEVIN T. LONG, 0000
TRACY L. LOPEZ, 0000
EVA M. LOSER, 0000
PETER M. LUDWIG, 0000
JOHN S. LUGO, 0000
MICHAEL P. LYNN, 0000
JENNIFER J. MACBAIN, 0000
DENNIS B. MACDOUGALL,
0000
IAN A. MACKINNON, 0000
CARL H. MANEMEIT, 0000
PAUL A. MANNER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. MANNION,
0000
DAVID M. MARTIN, 0000
DAYNE B. MARYOTT, 0000
MICHAEL R. MAULE, 0000
CAREN L. MCDURDY, 0000
ERIC J. MCDONALD, 0000
STUART R. MCKENNA, 0000
CATHLEEN M. MCQUADE,
0000
PATRICK G. MEIER, 0000
PHILIP B. MELTMAR, 0000
ROSARIO P. MERRELL, 0000
ANDREW P. MESHEL, 0000
XANTHE R. MIEDEMA, 0000
JULIE K. MILLER, 0000
PAUL C. MILLER, 0000
ANN K. MINAMI, 0000
CHAD A. MITCHELL, 0000
MONICA E. MITCHELL, 0000
CARLOS MONTANEZ, 0000
JOHN P. MOON, 0000
KARIN S. MORRAN, 0000
MARK S. MORRIS, 0000
DANIEL MORRISCH, 0000
SYLVIA I. NAGY, 0000
JAMEN A. NEUMAN, 0000
THANH V. NGUYEN, 0000
PAMELA E. NICKRAND, 0000
JEREMY C. NIKEL, 0000
JOHNNY M. NILSEN, 0000
EDWARD B. O'BRIEN, III,
0000
NATHAN R. OGLE, 0000
JANICE K. O'GRADY, 0000
SHIRLEY E. OGUN, 0000
JOHN A. OLIVEIRA, 0000
CLYDE D. OWEN, 0000
ERIC OXENDINE, 0000
JERRI A. PALMER, 0000
PHILIP D. PARKER, 0000
DOUGLAS K. PARRISH, 0000
JUSTICE M. PARROTT, 0000
JOE T. PATTERSON, III, 0000
BETHANY L. PATTON, 0000
DONALD D. PEALOT, 0000
BARTON L. PEILPOTT, 0000
JOSE M. PI, 0000
ROBERT D. POLLEY, JR.,
0000
BRIAN F. PRENDERGAST,
0000
COLE C. PRIZLER, 0000
PAUL A. PURDY, JR., 0000
EVELYN M. QUATTRONE,
0000
MARK K. RAKESTRAW, 0000
LINDA I. RAKOSNIK, 0000
DALE D. RAMIREZ, 0000
DEIDRA M. RAMOS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. REDDIN,
0000
DAVID C. REITER, 0000
JOANNA M. REITER, 0000

JANELLE A. RHODERICK, 0000
 JEFFREY P. RICHARD, 0000
 TIMOTHY R. RICHARDSON, 0000
 SHAWN A. RICKLEFS, 0000
 GEORGE P. RILEY, 0000
 JOHN ROROS, 0000
 KEVIN S. ROSENBERG, 0000
 PAUL W. ROUSSEAU, 0000
 ROBIN L. ROWEADLER, 0000
 BRET A. RUSSELL, 0000
 REGINALD T. RUSSELL, 0000
 SCOTT A. RUSSELL, 0000
 PHILIP J. RYNN, 0000
 LINDA M. SALEH, 0000
 SCOTT A. SAMPLES, 0000
 JOSE L. SANCHEZ, 0000
 PETER M. SCHEUFELE, 0000
 GRACE K. SEABROOK, 0000
 SHERRY J. SEAGRAM, 0000
 DAVID E. SEMON, 0000
 JAMES L. SHELTON, 0000
 LATANYA E. SIMMS, 0000
 STEPHEN D. SIMS, 0000
 TANYA B. SINCLAIR, 0000
 JOHN P. SMETAK, 0000
 CAROL A. SMITH, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER R. SMITH, 0000
 ERIN G. SNOW, 0000
 GEOFFREY W. SPENCER, 0000
 MARK O. STEARNS, 0000
 MICHAEL J. STEFFEN, 0000
 TODD M. STEIN, 0000
 MELISSA R. STERNLICHT, 0000
 TIMOTHY D. STONE, 0000
 TIFFANY J. STYLES, 0000
 SANDRA M. SUDDUTH, 0000
 JOHN D. SULLIVAN, 0000

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

CYNTHIA J. ANDRESEN, 0000
 REID B. APPLEQUIST, 0000
 CLAUDE W. ARNOLD, JR., 0000
 STEVEN A. ATTENWEILER, 0000
 JOHANNES M. BAILEY, 0000
 SAMANTHA D. BALDWIN, 0000
 DEETTA L. BARNES, 0000
 MELISSA A. BARNETT, 0000

CHARLES D. SWIFT, 0000
 DEANNA L. THOMAS, 0000
 CARLA K. THORSON, 0000
 CONNIE L. TODD, 0000
 TOBBY A. TOLBERT, 0000
 VALORIE A. TOTH, 0000
 JENNIFER L. TREDWAY, 0000
 JOANNE M. TUIN, 0000
 JEFFREY F. TULLIS, 0000
 PATRICK O. TURPIN, 0000
 SUSAN R. TUSSEY, 0000
 LISA M. UMPHREY, 0000
 JOHN E. URBAN, 0000
 JODY A. VANKLEEF, 0000
 NIEVA K. VANLEER, 0000
 JOHN F. VANPATTEN, 0000
 JOHN A. VAZZANO, 0000
 ESTELA I. VELEZ, 0000
 CHERRI L. VILHAUER, 0000
 DAWN M. WAGNER, 0000
 KURT'T H. WALTON, 0000
 CHAD E. WEBSTER, 0000
 T'YNAH R. WEST, 0000
 WENDY WIESE, 0000
 BARRY E. WILCOX, II, 0000
 JACK E. WILCOX, 0000
 FLOYD M. WILLIAMS, JR., 0000
 SHENEKIA D. WILLIAMS, 0000
 DOUGLAS A. WINEGARDNER, 0000
 LISA M. WING, 0000
 THERESA M. WOOD, 0000
 REGINALD G. WYCOFF, JR., 0000
 NICOLAS D.I. YAMODIS, 0000
 DEBRA L. YNIGUEZ, 0000
 LENORA J. YOUNG, 0000
 KIM T. ZABLAN, 0000
 JANICE E. ZERISHNEK, 0000

ERNESTO B. BARRIGA, 0000
 SUZANNE L. BLANTON, 0000
 DONALD W. BOWKER, 0000
 DONNA N. BRADLEY, 0000
 THOMAS R. BROADWAY, JR., 0000
 CHRISTOPHER P. BROWN, 0000
 ELIZABETH M. BROWN, 0000
 ROBERT B. BUCHANAN, 0000
 KELLY M. CANTLEY, 0000

JOHN E. CARROLL, II, 0000
 STEVEN B. CARROLL, 0000
 YONG K. CHA, 0000
 RALPH C. CICCII, JR., 0000
 CHRISTOPHER F. CIGNA, 0000
 MARK A. CLARK, 0000
 RICHARD A. CLARK, 0000
 LANA M. COLE, 0000
 BILLIE D. COLEY, 0000
 DANIEL W. COOK, 0000
 JON C. CRUZ, 0000
 DAVID A. CZACHOROWSKI, 0000
 EILEEN J. DANDREA, 0000
 JOEL D. DAVIS, 0000
 CONSTANTINO F. DELACRUZ, 0000
 WHITNEY E. DELOACH, 0000
 WILBER C. DELORME, 0000
 WILLIAM F. DENTON, 0000
 NAOMI N. DOMINGO, 0000
 PAUL B. DOUGHERTY, 0000
 DAVID E. DOYLE, 0000
 FRANK L. DUGIE, 0000
 ROBERT H. DURANT, 0000
 JOHN E. EAVES, JR., 0000
 MELISSA A. FARINO, 0000
 STEFAN C. FARRINGTON, 0000
 PAUL A. FEIKEMA, 0000
 PAUL S. FERMO, 0000
 LONNIE L. FIELDS, 0000
 EARL D. FILLMORE, 0000
 JEAN F. FISAK, 0000
 KENNETH L. FLAHERTY, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER G. FOLLIN, 0000
 PATRICK M. FOSTER, 0000
 KEITH A. FREESE, 0000
 RHONDA A. L. GABEL, 0000
 ORLANDO GALLARDO, JR., 0000
 NATASHA A. GAMMON, 0000
 DANIEL G. GARCIA, 0000
 JAYSON L. GARRELS, 0000
 MARK R. GARRIGUS, 0000
 JOHN D. GATES, 0000
 WILLIAM P. GILROY, 0000
 BRADLEE E. GOECKNER, 0000
 LEON M. GUIDRY, 0000
 MARY E. GWINN, 0000

ELIZABETH M. HAMILTON, 0000
 JOHN P. HAMILTON, 0000
 KENT B. HARRISON, 0000
 JEREMY J. HAWKS, 0000
 STEPHEN C. HAYES, 0000
 JERRY R. HAYWALD, 0000
 JOSHUA J. HENRY, 0000
 BRETT C. HERSHMAN, 0000
 BRENT A. HOLBECK, 0000
 JOHNNIE M. HOLMES, 0000
 RICARDO F. HUGHES, 0000
 ALEXANDER K. HUTCHISON, 0000
 ROLANDO R. IBANEZ, 0000
 DENNIS J. JACKO, 0000
 TEDDI M. JOHNSON, 0000
 GREGORY S. JONES, 0000
 WILLIAM L. JONES, 0000
 NICHOLAS S. KAKARAS, 0000
 MICHAEL T. KELLEY, 0000
 ROBERT D. KETCHELL, 0000
 JERRY A. KING, 0000
 TERESA M. KRONENBERGER, 0000
 KEVIN A. LANE, 0000
 JASON R. LEACH, 0000
 GREGORY J. LELAND, 0000
 PAUL S. LETENDER, 0000
 PAUL A. LOESCHE, 0000
 LAVERNE R. LOWRIMORE, 0000
 SHELTON L. LYONS, II, 0000
 DEBORAH L. MABEY, 0000
 MICHAEL A. MARSTON, 0000
 CLYDE D. MARTIN, JR., 0000
 DAVID H. MCALISTER, 0000
 JAMES E. MCCULLOUGH, II, 0000
 DEIRDRE M. MCGOVERN, 0000
 CHAD E. MCKENZIE, 0000
 KRISTOFER D. MICHAUD, 0000
 BRIAN T. MUTTY, 0000
 GINO S. NARTE, 0000
 CHARLES R. NEU, 0000
 DANIEL L. NORTON, 0000
 COLLEEN M. O'NEILL, 0000
 KEVIN J. OPPLER, 0000
 TROY D. OSTEN, 0000
 STEVEN J. PARKS, 0000
 JIMMY F. PATE, JR., 0000
 ROBERT D. PEREZ, 0000
 JOHN M. PETHEL, 0000

BRYAN A. PETTIGREW, 0000
 ROBERT R. PHILLIPS, 0000
 KEMAL O. PISKIN, 0000
 JEFFREY J. POOL, 0000
 NATHANAEAL B. PRICE, 0000
 JAMES G. REESE, JR., 0000
 VIRGLE D. REEVES, 0000
 CRAIG A. RETZLAFF, 0000
 MARK C. RICE, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER P. RINAUDO, 0000
 TOMMY RODRIGUEZ, 0000
 JENNIFER K. RUEGG, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER M. SACCO, 0000
 JAIME J. SALAZAR, 0000
 SONDRRA M. SANTANA, 0000
 MATTHEW I. SAVAGE, 0000
 ZOAH SCHENEMAN, 0000
 KENNETH E. SCHEUERMANN, 0000
 RICHARD M. SCHMIDT, 0000
 STEVEN K. SCHULTZ, 0000
 JOEL K. SENSENIG, 0000
 JOHN O. SIMPSON, 0000
 SHEILA A. SMITH, 0000
 STEVEN J. STASICK, 0000
 ANDY S. STECZO, 0000
 JAMES J. STEVENS, 0000
 NANCY L. STEWART, 0000

JOHN D. STONER, JR., 0000
 ANDREA L. STUHLMILLER, 0000
 GRETCHEN M. SWANSON, 0000
 DONALD T. SYLVESTER, 0000
 ROBERT THOMAS, 0000
 ERIK M. THORS, 0000
 MICHAEL J. TODD, 0000
 MICHAEL A. TORRES, 0000
 KHIEM Q. TRAN, 0000
 KAREN D. TREANOR, 0000
 ANDREW E. TUTTLE, 0000
 BENTON K. VAUGHAN, III, 0000
 AARON J. WAGNER, 0000
 LISA L. WAND, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER A. WEAVER, 0000
 GEORGE A. WESTLAKE, 0000
 DAVID L. WHITLEY, 0000
 ANN WILLIAMS, 0000
 DANNY A. WILLIAMS, 0000
 TRA D. WILLIAMS, 0000
 MICHAEL L. WITHERSPOON, 0000
 NORMAN B. WOODCOCK, 0000
 SARAH L. WRIGHT, 0000
 MICHAEL D. YOUNG, 0000

To be ensign

DAVID R. ARNING, 0000
 PATRICK J. FORD, 0000
 GARY HULING, 0000
 SHKINA M. JACKSON, 0000
 MICAH D. NEWTON, 0000
 ANTONIO J. SCURLOCK, 0000

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 13, 1999:

THE JUDICIARY

MARYANNE TRUMP BARRY, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT.
 DAVID N. HURD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.
 NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.