



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1999

No. 96

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We have a guest Chaplain today, Rev. Kenneth Lyons, Greater New Bethel Baptist Church, Jasper, TX. He is a guest of Senator HUTCHISON.

We are glad to have you with us.

### PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, Rev. Kenneth Lyons, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Your name be exalted above every name. Welcome in the name of Your Son, Jesus. We thank You for Your infinite love. You have looked beyond our faults as a government and a people and allowed us to enjoy the blessing of freedom, spiritually and physically.

Dear God, guide the minds of these Your ministers in the government of our country. Keep them ever mindful that they are instruments in Your service and for Your people, so that their lives may be peaceful in the world.

Lord, keep these Senators of this body and their families under Your wing. Grant them courage and boldness in this period of the history of our Nation. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator HUTCHISON is designated to lead the Senate in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Honorable KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, a Senator from the State of Texas, 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader this morning, I make the following announcement to the Senate:

This morning the Senate will debate cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 557 for 1 hour, to be followed by a cloture vote at 10:30 a.m. If cloture is invoked, the leader will file a cloture motion on the pending amendment to S. 557, the Social Security lockbox legislation, and that cloture vote will occur at 10:30 a.m. on Friday, July 16. Following that action, Senator SPECTER will be recognized as if in morning business for up to 30 minutes.

The Senate will then resume consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, with the hope of completing the bill during today's session of the Senate. Under a previous unanimous consent agreement, all amendments must be offered by 11:30 a.m. today. It may also be the intention of the leader to debate and vote on the Y2K conference report and to begin consideration of any other appropriations bills cleared for action. Therefore, Senators can expect votes throughout the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from Texas is recognized.

### REVEREND KENNETH LYONS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I wish to make a comment about Reverend Lyons, who just opened our Senate session with a prayer, because he is a very special person to me and to the State of Texas and really to all Americans.

A little over a year ago, a heinous crime was committed in the small town of Jasper, TX, when James Byrd, Jr., was brutally murdered simply because of his race, dragged to death by three men in a pickup truck. The senseless killing riveted the Nation and many feared the outbreak of civil dis-

order. But Rev. Kenneth Lyons helped still the troubled waters. He is pastor of Greater New Bethel Baptist Church where James Byrd's family worshipped every Sunday.

Pastor Lyons spoke fearlessly to people of all races. He said, "This must have been a divine wake-up call to the consciences of men. You can't fight fire with fire." He urged not vengeance but harmony and peace.

Reverend Lyons' wise leadership personified Abraham Lincoln's call to the "better angels of our nature." He helped unite the people of Jasper, TX, in their commitment to equality and justice, to rise above hatred and despair.

Millions of Americans watched that small town of Jasper, TX, as it came together because of Reverend Lyons' plea for redemption and healing. Because of his faith and eloquence, we are better people.

### RESPONSE IN JASPER, TEXAS

There are other heroes in Jasper, TX, and it was one of the great moments of my life to be able to go to Pastor Lyons' church and attend the burial ceremony for James Byrd, Jr., and to meet the kind of people who make this country what it is. I met James Byrd, Sr., and Mrs. Byrd, Renee Mullins, James Byrd, Jr.'s daughter, and his son. I met people who had just endured something that none of us ever want to have any of our family or friends ever endure. James Byrd, Sr., was saying: There is no hate here; there is love in this family.

That was the beginning of the healing process not only in Jasper, TX, but a model for America—when something we cannot possibly understand happens, someone steps forward and says we can't let this tear all of us down. James Byrd, Sr., started that process.

I want to talk about Billy Rowles, the Jasper County sheriff, who did not let one minute pass when he got that call on that fateful Sunday morning and he heard the beginning of what was

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S7973

going to be a nightmare for his town. Billy Rowles started making calls, and he said: This is not going to stand. We are going to have justice in Jasper County. We are going to have justice from what I am hearing over the phone on Sunday morning. And because of Billy Rowles' leadership, justice is on its way.

The mayor of Jasper is R.C. Horn. He was right there on the phone talking to Pastor Lyons, making calls to all of the clergy in Jasper, TX, that Sunday morning, setting the tone for what would be the message: That this community is not a bad community and I want every one of you in your pulpits on Sunday morning to say this is a community of love. Mayor Horn was one of those people who started the healing process.

Guy James Gray, the district attorney of Jasper County, was not going to let anything slip by. He was going to make sure the people who perpetrated this heinous crime would come to justice. Of the three people who have been accused, thanks to the good work of Guy James Gray, one has been convicted.

And there is Walter Diggles, the executive director of the Deep East Texas Council of Governments, always there behind the scenes, trying to help in this first week when all of the attention was focused on Jasper, TX. Jasper, TX, had never had the attention of the world focused on it.

But because of Walter Diggles, Billy Rowles, and Guy James Gray and Mayor Horn and the James Byrd, Jr. family, these people were able to withstand all the television cameras and all the people who came from outside to give them advice they did not really need because they knew what was the right thing to do. They knew that to keep their community together they were going to have to talk about love, not hate. They did not need anybody coming in from outside to tell them that because they were speaking from the heart. They didn't have focus groups and they didn't have advisers and psychiatrists. They did not need organizers and spinmeisters because they were doing it from the heart. And they have created a model that every community will follow if it wants to keep a community together after a terrible tragedy.

I want to add one more to this list because I have never seen anything like what happened in the trial of the first of those accused of this murder. There you saw the father of the accused, named Ronald King, sitting in the courtroom every day, absolutely devastated by what his son was accused of doing. This father, who adopted this boy to give him a chance in life, sat in that courtroom in support of his son, but devastated at what he was hearing in the courtroom. Mr. King came out of that courthouse every day, and he said: I don't blame the Byrd family for any bad feelings that they would have, and I apologize to the Byrd family. I sup-

port my son and I love my son and I always will, Mr. King said, but he said I understand how James Byrd, Sr. and his family feel and my heart goes out to them.

James Byrd, Sr. reached back to Ronald King and he said: I understand your pain. This is not your fault, and we will be strong together.

Ronald King is a hero, too, because what Pastor Lyons and the city of Jasper and all of those I have mentioned have done for our country is to show us that the spiritual community can make a difference by preaching love when there is a lot of opportunity for hate, and how that divine love can keep a community together, can make us remember our strengths in this country, and not dwell on the weaknesses.

I applaud Jasper, TX, and these leaders and Pastor Lyons, whom we have heard today; James Byrd, Sr. and his family; and Ronald King, for showing us that this is a great country and we are going to take a terrible tragedy and we are going to make this country stronger, as I believe it is today, because of a very small group of people who didn't need national advisers to tell them what was right. In fact, they have shown us what is right about our country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### GUIDANCE FOR THE DESIGNATION OF EMERGENCIES AS A PART OF THE BUDGET PROCESS—Motion to Proceed

##### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 1 hour for debate prior to cloture vote on the motion to proceed. The time will be equally divided between the two leaders.

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need to make an initial statement. Then we will have speakers on our side and work with the Democratic side to work out the remainder of the time.

Today is the 73rd day since we began the process of trying to move forward with a Social Security lockbox. I think, from every indication, we finally will begin to make some progress this morning. I hope this will be a rapid process from this point forward, that things will not be delayed much longer, and we can quickly come to some type of agreement for orderly consideration of this proposal.

It is vitally important we not delay any longer. Since we introduced this amendment on April 20, the following has taken place: \$22.2 billion more of the Social Security surplus or almost 20 percent of this year's surplus has

been put in danger of being raided. The House voted 416 to 12 to pass their own version of a lockbox, a version that we could not consider in this body. The President himself has endorsed the idea of a lockbox and stated that Social Security taxes should be saved for Social Security. Yesterday, the Democratic leader indicated the Democrats would not block this motion to proceed. So I see this as a positive.

What I have to say is very simple. It is clear that Americans, regardless of where they might live, believe their Social Security dollars ought to be used for Social Security. I cannot imagine there is a Member of the Senate who does not hear that message when talking to seniors in their States or, for that matter, when talking to anyone who is paying payroll taxes. The American people are frustrated when they hear that money they send here for Social Security is being spent on other programs. To some extent, this was justified during the period in which we were running budget deficits. But today we are not. Today we are running surpluses. The latest news is good news. It seems to me it even further justifies creating a lockbox to make sure none of these Social Security dollars are any longer spent on anything except Social Security. The only way to do it, in my view, is to pass legislation such as S. 557, such as the proposal that will be before us today.

So I ask my colleagues to not only give us the chance to move forward on this legislation but to work together to craft a proposal as soon as we possibly can so we can be sure these Social Security dollars do not get spent on other programs. It is a very attractive thing, to talk of new programs, of expanding existing programs, and so on, because today we are in a period of economic prosperity and we are running surpluses. But we should take this opportunity, in my view, to at least fence off the Social Security surplus so it cannot be used for other programs. I am hopeful today we can take an important step toward that end so I can go back to Michigan and tell the people in my State their Social Security payroll tax dollars are going to be protected. That is what I want to do. I suspect that is what a lot of other Members of the Chamber want to do.

I am hopeful that after today, once we get through the recess period, we will move expeditiously to finish the job. Social Security dollars ought to be spent on Social Security. We should move as quickly as possible to make that the case. So I am very optimistic, if we are successful with the cloture vote today, we can move in that direction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may need to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for his outstanding leadership on this issue.

Today the Senate will vote for the fifth time to stop filibusters on legislation to protect Social Security trust funds. It is time for us to stop, to end the delay. It is time for us to align ourselves with the American people who overwhelmingly want us to protect the money they put into the Social Security trust fund and to reserve it for Social Security payments. We should pass this bill so protecting Social Security will be the law of the land. It is time to build a tough law, a firewall if you will, between politicians' desires to spend and the Social Security trust fund.

There is no addiction more pervasive in this city than the spending of money. It is a tough habit to break, but we are in a position to do so. We are in a position to say we can manage our affairs without this money; let us make a commitment forever to break this habit of spending the Social Security trust funds.

President Clinton's proposed budget in January would have spent \$158 billion in Social Security surplus over the next 5 years out of the trust fund, but, thank goodness, this last week President Clinton announced that he does not want to do that. That concept is no longer his plan. Instead of spending that \$158 billion over 5 years in other projects, he said he wants to reserve it for Social Security—every penny for Social Security. "Social Security taxes should be saved for Social Security, period."

What a tremendous concept. It is one which we have been working on and we have been working to pass. The President has announced his support for it. It is a general concept which the House of Representatives has supported. In its recent vote a couple weeks ago, the House voted 416-12.

We look for bipartisan things to do in this city, things that unite us instead of divide us, things that mobilize the American people, things that find common objectives and common ground. Here is an item the American people overwhelmingly endorse. Here is an item on which the House of Representatives really reflects the American people, 416-12. That is an overwhelming vote. And the President of the United States endorses the lockbox.

What is interesting is that the President's endorsement is of the lockbox. He just did not say we should not spend Social Security as a general concept or a general idea or a principle by which we operate Government. When we talk about a lockbox, we are talking about institutionalizing the prohibition, not just saying this is something we hope to do in future years. By saying we want to build a lockbox, we have to build a structure for protecting Social Security, and that is something the President has said he wants—a struc-

ture, a lockbox, something that keeps us from making these expenditures.

For the past 6 months, this Congress has been devoted to protecting all the Social Security surplus. In January, congressional Republicans began working to ensure that Congress would protect every penny of the surplus. In March, Senator DOMENICI and I introduced S. 502, called the Protect Social Security Benefits Act, which would have instituted a point of order preventing Congress from spending any Social Security dollars for non-Social Security purposes.

What does a point of order mean? A point of order means that if there is a point of order and someone tries to do it, the Chair, the Presiding Officer, can say it is out of order. Most Americans have been part of some kind of meeting somewhere when someone brought something up that was out of order. The gavel goes down, and the person presiding over the meeting says: We are not going to discuss that; that is not a part of what we do. There is a point of order against it. It is out of order, and you move on to something else.

That is the way we propose to treat proposals that will spend the Social Security surplus. We will simply say: We don't do that; it is against our rules; it is out of order, we will move on to something else. That was S. 502.

Then in April, together with Senator DOMENICI, the Senate passed a budget resolution that did not spend any of the Social Security surpluses for the next decade. Included in the resolution was language endorsing the idea of locking away the Social Security surpluses, sort of a rules of the Senate lockbox but not a statutory lockbox. A statutory lockbox, of course, would bind the House, the Senate, and the President. This language passed the Senate with unanimous approval.

Also in April, Senators ABRAHAM, DOMENICI, and I offered the Social Security lockbox amendment which would have added executive responsibilities to the congressional requirement to protect the Social Security surpluses. By "executive responsibilities," we were really saying the President had to submit a budget that did not invade the Social Security surplus as part of the President's plan.

The Senate has voted on the Abraham-Domenici-Ashcroft plan three times so far, and I believe we will agree to the motion to proceed today. But until today, the Senate has filibustered, has said we will not go there. Frankly, the President of the United States wants to go there, the American people want to go there. The President had the courage to reverse his position, first saying, "I want to spend some of that money," then saying, "No, we should reserve every cent for Social Security, period."

On May 26, the House of Representatives, reflecting, I believe, the people of America—and that is really what we are supposed to do in many respects;

that is why we are sent here—overwhelmingly passed H.R. 1259, Congressman HERGER's measure to protect the surpluses. The vote in that case, as I have already mentioned, was 416-12. That means for every 100 votes in favor of the measure, there were only 3 votes against the measure. Mr. President, 100 to 3 is a pretty strong margin. That is a bipartisan consensus. This reflects the will of the people.

On June 10, Democrats in the Senate blocked the Herger measure. They voted against moving even to consider it.

It is time we stop this kind of parliamentary maneuver. We all know what the will of the American people is. We know what the clear statement of the President of the United States is. We know what we have done on five previous occasions, refusing to discuss it. Today we should vote to move forward on this issue.

The lockbox will accomplish an important goal: Protect Social Security taxes. It will reserve those taxes for Social Security, and Social Security alone, so that when someday those who need Social Security want to call on this Government for the payment of their benefit, the Government will be stronger, having less debt, having more discipline, having a greater capacity to meet its obligations and to honor the commitments made under Social Security.

Those who say they want to protect Social Security should join us in our efforts to save every dime—no, let me correct that—every penny, every cent of this money for Social Security's future beneficiaries. This lockbox is a way to make this happen.

Congress has been moving to create a Social Security lockbox this entire year. President Clinton has now stated he agrees with us, and I welcome the support of the President and Senate Democrats in finishing the Nation's business in supporting the toughest possible lockbox measure, one that protects not 20 percent, not 40 percent, not 60 percent, not 80 percent, not 99 percent, but 100 percent of the Social Security surpluses, protects them so they are available to meet the responsibilities of the Social Security system.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of the time of those in support of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I do not oppose the motion to proceed. I expect the Senate will perhaps vote unanimously to proceed on this issue, but I do want to give some historic perspective to this issue of a lockbox.

I proposed a lockbox amendment in 1983. I offered an amendment the day

when the Ways and Means Committee passed the Social Security reform package in 1983. I said: If we do not put this extra Social Security money away, it will be used as part of the operating budget and it will not be saved. My amendment lost in the Ways and Means Committee in 1983. So this is not a new idea.

One of the interesting things about this debate is, it was not too many years ago that we debated a constitutional amendment to balance the budget in the Senate. I voted against that, and the constitutional amendment lost by one vote. I went through some very interesting times politically back home and across the country because I cast a vote that defeated the constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

One of the points I continued to make in the Senate as we debated that—and I was accused of talking about gimmicks and using gimmicks at that point—was the constitutional amendment to balance the budget was written in a way that said all revenue that comes into the Federal Government shall be considered revenue for the purposes of the budget. There was no distinction between Social Security moneys and other moneys; it is all operating budget revenue. To the extent we require a balanced budget, it means we can use the Social Security money as ordinary revenue and then we can claim we balanced the budget. I said that is writing in the Constitution the invitation to continue doing what we have been doing, which is looting Social Security.

What I heard in response was no. There were three stages of denial:

First, we deny we are looting Social Security. That was the first stage of denial.

The second was: Well, even though we deny it, if, in fact, we are doing it, we promise to quit.

And the third stage of denial was: We insist we are not doing it, but if we are doing it, we promise to quit. And if we can't quit it, we will at least taper off.

Those were the three stages of denial in the Senate.

Because those of us who said, we will not write into the Constitution an amendment that permits forever the use of Social Security trust funds as part of the operating budget, we were told: Well, would it be all right if we said we will keep using the Social Security trust funds for the next 12 years? I said: No, that would not be all right. So that was the debate back a few years ago.

Now we come to a debate today, and the folks who then called our position on Social Security revenues a gimmick are now proposing a lockbox. I say, I think we should have a lockbox. But I do not think you ought to do a lockbox in isolation. I think you should have a lockbox with respect to the Social Security revenues so they cannot be used for ordinary operating revenue. That money is taken from workers' pay-

checks. It is called Social Security dedicated taxes. It goes into a dedicated fund and ought not be available under any circumstances for any other purposes. That is the point we made on the constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

I have some charts here, that I will not use, that describe what was told to us during that debate: Gee, you're standing up talking about gimmicks. Of course you have to use the Social Security money as part of the regular budget in order to balance the budget. You can't balance the budget without using Social Security money.

History, of course, shows that was nonsense. But here we are, and the question is the lockbox. We ought to have a lockbox. We ought to do several things at the same time, however. Because I worry. I see this week Reuters has a press story: "How Republicans Propose \$1 trillion in tax cuts." If you do a lockbox on Social Security revenues only and then say, all right, now we have locked away Social Security revenues only, and we propose \$1 trillion in tax cuts, the question in two areas is: What have you done to extend the life of Social Security? And what have you done in this fiscal policy to extend the life of Medicare?

Unfortunately, the answer in both cases could be, you have done nothing to save for Medicare; and while you might have given \$1 trillion in tax cuts, you may have done nothing to extend, even by 1 year, the Social Security program.

So let us do a couple of things. Let us do—together—a lockbox. I support that. I was ridiculed for it back in the constitutional amendment debate, but I have always supported it. I supported it going back to 1983 when I offered the amendment to do it in the House Ways and Means Committee. But let us not just do the lockbox. Let's do the lockbox the right way. Secondly, let us make sure that some of the additional revenue that is available extends the life of Medicare and extends the life of Social Security. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DORGAN. This would provide a guarantee that the revenue stream for Social Security is available only for Social Security; that is, the tax money that is available for it goes only into the Social Security trust fund and can be used only for that purpose.

But it would do two other things as well. It would say, let us use some additional resources not just for a \$1 trillion tax cut but also to extend the life of Social Security and the life of Medicare. Doing both of these things, I think, will give the American people the reassurance that both of these programs, which have been so important in the lives of so many Americans in this country, will be available for many years to come.

I do not think, as I said when I started, there will be a debate here on

whether we should proceed. Let's proceed. I expect the motion to proceed will carry, perhaps unanimously. We will have a debate on the lockbox issue.

But my point is, let us not debate that in isolation. Let us debate it with the eye on this ball: That we need to extend the life of Social Security and extend the life of Medicare, even as we do what we should have done long ago; and that is, make certain that no Social Security revenues are used for any purpose other than the solvency of the Social Security system itself. That is what workers expect. That is the basis on which money is taken from their paychecks and put into a dedicated tax fund. That is what senior citizens expect from this program, which was a solemn promise made to them many decades ago.

I thank the Senator from New Jersey for the time. I look forward to the debate following the motion to proceed.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield myself such time as is necessary to make some remarks.

Mr. President, I say thank you to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota because he kind of hit the nail on the head. Let's get on with this debate. That is the question. And whether or not we disguise it in terms of votes to the public at large—and cloture votes and things of that nature may seem rather arcane to the public—the main thing is to get on with the discussion.

I am supporting the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 557, which is the legislation to reform the budget rules governing emergency spending. I am going to support cloture on the motion to move ahead with this—we call it a motion to proceed—to get on with the debate, not only because I support the underlying legislation, which amends the rules governing emergency spending but, more importantly, because like most, if not all, Democrats, I strongly support the establishment of a Social Security and Medicare lockbox. It is time for a real debate to occur on a lockbox. And I look forward to that debate.

Democrats have long argued that protecting Social Security and Medicare should be Congress' top priority. We believe that strongly. We simply must prepare our country for the impending retirement of the baby boomers. We ought to do it now, particularly since we are going through this incredible prosperity, a prosperity never before seen in this country.

To help achieve that goal, Senator CONRAD and I proposed our own version of a Social Security and Medicare lockbox. It is a lockbox that reserves the surpluses for both Social Security and Medicare—reserves them; you cannot touch them—without creating the threat of what is now proposed, which could be a Government-wide default.

Our lockbox has much stricter enforcement than the weak one that was approved by the House of Representatives.

Early this week, President Clinton also proposed to establish a Social Security and Medicare lockbox. His proposal not only would prevent Congress from spending Social Security surpluses in any year, but it would extend the solvency of the trust fund to the year 2053.

Although all of the details of the President's plan have not been worked out yet, I strongly support his general approach. I am hopeful it can win with bipartisan support. We would like to see it that way.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM, and Senator DOMENICI have proposed a different version of a lockbox which has been offered as an amendment to the previous bill S. 557. Unfortunately, their lockbox is seriously openable. In fact, as Treasury Secretary Rubin has written, instead of protecting Social Security benefits, their lockbox actually would threaten benefits. That is because it could trigger a Government-wide default based on factors beyond Congress' control.

Such a default would make it impossible to pay Social Security benefits. They can call it what they will—lockbox, cash drawer, whatever—but it will still impair the possibility, at some point, to pay the Social Security benefits. The issue before the Senate today isn't whether we are for or against the Abraham-Domenici lockbox. It is not whether we are for or against the Democratic lockbox. The issue is whether we should proceed to a debate about lockbox legislation at all. I believe we should. It should be an open debate. Senators should have the right to offer amendments, but we should go ahead and get that debate underway.

In the past, the majority has tried to stifle that debate and to push through their own version of a lockbox without giving the Democrats and the American people an opportunity to present and to consider amendments. We Democrats have rightly resisted that. We cannot be gagged, and we will not be locked out of the legislative process, especially on an issue as important as protecting Social Security.

Having said that, nobody should doubt the commitment of Senate Democrats to support a Social Security and Medicare lockbox. I take a moment here to identify what a lockbox is to represent: a place you can't invade for any other reason except to make sure that Social Security is there for the longest period of time available for those who are paying into this system, the money to pay those benefits is going to be there.

Another major concern of the American public, the elderly public particularly, is Medicare. Will it run out of funds before the 50-year-old is there to have his or her health care protected?

That is what we are debating. We ought not to be talking about process. We ought to be talking about what are the promises that we are trying to fulfill.

One is that Social Security will be there when you get there and you want it and you need it. Two is that Medicare is there to help protect the health of an aging population.

I expect there is going to be a very strong vote on this side of the aisle in support of moving to proceed to that debate. Unfortunately, what we have heard is that the majority will then file cloture on the bill itself. Another explanation. Cloture means to shut down the debate, not permit the Democrats to add amendments, not to permit the American public to hear the full discussion. That is the issue—continuing to block our ability to offer any open, new ideas to their original proposal.

Well, if that is true, it is outrageous. It is the kind of political game that has been played on this floor on this issue from day 1. Apparently the majority isn't as anxious to get a Social Security lockbox as they pretend to be. They just want to force the Democrats to cast votes against cloture, against continuing the debate, against permitting the debate.

Well, Democrats have to oppose cloture, if we are being blocked from offering amendments. That doesn't mean we are being obstructive. It doesn't mean we are filibustering the bill. We just have to protect our rights and the citizens' rights as we see them.

What the Republicans want to do is force us to cast these cloture votes and then claim that we are filibustering the lockbox. It is wrong, and they are aware of it. They want to shut us out of the debate. We represent a significant part of the American public. Whether they voted for us or they didn't, we represent them.

This isn't just playing politics. It is unfair, and it is especially unbecoming of a party that is in the majority and purportedly running Government. They should be spending their time getting legislation passed, not just forcing Democrats to walk the line, to cast votes that they can later misrepresent for political gain.

President Clinton has reached out his hand with a proposal that obviously lays the groundwork for a bipartisan deal. He is known to include Republicans in discussions about things. I serve on the Budget Committee. I am the senior Democrat. This is the third President with whom I have served. I have never seen a President more anxious to discuss his ideas on legislation with the other side than President Clinton.

He said he is willing to compromise on tax cuts. He said he wants to work with the Congress. What is the response from the majority? Partisan politics. You have to ask why. Do they really think it makes any difference whether there are five cloture votes in-

stead of four? It is a mischaracterization. Who is trying to kid whom? This goes beyond petty. It really is unfair and pathetic.

I hope we are going to stop these political games. Then let us sit down on a bipartisan basis and do the work of the people. Let us develop a real lockbox that makes sense to both of us, a consensus view, and one that really protects Social Security and Medicare.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Michigan for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator from Pennsylvania would like.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I have to comment on the statement of the Senator from New Jersey.

One of the more vexing problems we have in political debate in America is who is telling the truth. What I am going to tell you is 180 degrees from what the Senator from New Jersey just said. What he repeatedly said is true is, in fact, not true.

What the Senator from New Jersey said is that the Democrats would not be able to offer amendments on the Social Security lockbox as a result of the cloture votes that were taken on April 22, April 30, and June 15. That is not true.

Let me state that again, emphatically, to the Senator from New Jersey and to the American public: What the Senator from New Jersey just said, which is that Democrats were blocked from offering amendments on the issue of a Social Security lockbox, is not true. So the entire speech we just heard was, in fact, a statement which had no basis in fact. That is true.

The Senator from New Jersey could have opposed cloture and offered all the amendments he wanted on the Social Security lockbox. We could have had hours, days of debate on a Social Security lockbox. We wanted to have those kinds of debates. They refused.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Isn't it so that the tree—I don't want to use arcane language; I always try to get away from that so the public understands what we are talking about. Weren't we blocked from amendments by virtue of the fact that the amendment tree was filled by the Republicans?

Mr. SANTORUM. The April 22 vote was a vote on cloture on the first-degree amendment. The tree was not filled. It was a first-degree amendment vote on cloture, No. 1. We wanted a vote on that particular amendment, yes.

After that amendment would have passed or failed, you were then available to offer all the amendments you

wanted on Social Security. You could have offered your own Social Security lockbox. You could have taken the Abraham bill and changed the wording in it, and we could have had a vote on that, but you did not want to do that. You did not want to have that debate. You refused us even getting into a vote. All we wanted to do with these cloture motions was to say: Give us a clean vote on this particular proposal. After that, you are free to amend it. You are free to offer your own; you can do whatever you want. You can offer a Medicare lockbox. You can do whatever you want. Just give us a vote on our proposal and then you are welcome to do whatever else you want. You said emphatically, unanimously, three times: No.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I ask the Senator, if he will indulge another question, was the tree filled with second-degree amendments?

Mr. SANTORUM. That was not the statement of the Senator from New Jersey. He made the statement that he could not offer amendments. The answer is, he could have offered amendments.

What we wanted was a vote on the Abraham-Domenici bill. After that vote, he was free to amend that proposal. He was free to offer his own proposal. There could have been a full and open debate on Social Security lockbox, after he gave us a vote on our amendment.

I don't think that is an unreasonable thing to ask.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Well, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for the courtesy. But the fact of the matter is that there was an obstruction to us offering amendments until the Republicans were certain that they had their amendment considered in its raw form. Frankly, to me, that was blocking Democrats from having it.

Mr. SANTORUM. All I say to the Senator from New Jersey is that all we asked for is to give us a clean up-or-down vote on our amendment. After that amendment, you could have amended that thing, you could have offered your own, done anything you wanted. All we wanted to make sure of was that we had a clean vote on our amendment to start this debate, and after that, you could have done anything you wanted.

By the way, if you look at the statement you just read into the RECORD, you said exactly the opposite of what I just said. You said you could not have offered amendments when, in fact, you could have. You still had the right to, and you chose not to because you didn't want to enter into this debate.

We see a wonderful willingness on the part of the Democrats now, after the President joined our side in saying we want a lockbox, to open up and debate this and offer amendments, when you had the very same opportunity four times to do the same thing.

I welcome that. I welcome that we are going to have an opportunity to

focus in on what I think is one of the most important things—not just for Social Security but important things for the long-term fiscal future of this country, this government; that is, putting in place a provision that says if you are going to spend more money on new government programs, or even if they are going to spend money on tax cuts, you are not going to spend it on Social Security unless you stand up before this Senate and before the American public and say: We are going to take Social Security dollars. We believe it is more important to do tax cuts. We believe it is more important to do funding for education or funding for defense than it is to provide money for Social Security.

That is the vote we are looking for. That is the vote of accountability that we want every Member of the Senate to have to cast. That is the fiscal discipline, when people have to make that choice, and it is clear to everybody what the choice is. We have lots of points of order and procedural things, but then everybody sort of walks out of the room and spins it their way. In this case, with the lockbox vote, where it says you have to vote on a motion that says we will spend Social Security money for X or Y or Z, you have to tell the American people that you believe that is a higher priority than Social Security.

We have no such vote today. But if we pass a lockbox, then the American public will know what your choices are. There may be a situation where we need to spend Social Security money. Frankly, I can't think of one, but there may be one—an emergency, a true emergency, where our national security is at risk. There may be a situation where we want to spend Social Security dollars, but it has to be voted on. That is the most important thing. That is what the other side never wanted to have happen.

I thank the President for breaking the logjam over there. The House Democrats did a pretty good job; they passed a Social Security lockbox bill. But it was the folks on the other side who stood as the dam to this current that was flowing through the Congress. I thank the President for getting the beavers to work, getting them out of the way and making sure we can have a full, fair, and open debate—as we could have three or four times previous to this. We could have had a full, fair, open debate in the Senate about a very important issue, yes, for Social Security but just as important to the fiscal discipline of the U.S. Government in the future.

I thank the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. DOMENICI, for their excellent work on this issue.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time do the Republicans have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes 18 seconds are remaining on the Republican side; 12 minutes 12 sec-

onds are remaining on the Democrat side.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield me 4 minutes?

Mr. ABRAHAM. I yield the Senator as much time as he needs.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, please tell me when I have used 4 minutes.

I say to the President of the United States: Thank you very much, Mr. President. You have agreed with us on one of the most important issues confronting the senior citizens of this Nation. In your budget and your recommendations in the past, during this fiscal year, you suggested that only 62 percent of the Social Security trust fund be saved and put in a trust fund and stay there for senior citizens for their Social Security. We suggested in our budget resolution that anything short of 100 percent was not right. After weeks of debate in this body, without an opportunity to get a vote on an amendment that would have said that and would have locked it tightly in place, the President of the United States announced that there are more resources available because the surpluses are bigger and decided that he agreed with the Republicans that 100 percent of the Social Security trust fund should be set aside for Social Security purposes.

Now the time has come for the Senate to do that. This is not an issue of Medicare. This is an issue of the Social Security trust fund being available for no purpose other than Social Security. In the meantime, it is used to reduce the national debt. That is the program, that is the plan, that is the safest and fairest thing for seniors across this land.

Pretty soon, we are going to find out whether that is really the issue or whether there is another issue, and that other issue is, even if you have done that and set it aside and locked it away, should there be a tax cut? It would appear that for some reason, the President of the United States and maybe a majority of the Democrats in the Senate don't want to let the American people have a refund of the taxes they have overpaid. And now we learn from both auditing or accounting entities, the President's and ours, that that surplus is even bigger than we thought. That is aside from the Social Security trust fund—in addition to it, without touching it.

The issue, then, is what kind of gimmick are we going to use to eat up that surplus so there is no money available to give back to the American people? That is the issue. The issue will be couched as if we should put \$350 billion of this non-Social Security surplus in a Medicare trust fund. But the President's own proposals belie the necessity for that and just give it a birth—you open it up and you can see it for what it is, an effort to deny the American people a tax cut because, lo and behold, the President said we can reform Medicare. We can actually put in place prescription drugs. And what is



the price tag? Let's just agree that the President has a good number—how about that, I say to Senator ABRAHAM—\$46 billion, not \$396 billion; \$46 billion is what he says we need during the next decade to provide prescription drugs, which he deems to be good for the senior citizens of America. He is crossing this land and saying: I am for prescription drugs.

We are for prescription drugs. In fact, we are so pleased that the President has acknowledged exactly that situation that we are almost prepared to say—as soon as we run some numbers—that we can do better than you have done in terms of prescription drugs for senior citizens who need prescription drug assistance.

But let's remember, he says we need \$46 billion. We are going to hear some arguments about the lockbox, saying let's have another lockbox for Medicare and let's take a bunch of the money that the taxpayers ought to get and put it over there in a trust fund under the rubric that it will help get rid of the deficit, that it will bring down the deficit of the United States, the overall debt—even though the three major accounting entities that have testified said it will be the same thing whether you put it in there or not. It has no impact because at some point you have to pay off those IOUs, and that means a tax increase.

Now, this is rather complicated, but the truth of the matter is—listen up, seniors—we are going to provide a prescription drug benefit as good as the President's or better. Let's focus on that. That is what we are going to do. Indeed, we are going to put every nickel—I remind everybody it takes \$120 billion more for the trust fund to get all it is entitled to, according to CBO. We are going to put more than \$1.8 trillion in. We are going to put \$1.9 trillion in that trust fund.

In summary, we are making some headway. It is slow and tedious.

I assume that today all Members on the other side of the aisle are going to vote for cloture on the motion to proceed. I believe that is the case. It will be 100 to nothing, as if they have agreed to a lockbox. Actually, that is a wasted vote, if there are going to be 100. They are just deciding they all want to go home and say: We are for the lockbox also.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we vitiate the yeas and nays on the lockbox motion to proceed—

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We object.

Mr. DOMENICI. May I finish? I wasn't finished.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am sorry. Please continue.

Mr. DOMENICI. May I finish my consent request? I would like to make sure it makes some sense.

I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with that vote and that we proceed to substitute for that a motion as if cloture was before us on the actual lockbox amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

If the Senator has a little time later, I would be glad to use another minute. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Republicans control 2 minutes 54 seconds. The Democrats have 12 minutes 12 seconds.

The question from the Chair is, Who yields time?

If neither side yields time, the time will be charged equally to both sides.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time not be counted to either side.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. President, we are going through an exercise about what is being characterized by the Democrats and what is being characterized by the Republicans as an imperfect lockbox situation—a lockbox recommendation.

I want to try to get this debate on this subject itself instead of the process. The fact of the matter is that if we try to define what constitutes a lockbox—we heard the Senator from North Dakota earlier talking about his effort to identify a lockbox going back to 1982 or 1983, in that period. Lockbox terminology was used way before it was discussed on this floor. It is a common expression in terms of banking and financial programs.

What we are talking about, very simply, is whether or not we put enough money away to say to the American public, when it is your time to retire—talking to those who now are, let's say, in their twenties, maybe in their teens—Social Security will be there for you when it is your time to use that benefit.

That is the discussion that goes on.

The other program—Medicare, which is directly linked to the Social Security program—health care for the elderly, for seniors, is the biggest worry among our population. People identify it as their concern about being locked out of health care—not knowing what conditions might arise that will absorb all of their savings, all of their resources. With the good science that has been developed over the years, we have had far better health than we thought we might have, looking back some years.

I know that when I was in the Army during World War II, I never dreamed that at this stage of my life I would be hard at work trying to do the things that I do, and feeling pretty good about

it. I am glad to know there is a program out there for those who aren't physically able to deal with life's daily pressures, and when they run into medical problems, health care is going to be there. That is the way it ought to be.

With all of that, and all of the criticism of President Clinton, the fact is that he is the leader in the country who saw us stop the hemorrhaging of incredibly increasing debt that was falling upon not just the present generation but future generations.

I used to hear the cries: We are saddling our children and our grandchildren with debt. Now we want to pay it off. They say: Well, paying off debt, what does it mean? It means an awful lot. The fact of the matter is that it provides the kind of things that families try to provide; and that is security for the future—reserves—so that when you have something you either need or want, you have some means to do it.

That is what we are talking about here. We want to preserve, and we want to increase, the solvency of Medicare to make sure it is there for a longer period of time. We want to extend Medicare to 2025 and have Social Security retirement benefits available until 2053, with a pledge from the White House and from this President to try to reform the process to extend it even further. That is what we are discussing.

Despite the cries and the pleas—"to tell the truth," is what I heard. I don't usually use that kind of terminology, because not telling the truth suggests some kind of a character flaw. The truth in many times is as observed by the person speaking. But the real judgment comes from the others who hear it. The truth of the matter is that we are trying our darndest—each side of the aisle—in this particular construction of how they see us, we being able to provide the kind of security that our people want. We on this side of the aisle think it ought to be done by not only preserving all of the Social Security surpluses but by paying down the debt and increasing reserves available to put into that Social Security trust fund to extend it slightly even further. That is what we want to do.

All of the gimmicks that are used, all of the ploys that the majority has used characteristically to try to stop the Democrats from offering amendments, from making this debate available to the public—that is the way it goes. We have never seen the kind of a period where so many cloture votes are ordered at the same time that a bill is sent up to the desk to be considered. Almost immediately, in so many cases, it is followed by a cloture vote before there is any debate. The cries of a filibuster are hollow cries, because no filibuster has had a chance to get underway. There hasn't been any chance to talk at all. Shut it down. Use the cloture vote technique.

The public shouldn't perhaps be deceived by what they hear about how anxious the Republicans are to get on

with the work of the people when they refuse to allow reasonable debate on the subject. There are ways to do it: Fill up the amendment tree, that stops it; invoke cloture, that stops it; or put in quorum calls, or have majority votes on things that stop the process.

The question is simply, Do we want to extend Social Security solvency? I think that answer has to be yes. Do we want to extend the Medicare solvency? I think that answer has to be yes.

Let the American people decide. When do they decide? They decide in November 2000 whether or not they prefer one method or the other. We ought to be plain spoken about what it is we are trying to do and not shut off the debate and not say that the Democrats could have offered amendments. They couldn't have, not at that time. They could have in due time—after everything was signed, sealed, and delivered. It is a backhanded way of operating.

I hope we will move on to the debate of the lockbox legislation. Let the public hear it. Take the time necessary to have a full airing. Let either side amend it and get on with serving the people's needs.

How much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has control of 3 minutes 20 seconds; the Republicans have 2 minutes 54 seconds.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield the floor.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute 30 seconds.

We are here today to try to put in motion a process that will save the Social Security trust fund surpluses for Social Security. The Republicans have been trying to simply get a vote on our proposal for over 70 days.

The entire parliamentary effort that has been described has been aimed at simply getting us a chance to have a vote on what was our original amendment to a different bill. The notion that getting cloture on that amendment would somehow stifle opportunities for others to bring amendments is not the way this system works. I think everybody should understand that. Our goal is to get a vote on the amendment we wanted. That is perfectly consistent with what people on all sides always try to do. It was a simple effort.

Let's not get caught up in the parliamentary discussions. The bottom line is we are still trying to create a lockbox for the American people who send payroll taxes to Washington so they can be assured those dollars go to Social Security. That is what we are fighting for. This debate is no more complicated than that.

We have heard claims people want a weaker lockbox, a harder lockbox. Let's go forward with it. Let's pass this motion. Let's vote for cloture today. Give Members a chance to have a vote on our plan. If others want to offer their plans, there will be opportunities for that.

I don't think there should be any absence of clarity as to what we have

been trying to achieve for 73 days, and that is simply to get a vote on a lockbox, which was brought as an amendment by the Republicans. We will still get that vote; we will keep fighting until we do.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield back the remaining time.

Mr. ABRAHAM. How much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republicans have 1 minute 16 seconds.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I yield that time to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this is not an issue of what kind of economic game plan we have had for the last 5 or 6 years. We all understand that hard-working Americans are making this economy hum. Investors who have become more enlightened and entrepreneurs who are taking more risks have caused a great American recovery, sustained in a manner we have never expected.

The issue is, when we collect more taxes, and we exceed expectations—in fact, not just by a few hundred million, but actually approaching \$1 trillion—should we wait for the Government to spend it or should we give some of it back to the American taxpayer?

Actually, the Social Security trust fund can be saved. Medicare with prescription drugs can be reformed and fixed so we have prescription drugs, and there is still a large amount of money left over. What should we do with it? Invent some way to set it aside? If we do that, it will be spent. Let's give some of it back to the American people. That is why the lockbox is important. It says what is left over does not belong to Social Security; it belongs to the American people. Use it prudently, Congress, and give back some of it.

It appears there is a war with that side of the aisle against giving anything back to the American people from these kinds of surpluses. I believe we will win that war. We relish it. We are ready to go. That will be the issue the next couple of months.

I yield the floor.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 89, S. 557, a bill to provide guidance for the designation of emergencies as a part of the budget process:

Trent Lott, Spencer Abraham, Jim Inhofe, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Pete Domenici, Paul Coverdell, Wayne Allard, Jesse Helms, Larry E. Craig, Mike Crapo, Chuck Hagel, Mike DeWine, Michael H. Enzi, Judd Gregg, Tim Hutchinson, and Craig Thomas.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call is waived.

#### VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 557, a bill to provide guidance for the designation of emergencies as part of the budget process, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rules. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced— yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 193 Leg.]

#### YEAS—99

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 99, the nays are 1. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

#### GUIDANCE FOR THE DESIGNATION OF EMERGENCIES AS A PART OF THE BUDGET PROCESS—RESUMED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 557) to provide guidance for the designation of emergencies as a part of the budget process.

Pending:

Lott (for Abraham) amendment No. 254, to preserve and protect the surpluses of the social security trust funds by reaffirming the exclusion of receipts and disbursement from the budget, by setting a limit on the debt held by the public, and by amending the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide a process to reduce the limit on the debt held by the public.

Abraham Amendment No. 255 (to Amendment No. 254), in the nature of a substitute.



Lott motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Governmental Affairs, with instructions and report back forthwith.

Lott amendment No. 296 (to the instructions of the Lott motion to recommit), to provide for Social Security surplus preservation and debt reduction.

Lott amendment No. 297 (to Amendment No. 296), in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk to the pending amendment.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the pending amendment No. 297 to Calendar No. 89, S. 557, a bill to provide guidance for the designation of emergencies as a part of the budget process:

Trent Lott, Pete Domenici, Rod Grams, Michael Crapo, Bill Frist, Michael Enzi, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Judd Gregg, Strom Thurmond, Chuck Hagel, Thad Cochran, Rick Santorum, Paul Coverdell, James Inhofe, Bob Smith, Wayne Allard.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, under the previous order, this cloture vote will occur on Friday, July 16, at 10:30 a.m. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived. And I ask consent the bill be placed back on the calendar.

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

Mr. LOTT. Let me emphasize to all Senators to double-check and recheck their calendars—there will be a vote on Friday morning, the 16th, at 10:30—so that everybody will know they will be expected to be present and voting at that time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Pennsylvania has 30 minutes.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a few seconds for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. SPECTER. I agree to yield for 15 seconds, which the Senator asked for, for a unanimous consent request.

#### TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1193

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent to send an amendment to the desk to

the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill and that the amendment be laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NOMINATION OF LAWRENCE SUMMERS AND PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I had asked for a reservation of some 30 minutes to speak on the pending nomination of Mr. Larry Summers for the position of Secretary of the Treasury.

In considering the nomination of Mr. Summers for the position of Secretary of the Treasury, I have reviewed the many facets of the work of that particular office and have focused with particularity, at this time, on the administration's policy on nonenforcement of the antidumping laws. I had met with Mr. Summers on Friday, June 18th, and told him at that time that I was giving consideration to a protest vote against his nomination because of the administration's failure to enforce the antidumping laws after having discussed with him his own views.

Since that time I have decided to direct my efforts, instead, to try to put together a coalition of Members of Congress, both in the House and the Senate, to find a remedy where a private right of action could be used to enforce the antidumping laws.

This is a subject that has been of great concern to me during my entire tenure in the Senate, having introduced a variety of bills—which I shall discuss in due course—going back as early as 1982.

In the course of a number of legislative proposals, I have had cosponsorship from a wide variety of my Senate colleagues, including then-Senator GORE, Senators THURMOND, BYRD, HELMS, COCHRAN, HATCH, INOUE, MURKOWSKI, KENNEDY, LEVIN, SANTORUM, MIKULSKI, and SESSIONS.

The problem of dumping is an extraordinarily acute problem in America today. It has come into very sharp focus with what has been happening in the steel industry, which has been decimated over the past two decades.

Steel, two decades ago—in 1979—had employees numbering approximately 500,000. Today, we have about a third of that number. In the course of the past several months, some 10,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs because of dumping from many foreign importers. But in reviewing the issue of dumping, I have found that it is extraordinarily widespread.

Here is a partial list of the products which are dumped in the United States, in addition to steel: wheat, hogs, lamb, cotton, sugar, orange juice, raspberries, flowers, salmon, mushrooms, paper clips, pencils, garlic, brake rotors, telephone systems, brass, pasta, picture tubes, rubber, industrial belts. And the series goes on and on.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, the antidumping duty orders in effect as of March 1, 1999, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPECTER. This list contains, I am advised, some 280 products which are dumped in the United States where our dumping laws, simply stated, are not enforced.

There is a groundswell in America today protesting the failure to enforce the antidumping laws. Dumping is a situation where, for example, steel coming from Russia will be sold cheaper in the United States than it is being sold in Russia. That is flatly against the laws of the United States. It is flatly against international trade laws. The United States has laws against that kind of dumping. But they are, simply stated, ignored.

The groundswell of opposition to dumping is reflected in the very strong vote in the House of Representatives on the so-called steel quota bill; 289 Members of the House voting in favor of it, 141 in opposition, more than enough votes to override a veto.

When the issue came to the Senate last week, there was considerable speculation as to whether there would be 67 votes to override a veto and whether there would be an excess of 60 votes for cloture. Then, as a result of some very intense, last-minute lobbying by the administration, a great many Senators changed their votes, reversed their announced intentions, and we had 42 votes in favor of the steel quota bill. Even so, it was a large vote in the Senate—considering all the circumstances—because of the very strong public policy against quotas, remembering the problems in the Smoot-Hawley era. I think the effort at the quota bill was really to attract the attention of the administration, to show how serious the problem was.

In my capacity as chairman of the steel caucus, I have convened a number of meetings of our caucus. I have met with Treasury Secretary Rubin and Commerce Secretary Daley and Trade Representative Barshefsky. We have made the case of the need for enforcement of our trade laws. While not exactly a deaf ear, there was certainly little by way of any positive response.

I had an opportunity to talk personally with the President during a long plane ride from Andrews to Tel Aviv last December. The plane ride was more than 10 hours, an opportunity to talk about a great many subjects. I discussed with the President the very serious problems with the steel industry. He was sympathetic but nothing really has come from the administration to deal effectively with the problem of dumping.

The fact of life is, where it comes to considerations of foreign policy or defense policy, American industry is traditionally sacrificed and the antidumping laws are not enforced.

This is an issue which has concerned me, as a Pennsylvania Senator, since 1981 when I took my oath of office. In 1984, there was a favorable ruling by

the International Trade Commission supporting the steel industry. It was then up to the President, President Ronald Reagan, to determine whether or not that International Trade Commission ruling would stand. My then colleague, Senator John Heinz—the late Senator Heinz, who we all miss so very much—and I made the rounds of key administration officials. Then-Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige was in favor of upholding the International Trade Commission order. Then-Trade Representative Bill Brock was in favor of upholding the International Trade Commission order. Then-Senator Heinz and I met with Secretary of State George Shultz, separately with Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, and were told in no uncertain terms by the Secretary of State that our foreign policy was such that the ITC decision had to be reversed by the President. That was Secretary Shultz' recommendation. Secretary of Defense Weinberger said about the same thing, that defense policy required the ITC ruling be overturned, which the President had the right to do. So, in fact, in September of 1984, President Reagan did overturn the International Trade Commission ruling. That was just symptomatic and characteristic of what had happened with respect to dumping and the harm of lost jobs to the industry.

Since the early 1980s, the steel industry has poured \$50 billion of capital into modernization efforts and has pared the payrolls, as I noted earlier, from about 500,000 to about a third of that. There is no way that the American steel industry can compete with dumped steel; where Russians or Brazilians or others are prepared to steal—dumping is a form of stealing, spelled different from steel—the product. There is no way the American steel industry can compete with dumping.

On June 18 of this year, the Washington Post contained a notation that Secretary of Commerce Daley had declared the steel crisis was over. Outraged by that conclusion, 12 chief executive officers of American steel companies wrote to Secretary William Daley, in part as follows:

The steel crisis is still very much with us. Cold rolled imports are up dramatically, 24 percent above the level for the first 4 months of last year. Imports of cut-to-length plate are up dramatically, 25 percent year-to-year in for this period. The prices remain extremely depressed. Operating rates have plunged from 93 percent to 80 percent on an annualized basis.

A 10 percent change in operating rates equals about \$5 billion in revenue, so that decrease would be in the \$7 to \$8 billion range in decreased revenue.

Within the next week, after the letter of June 18 to Secretary Daley from the steel executives, the statistics released by the Department of Commerce showed a tremendous additional surge. From April to May, imports went up by almost 700,000 metric tons, more than 30 percent. Imports of cold-rolled steel

products from Russia were 7,296 metric tons in April 1999, and almost 41,000 metric tons the following month of May, an increase of more than 450 percent.

So we have seen the problem aggravated. The steel companies have brought seven antidumping cases with the Department of Commerce. Six of those have been subjected to suspension agreements by the Department of Commerce. When a complaint is brought, the Department of Commerce has the authority to end the complaint with a suspension agreement.

I had an opportunity to talk at some length just yesterday to Secretary of Commerce Daley to try to get an update on enforcement of the antidumping laws, and more particularly, the enforcement of the antidumping laws with regard to steel. Secretary Daley, at least to my way of thinking, was not at all on target with what the Department of Commerce is doing.

I confronted him with the specifics on the suspension agreement that the Department of Commerce entered into with Russia on February 22 of this year. That agreement permits unfair traders to avoid liability for millions of dollars in penalties due on steel dumped since November of 1998. The terms of the suspension agreement result in imports rising to a level of 750,000 metric tons per year and further displace very substantial domestic production. With respect to the proposed Brazilian antidumping suspension agreement, the fixed exchange rate locks in unrealistic low prices without allowing for future changes in the exchange rate. On another proposed Brazilian countervailing suspension agreement, it is 37 percent above the prelevel crisis.

So here we have efforts made under section 201, where the President has the right to rescind the remedy. That is consistently done. Here we have these countervailing duty cases brought, where the Department of Commerce has the authority to enter into a suspension agreement to the detriment of the American steel industry. That is consistently done.

The remedy which I suggest on pending legislation is to provide for a private right of action so the injured parties—whether they are the steelworkers who have been demonstrating and protesting in Washington, D.C. in major rallies or whether it would be the steel companies who have written to administration officials—the injured parties would have an opportunity to go into Federal court to get justice.

You have the trade laws of the United States which prohibit dumping; you have the international trade laws, which prohibit dumping. The laws prohibiting dumping are entirely consistent with GATT, our international trade agreements. But those antidumping laws are, simply stated, not enforced.

In my discussions with Secretary Daley yesterday, he raised the question

about the very substantial trade, the lower prices to consumers, and noted that in an era where there is overcapacity around the world and there is a world depression, the United States is an obvious target for this dumping, to the benefit of our consumers. But that is not an adequate answer. That is not an adequate answer when thousands of steelworkers are laid off, or when the farmers are having a disastrous economic time, when the Congress has to appropriate billions of dollars in farm relief because of the dumping of wheat, the dumping of hogs, and dumping of lamb.

I recall as a teenager working in the wheat fields in Kansas before moving to Pennsylvania. I grew up in a small community, Russell, KS, in the heart of America's breadbasket, the heart of America's wheat basket. The wheat that has been dumped on the American markets has had a tremendously devastating effect on the American farm community, as so much of the other dumping of the commodities I have noted.

There is a remedy that would provide a private right of action to go to court, where the courts would be concerned with what the law is against dumping and would be concerned with what the evidence is—strong evidence to prove that dumping exists. Then the court, under the legislation I have introduced, would enter what is called an "equitable order," to assess a duty or a tariff that is consistent with GATT, based upon the difference between what the goods ought to sell for and the price at which they are dumped.

There is, obviously, concern by the administration about the use of the court system when the administration wants to have the power to make decisions as the administration chooses. But when the administration acts in the interest of foreign policy, or in the interest of defense policy, to the prejudice of so many workers in America who are not getting justice, that simply is not right.

The equity action would not submit the case to a jury. Rather, it is decided on traditional principles of the law of equity by a judge alone. It is possible to have a temporary restraining order issued on the basis of affidavits submitted. It is not a complicated matter to prove dumping. A judge then has the authority, under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to issue what is called an ex parte order just on the application of one party—without even the other party being present—where the affidavits are sufficient. The duty then arises for the court to have a hearing within 5 days on a preliminary injunction. Then these equity matters can be tried in a matter of a few days, or a couple of weeks at the outside.

When some administration officials have complained that court cases take a very long time, it simply is not true. Where a court of equity issues an order, that order stays in effect even when an appeal is taken, unless there

is an issuance of a supersedeas. To get a supersedeas, there has to be a bond posted in twice the amount of the damages. The fact is that once these enforcement actions would be taken, the dumpers would find it more expensive to violate the law than to comply with the law. This would be a remedy that would have a very profound effect.

This is not an idea I have proposed for the first time in the legislation filed this year. During the 97th Congress, I introduced Senate bill 2167. In the 98th Congress, I introduced similar legislation under the number of Senate bill 418. In the 99th Congress, it was S. 236. In the 100th Congress, it was S. 361. In the 102d Congress, it was S. 2508. In the 103d Congress, it was S. 332. On March 3 of this year, I introduced the pending legislation as Senate bill 528.

Votes have been held, with one vote as close as 51-47, losing on an effort to attach that as an amendment. One of the bills was reported unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee and, as noted before, a considerable group of colleagues have sponsored one or more of these bills: then-Senator GORE, Senators THURMOND, BYRD, COCHRAN, HELMS, INOUE, MURKOWSKI, HATCH, KENNEDY, LEVIN, SANTORUM, MIKULSKI, and SESSIONS have all been supportive of this legislation.

I must say that the hearings in the Finance Committee have not produced a consideration of this legislation in a markup. So it is my intention to find a vehicle on which to offer this legislation, some other bill that comes to the floor. In discussions with many colleagues, there is very considerable interest in many quarters because when the matter is discussed, so many of my fellow Senators say, well, that is a wheat issue that prejudices the farmers of my State; or that is a hog issue or a lamb issue that prejudices the farmers of my State; or with the enormous list of products involved, so many jobs are being taken.

So the essence of the issue is: What will happen on enforcement of antidumping laws in America? The bitter fact of life is that administrations that are both Republican and Democrat have not been interested or diligent in enforcing our antidumping laws. Instead, they have preferred to bend to the interests of the foreign policy considerations, or defense policy. When Russia dumps in the United States—and Russia's economy is in a precarious shape—the administration enters into a suspension agreement badly prejudicing the American steel industry, causing the loss of thousands of

jobs on the administration's conclusion that it is more important to have a solid economy in Russia and not to have instability with Boris Yeltsin than it is to lose thousands of jobs of the steelworkers. When wheat, or lambs, or hogs, or orange juice, is dumped, there again, the avalanche of those cases is beyond the capacity of the administration to handle.

There is a solid precedent in our legal procedures for private rights of action. We have the antitrust laws that are enforced by private parties, who are authorized under Federal statutes to get not only damages, but treble damages, three times the damages. You have the securities laws of the United States that are enforced by private rights of action.

The Securities and Exchange Commission simply can't handle all of the enforcement of our securities laws, just as the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission cannot handle all of the antitrust laws. This has been a subject of deep concern to me, since my days as a law student when I wrote an extensive article in the Yale Law Journal, appearing in 1955, on private rights of action. It was directed at the criminal process, but the analogies are the same. If we enact legislation that enables the steelworkers, or the steel companies, or the farmers, or the wheat companies, or the electronics industry, or the telephone industry, or the long list of industries that have been victimized by dumping to go into court, the judge will not look at what is our foreign policy or what is our defense policy, but will see the U.S. law that prohibits dumping, and will analyze the GATT provisions which authorize the enforcement of antidumping laws.

The legislation calls for these actions to be brought in the U.S. International Court of Trade in New York City.

So this is not a matter of the steelworkers going to a friendly judge in Pittsburgh, or the wheat farmers going to a friendly judge in Wichita, but it will be handled by the International Court of Trade which sits in New York City and has the expertise and the detachment to look at the law—to look at the facts—and to do justice. But justice is not being done in America today where you have the failure of the administration to enforce these laws.

During the almost two decades that I have served in the Senate, it has been the same whether the administration was of one party or the other, and that it is easy to slough off the loss of jobs and the loss of American industry. But that, simply stated, is not fair.

It may be that if we mobilized a group of Senators to vote against the nomination of Mr. Summers, or if I voted against the nomination of Mr. Summers, it would attract more attention than a 22-minute floor statement. But after having considered the matter for the intervening almost 2 weeks since I met with Mr. Summers, I thought that it would be not fair to him. He has an excellent record, a good academic record, and a strong record in the Department of the Treasury. But when I discussed with him the enforcement of the antidumping laws, I did not find the concerns that I thought the Secretary of the Treasury-Designate ought to have. But we have agreed to talk further.

Yesterday, when I talked to Secretary of Commerce Daley, again I did not find the kind of sensitivity or concerns that I thought the Secretary of Commerce ought to have.

When I reviewed the suspension agreements that Secretary Daley's Department entered into, I thought that they were prejudicial to the interests of the American steel industry. But in America, we have had so many illustrations where the legislative bodies don't act, or where the executive branches don't act but where the courts do. It is nothing like life tenure for a Federal judge and the dispassionate application of the rule of law but, rather, the facts to the case. But were that to be done, it is not a matter of protectionism. It is a matter of enforcing the basic rule of free trade.

Anytime someone takes up the cudgel to complain about what is happening for failure to enforce antidumping laws, the financial publications are always saying that is a cry for protectionism. But the fact is that it is not protectionism. It is enforcing the basic tenet of free trade, which means no dumping. If you have dumping you do not have free trade.

We are going to continue to work with the coalition of Senators. We will not use this occasion to protest the administration's failure to enforce the antidumping laws by a protest vote against Mr. Summers but to try to bring a coalition together, and perhaps even to persuade the new Secretary of Treasury, the existing Secretary of Commerce, and perhaps even the President, that justice and fairness and equity requires enforcement through the judicial process, which is the only way to get appropriate relief.

I thank the Chair.

#### EXHIBIT NO. 1

#### ANTIDUMPING DUTY ORDERS IN EFFECT ON MARCH 1, 1999

[Duty orders revoked by Sunset Review remain in effect until Jan. 1, 2000]

Case No. and country	Product	D I
A-357-007 Argentina	Carbon steel wire rod	1
A-357-405 Argentina	Barbed wire and barless wire strand	1
A-357-802 Argentina	L-WR welded carbon steel pipe and tube	0
A-357-804 Argentina	Silicon metal	0

## ANTIDUMPING DUTY ORDERS IN EFFECT ON MARCH 1, 1999—Continued

[Duty orders revoked by Sunset Review remain in effect until Jan. 1, 2000]

Case No. and country	Product	D I
A-357-809 Argentina	Line and pressure pipe	0
A-357-810 Argentina	Oil country tubular goods	0
A-831-801 Armenia	Solid urea	0
A-602-803 Australia	Corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products	0
A-832-801 Azerbaijan	Solid urea	0
A-538-802 Bangladesh	Cotton shop towels	0
A-822-801 Belarus	Solid urea	0
A-423-077 Belgium	Sugar	0
A-423-602 Belgium	Industrial phosphoric acid	1
A-423-805 Belgium	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	0
A-351-503 Brazil	Iron construction castings	0
A-351-505 Brazil	Malleable cast iron pipe fittings	0
A-351-602 Brazil	Carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings	0
A-351-603 Brazil	Brass sheet and strip	0
A-351-605 Brazil	Frozen concentrated orange juice	0
A-351-804 Brazil	Industrial nitrocellulose	1
A-351-806 Brazil	Silicon metal	0
A-351-809 Brazil	Circular welded non-alloy steel pipe	1
A-351-811 Brazil	Hot rolled lead/bismuth carbon steel products	0
A-351-817 Brazil	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	0
A-351-819 Brazil	Stainless steel wire rod	0
A-351-820 Brazil	Ferrosilicon	0
A-351-824 Brazil	Silicomanganese	1
A-351-825 Brazil	Stainless steel bar	0
A-351-826 Brazil	Line and pressure pipe	0
A-122-047 Canada	Elemental sulphur	0
A-122-085 Canada	Sugar and syrup	0
A-122-401 Canada	Red raspberries	0
A-122-503 Canada	Iron construction castings	0
A-122-506 Canada	Oil country tubular goods	0
A-122-601 Canada	Brass sheet and strip	0
A-122-605 Canada	Color picture tubes	1
A-122-804 Canada	New steel rails	1
A-122-814 Canada	Pure and alloy magnesium	1
A-122-822 Canada	Corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products	0
A-122-823 Canada	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	0
A-337-602 Chile	Fresh cut flowers	0
A-337-803 Chile	Fresh Atlantic salmon	0
A-337-804 Chile	Preserved mushrooms	0
A-570-001 China PRC	Potassium permanganate	0
A-570-002 China PRC	Chloropicrin	0
A-570-003 China PRC	Cotton shop towels	0
A-570-007 China PRC	Barium chloride	1
A-570-101 China PRC	Greig polyester cotton print cloth	0
A-570-501 China PRC	Natural bristle paint brushes and brush heads	0
A-570-502 China PRC	Iron construction castings	0
A-570-504 China PRC	Petroleum wax candles	0
A-570-506 China PRC	Porcelain-on-steel cooking ware	1
A-570-601 China PRC	Tapered roller bearings	0
A-570-802 China PRC	Industrial nitrocellulose	1
A-570-803 China PRC	Heavy forged hand tools, w/wo handles	0
A-570-804 China PRC	Sparklers	0
A-570-805 China PRC	Sulfur chemicals (sodium thiosulfate)	0
A-570-806 China PRC	Silicon metal	0
A-570-808 China PRC	Chrome-plated lug nuts	1
A-570-811 China PRC	Tungsten ore concentrates	0
A-570-814 China PRC	Carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings	0
A-570-815 China PRC	Sulfanilic acid	1
A-570-819 China PRC	Ferrosilicon	0
A-570-820 China PRC	Compact ductile iron waterworks fittings	0
A-570-822 China PRC	Helical spring lock washers	1
A-570-825 China PRC	Serbic acid	0
A-570-826 China PRC	Paper clips	1
A-570-827 China PRC	Pencils, cased	1
A-570-828 China PRC	Silicomanganese	1
A-570-830 China PRC	Coumarin	0
A-570-831 China PRC	Garlic, fresh	0
A-570-832 China PRC	Pure magnesium	0
A-570-835 China PRC	Furfuryl alcohol	0
A-570-836 China PRC	Glycine	0
A-570-840 China PRC	Manganese metal	1
A-570-842 China PRC	Polyvinyl alcohol	0
A-570-844 China PRC	Melamine institutional dinnerware	0
A-570-846 China PRC	Brake rotors	0
A-570-847 China PRC	Persulfates	0
A-570-848 China PRC	Freshwater crawfish tailmeat	1
A-583-008 China Taiwan	Small diam. welded carbon steel pipe and tube	0
A-583-080 China Taiwan	Carbon steel plate	1
A-583-505 China Taiwan	Oil country tubular goods	0
A-583-507 China Taiwan	Malleable cast iron pipe fittings	0
A-583-508 China Taiwan	Porcelain-on-steel cooking ware	1
A-583-603 China Taiwan	Top-of-the-stove stnls steel cooking ware	0
A-583-605 China Taiwan	Carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings	0
A-583-803 China Taiwan	Light-walled rect. welded carbon steel pipe and tube	0
A-583-806 China Taiwan	Telephone systems and subassemblies thereof	0
A-583-810 China Taiwan	Chrome-plated lug nuts	1
A-583-814 China Taiwan	Circular welded non-alloy steel pipe	1
A-583-815 China Taiwan	Welded ASTM A-312 stainless steel pipe	1
A-583-816 China Taiwan	Stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings	0
A-583-820 China Taiwan	Helical spring lock washers	1
A-583-821 China Taiwan	Stainless steel flanges	0
A-583-824 China Taiwan	Polyvinyl alcohol	0
A-583-825 China Taiwan	Melamine institutional dinnerware	0
A-583-826 China Taiwan	Collated roofing nails	1
A-583-827 China Taiwan	Static random access memory	0
A-583-828 China Taiwan	Stainless steel wire rod	0
A-301-602 Colombia	Fresh cut flowers	0
A-331-602 Ecuador	Fresh cut flowers	0
A-447-801 Estonia	Solid urea	0
A-405-802 Finland	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	0
A-427-001 France	Sorbitol	0
A-427-009 France	Industrial nitrocellulose	0
A-427-078 France	Sugar	0
A-427-098 France	Anhydrous sodium metasilicate	0
A-427-602 France	Brass sheet and strip	0
A-427-801 France	Antifriction bearings	0
A-427-804 France	Hot rolled lead/bismuth carbon steel products	0
A-427-808 France	Corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products	0
A-427-811 France	Stainless steel wire rod	0

## ANTIDUMPING DUTY ORDERS IN EFFECT ON MARCH 1, 1999—Continued

[Duty orders revoked by Sunset Review remain in effect until Jan. 1, 2000]

Case No. and country	Product	D I
A-427-812 France	Calcium aluminate cement and cement clinker	0
A-100-001 General Issues	Antifriction bearings	0
A-100-003 General Issues	Carbon steel flat products (filed 30-Jun-92)	0
A-833-801 Georgia	Solid urea	0
A-428-811 Germany United	Hot rolled lead/bismuth carbon steel products	0
A-428-814 Germany United	Cold-rolled carbon steel flat products	0
A-428-815 Germany United	Corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products	0
A-428-816 Germany United	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	0
A-428-820 Germany United	Seamless line and pressure pipe	0
A-428-821 Germany United	Large newspaper printing pressure and components	0
A-428-082 Germany West	Sugar	0
A-428-602 Germany West	Brass sheet and strip	0
A-428-801 Germany West	Antifriction bearings	0
A-428-802 Germany West	Industrial belts	0
A-428-803 Germany West	Industrial nitrocellulose	1
A-428-807 Germany West	Sulfur chemicals	0
A-428-801 Greece	Electrolytic manganese dioxide	0
A-437-601 Hungary	Tapered roller bearing	0
A-533-502 India	Welded carbon steel pipes and tubes	0
A-533-806 India	Sulfanilic acid	0
A-533-809 India	Stainless steel flanges	0
A-533-810 India	Stainless steel bar	0
A-533-813 India	Preserved mushrooms	0
A-560-801 Indonesia	Melamine institutional dinnerware preserved mushrooms	0
A-560-802 Indonesia		0
A-507-502 Iran	In shell pistachios	1
A-508-602 Israel	Oil country tubular goods	0
A-508-604 Israel	Industrial phosphoric acid	1
A-475-059 Italy	Pressure sensitive plastic tape	0
A-475-401 Italy	Brass fire protection products	0
A-475-601 Italy	Brass sheet and strip	0
A-475-703 Italy	Granular polytetrafluoroethylene resin	1
A-475-801 Italy	Antifriction bearings	0
A-475-802 Italy	Industrial belts	0
A-475-811 Italy	Grain-oriented electrical steel	0
A-475-814 Italy	Seamless line and pressure pipe	0
A-475-816 Italy	Oil country tubular goods	0
A-475-818 Italy	Pasta, certain	0
A-475-820 Italy	Stainless steel wire rod	0
A-588-028 Japan	Roller chain other than bicycle	0
A-588-041 Japan	Methionine, synthetic	0
A-588-045 Japan	Steel wire rope	0
A-588-054 Japan	Tapered roller bearing, under 4"	1
A-588-056 Japan	Melamine in crystal form	1
A-588-068 Japan	P.C. steel wire strand	1
A-588-401 Japan	Calcium hypochlorite	0
A-588-405 Japan	Cellular mobile telephones and subassemblies	1
A-588-602 Japan	Carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings	0
A-588-604 Japan	Tapered roller bearings, over 4"	0
A-588-605 Japan	Malleable cast iron pipe fittings	0
A-588-609 Japan	Color picture tubes	1
A-588-702 Japan	Stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings	0
A-588-703 Japan	Internal combustion and forklift trucks	0
A-588-704 Japan	Brass sheet and strip	0
A-588-706 Japan	Nitrile rubber	0
A-588-707 Japan	Granular polytetrafluoroethylene resin	1
A-588-802 Japan	3.5" microdisks and media therefor	0
A-588-804 Japan	Antifriction bearings	0
A-588-806 Japan	Electrolytic manganese dioxide	0
A-588-807 Japan	Industrial belts	0
A-588-809 Japan	Telephone systems and subassemblies thereof	0
A-588-810 Japan	Mechanical transfer presses	0
A-588-811 Japan	Drafting machines and parts thereof	0
A-588-812 Japan	Industrial nitrocellulose	1
A-588-813 Japan	Multiangle laser light scattering instr	0
A-588-815 Japan	Gray Portland cement and cement clinker	0
A-588-816 Japan	Benzyl P-Hydroxybenzoate (Benzyl paraben)	0
A-588-823 Japan	Prof electric cutting/sanding/grinding tools	0
A-588-826 Japan	Corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products	0
A-588-829 Japan	Defrost timers	0
A-588-831 Japan	Grain-oriented electrical steel	0
A-588-833 Japan	Stainless steel bar	0
A-588-835 Japan	Oil country tubular goods	0
A-588-836 Japan	Polyvinyl alcohol	0
A-588-837 Japan	Large newspaper printing presses and components	0
A-588-838 Japan	Clad steel plate	0
A-588-840 Japan	Gas Turbo compressors	0
A-588-843 Japan	Stainless steel wire rod	0
A-834-801 Kazakhstan	Solid Urea	0
A-834-804 Kazakhstan	Ferrosilicon	0
A-779-602 Kenya	Fresh cut flowers	0
A-580-507 Korea South	Malleable cast iron pipe fittings	0
A-580-601 Korea South	Top-of-the-stove stnls steel cooking ware	0
A-580-603 Korea South	Brass sheet and strip	0
A-580-605 Korea South	Color Picture tubes	1
A-580-803 Korea South	Telephone systems and subassemblies thereof	0
A-580-805 Korea South	Industrial nitrocellulose	1
A-580-807 Korea South	Polyethylene terephthalate (pet) film	0
A-580-809 Korea South	Circular welded non-alloy steel pipe	1
A-580-810 Korea South	Welded ASTM A-312 stainless steel pipe	1
A-580-811 Korea South	Carbon steel wire rope	0
A-580-812 Korea South	Drams of 1 MEGABIT and above	0
A-580-813 Korea South	Stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings	0
A-580-815 Korea South	Cold-rolled carbon steel flat products	0
A-580-816 Korea South	Corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products	0
A-580-825 Korea South	Old country tubular goods	0
A-580-829 Korea South	Stainless steel wire rod	0
A-835-801 Kyrgyzstan	Solid urea	0
A-449-801 Latvia	Solid urea	0
A-451-801 Lithuania	Solid urea	0
A-557-805 Malaysia	Extruded rubber thread	0
A-201-504 Mexico	Porcelain-on-steel cooking ware	1
A-201-601 Mexico	Fresh cut flowers	0
A-201-802 Mexico	Gray Portland cement and cement clinker	1
A-201-805 Mexico	Circular welded non-alloy steel pipe	1
A-201-806 Mexico	Carbon steel wire rope	0
A-201-809 Mexico	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	0
A-201-817 Mexico	Oil country tubular goods	0
A-841-801 Moldova	Solid urea	0

## ANTIDUMPING DUTY ORDERS IN EFFECT ON MARCH 1, 1999—Continued

[Duty orders revoked by Sunset Review remain in effect until Jan. 1, 2000]

Case No. and country	Product	D I
A-421-701 Netherlands	Brass sheet and strip	0
A-421-804 Netherlands	Cold-rolled carbon steel flat products	0
A-421-805 Netherlands	Aramid fiber of PPD-T	0
A-614-502 New Zealand	Low fuming brazing copper wire and rod	0
A-614-801 New Zealand	Fresh kiwifruit	0
A-403-801 Norway	Fresh and chilled Atlantic salmon	0
A-455-802 Poland	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	0
A-485-601 Romania	Urea	0
A-485-602 Romania	Tapered roller bearings	0
A-485-801 Romania	Antifriction bearings	0
A-485-803 Romania	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	0
A-821-801 Russia	Solid urea	0
A-821-804 Russia	Ferrosilicon	0
A-821-805 Russia	Pure magnesium	0
A-821-807 Russia	Ferrovandium and nitrided vanadium	0
A-559-502 Singapore	Small diameter standard and rectangular pipe and tube	1
A-559-601 Singapore	Color picture tubes	1
A-559-801 Singapore	Antifriction bearings	0
A-559-802 Singapore	Industrial belts	0
A-791-502 South Africa	Low fuming brazing copper wire and rod	0
A-791-802 South Africa	Furfuryl alcohol	0
A-469-007 Spain	Potassium permanganate	0
A-469-803 Spain	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	0
A-469-805 Spain	Stainless steel bar	0
A-469-807 Spain	Stainless steel wire rod	0
A-401-040 Sweden	Stainless steel plate	0
A-401-601 Sweden	Brass sheet and strip	0
A-401-603 Sweden	Stainless steel hollow products	1
A-401-801 Sweden	Antifriction bearings	0
A-401-805 Sweden	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	0
A-401-806 Sweden	stainless steel wire rod	0
A-842-801 Tajikistan	Solid urea	0
A-549-502 Thailand	Welded carbon steel pipes and tubes	0
A-549-601 Thailand	Malleable cast iron pipe fittings	0
A-549-807 Thailand	Carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings	0
A-549-812 Thailand	Furfuryl alcohol	0
A-549-813 Thailand	Canned pineapple fruit	0
A-489-501 Turkey	Welded carbon steel pipe and tube	0
A-489-602 Turkey	Aspirin	1
A-489-805 Turkey	Pasta, certain	0
A-489-807 Turkey	Rebar steel	0
A-843-801 Turkmenistan	Solid urea	0
A-823-801 Ukraine	Solid urea	0
A-823-802 Ukraine	Uranium	1
A-823-804 Ukraine	Ferrosilicon	0
A-823-806 Ukraine	Pure magnesium	0
A-412-801 United Kingdom	Antifriction bearings	0
A-412-803 United Kingdom	Industrial nitrocellulose	1
A-412-805 United Kingdom	Sulfur chemicals	0
A-412-810 United Kingdom	Hot rolled lead/bismuth carbon steel products	0
A-412-814 United Kingdom	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	0
A-461-008 USSR	Titanium sponge	1
A-461-601 USSR	Solid urea	0
A-844-801 Uzbekistan	Solid urea	0
A-307-805 Venezuela	Circular welded non-alloy steel pipe	1
A-307-807 Venezuela	Ferrosilicon	0
A-479-801 Yugoslavia	Industrial nitrocellulose	1

## EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING AMENDMENTS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have been asked to request on behalf of the leader that the deadline for failing first-degree amendments on the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill be extended until noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.  
The Senator from Connecticut.

## PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for Ellen Gadbois, a Fellow in Senator KENNEDY's office, be allowed floor privileges for 1 day.

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

## NOMINATION OF LARRY SUMMERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to say to my colleague from Pennsylvania, who just addressed the issue of Treasury and the issue of steel, that I supported the proposal last week of Senator ROCKEFELLER and felt as though that was a strong message that we needed to be sending. We didn't prevail in that particular issue. It is an

important issue for the Senator from Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania's economy depends on many sectors. But steel is a very important one. And the trade issue is extremely important.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Connecticut for those comments. I dare say that if we polled all of our colleagues, the other 98, there would not be a Senator who would not have problems in his own State on dumping. Some may object saying that they do not want to have anything to impede the flow of commerce, but there are some limits.

When it comes to the law, I know my colleague from Connecticut is as concerned about the rule of law as I am. If we want to eliminate the antidumping provisions, I will keep quiet. But when the law prohibits dumping and there is so much of it to the prejudice of so many people—talk about victims' rights—this is an injustice that is being perpetrated day in and day out. If it goes to court, justice will be done.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague. Everyone faces these dumping issues. We are a very open society. That is one of our strengths. But there are limits. The only thing I would say—again, I don't want to tie us up because we have

other matters to attend to—is that I happen to be a strong supporter of Larry Summers as a candidate for the Secretary of the Treasury position.

He is a very fine individual who I think will do a tremendous job. First of all, he will be listening to people such as our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, and I hope the colleague of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Connecticut, on these matters. I am sure he will do that. I know that he will do that.

But, obviously more importantly, we need not just good listening but also a willingness to make the fight as only can be done at the executive branch level. We in Congress can pass amendments and bills to try to do it. But in the area of trade—I know that my colleague from Pennsylvania will agree—the executive branch is really where the influence is most felt through the Office of the President, the Secretary of Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of State, where they raise these issues at that level. That is where we have the most success, I think, at least historically, in dealing with the kind of issues that he has addressed this morning.

I am confident that Larry Summers is going to be a very strong advocate



on behalf of our country and its needs and its sectors that the Senator from Pennsylvania has talked about.

I just didn't want the moment to pass without expressing my support for this very fine individual, whom I have come to know and respect immensely over the last number of years. He has worked with Rubin in Treasury.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, just one further comment. Some of our most worthwhile floor discussions is when there is an exchange of ideas. So often comments go from protection of speech out into a vacuum. Like the old saying about college lectures in classes, it goes from the notes of the professor to the notes of the student without passing through the head of either. But when you have a discussion, it may be a little more informative. The executive branch is where it ought to start. But if there is not relief from the executive branch, then I look to the judicial branch.

The one conclusive item that I will note, because I don't want to take more than another 45 seconds, is in the enforcement of the civil rights laws. We could never have gotten desegregation in America if it was left up to the Congress or to the State legislatures or to the Presidents and the Governors nibbling at the edges a little bit. But when the case went to court, justice was done.

Mr. DODD. The Senator from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct. We need to have that judicial branch if we are going to really make the laws work ultimately. I appreciate that point. It is one well taken.

I agree with his point as well that if you are going to have antidumping laws on the books, enforcing them is the only way to live up to our obligations.

I appreciate his comments.

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

#### TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—RESUMED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1282) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Dorgan (for Moynihan) amendment No. 1189, to ensure the expeditious construction of a new United States Mission to the United Nations.

Dorgan (for Moynihan) amendment No. 1190, to ensure that the General Services Administration has adequate funds available for programmatic needs.

Dorgan (for Moynihan) amendment No. 1191, to ensure that health and safety con-

cerns at the Federal Courthouse at 40 Centre Street in New York, New York are alleviated.

Campbell/Dorgan amendment No. 1192, to provide for an increase in certain Federal buildings funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, pursuant to the consent agreement of last night, I send the following amendments to the desk for consideration and ask they be set aside.

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

#### AMENDMENTS NO. 1194 THROUGH NO. 1204

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like at least to give the names of the amendments: Senator WARNER, amendment on professional liability insurance for Federal employees; for Senator KYL, \$50 million for Customs Service; another one for Senator KYL, sense of the Senate for funding for the Customs Service; one for Senator JEFFORDS on child care centers in Federal facilities; one for Senator ENZI, the high-intensity drug trafficking areas; Senator GRASSLEY, funding for the Customs Service; Senator DEWINE, abortion services in Federal health plans; Senators LOTT and DASCHLE, conveyance of the land to Columbia Hospital for Women; Senator COLLINS, Veterans of Foreign Wars Stamp; Senator DEWINE, funding for the Customs Service; and Senator HUTCHISON of Texas, \$50 million for the Customs Service.

With that, I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be numbered and set aside.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1191, WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. On behalf of Senator MOYNIHAN, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to withdraw amendment 1191.

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

#### AMENDMENTS NO. 1189 THROUGH NO. 1214

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send a group of amendments to the desk pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement to have them offered by 12 o'clock. I will read their names: an amendment by Senator REID; amendment by Senator BAUCUS, amendments by Senators SCHUMER, MOYNIHAN, HARKIN; another from Senators SCHUMER, LANDRIEU, WELLSTONE, TORRICELLI, and LAUTENBERG.

I ask they be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are set aside.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I now yield to my colleague, Senator COLLINS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1202

(Purpose: To request the United States Postal Service to issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States)

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], for herself, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DORGAN and Mr. GREGG, proposes an amendment numbered 1202.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 98, insert between lines 4 and 5 the following:

SEC. 636. (a) Congress finds that—

(1) the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States (in this section referred to as the "VFW"), which was formed by veterans of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection to help secure rights and benefits for their service, will be celebrating its 100th anniversary in 1999;

(2) members of the VFW have fought, bled, and died in every war, conflict, police action, and military intervention in which the United States has engaged during this century;

(3) over its history, the VFW has ably represented the interests of veterans in Congress and State Legislatures across the Nation and established a network of trained service officers who, at no charge, have helped millions of veterans and their dependents to secure the education, disability compensation, pension, and health care benefits they are rightfully entitled to receive as a result of the military service performed by those veterans;

(4) the VFW has also been deeply involved in national education projects, awarding nearly \$2,700,000 in scholarships annually, as well as countless community projects initiated by its 10,000 posts; and

(5) the United States Postal Service has issued commemorative postage stamps honoring the VFW's 50th and 75th anniversaries, respectively.

(b) Therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that the United States Postal Service is encouraged to issue a commemorative postage stamp in honor of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Ms. COLLINS. On behalf of Senators CAMPBELL, DORGAN, GREGG, and myself, I am pleased to offer a sense-of-the-Senate amendment urging the U.S. Postal Service to issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The VFW will be celebrating its centennial in September of this year. This sense-of-the-Senate resolution is similar to legislation I introduced earlier this year which had been cosponsored by 59 of our colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that list of cosponsors be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the 71st was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. CON. RES. #12—COSPONSORS (59)

Senator Inouye, Daniel K.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Roth, William V., Jr.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Jeffords, James M.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Torricelli, Robert G.—02/22/99.  
 Senator DeWine, Michael—02/22/99.  
 Senator Voinovich, George V.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Helms, Jesse—02/22/99.  
 Senator Cleland, Max—02/22/99.  
 Senator Daschle, Thomas A.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Abraham, Spencer—02/22/99.  
 Senator Allard, Wayne—02/22/99.  
 Senator Brownback, Sam—02/22/99.  
 Senator Chafee, John H.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Dodd, Christopher J.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Enzi, Michael B.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Fitzgerald, Peter G.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Gramm, Phil—02/22/99.  
 Senator Landrieu, Mary L.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Thurmond, Strom—02/22/99.  
 Senator Specter, Arlen—02/22/99.  
 Senator Durbin, Richard J.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Hagel, Chuck—02/22/99.  
 Senator Inhofe, James M.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Biden, Joseph R., Jr.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Lott, Trent—02/22/99.  
 Senator Sessions, Jeff—02/22/99.  
 Senator Snowe, Olympia J.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Hatch, Orrin G.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Lincoln, Blanche—02/22/99.  
 Senator Lugar, Richard G.—04/14/99.  
 Senator Nickles, Don—02/22/99.  
 Senator Frist, Bill—02/22/99.  
 Senator Rockefeller, John D., IV—02/22/99.  
 Senator Kerry, John F.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Coverdell, Paul—02/22/99.  
 Senator Shelby, Richard C.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Robb, Charles S.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Conrad, Kent—02/22/99.  
 Senator Grassley, Charles E.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Akaka, Daniel K.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Baucus, Max—02/22/99.  
 Senator Bryan, Richard H.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Craig, Larry E.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Domenici, Pete V.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Feingold, Russell, D.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Gorton, Slade—02/22/99.  
 Senator Gregg, Judd—02/22/99.  
 Senator Stevens, Ted—02/22/99.  
 Senator Wellstone, Paul D.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Ashcroft, John—02/22/99.  
 Senator Warner, John W.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Reid, Harry M.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Boxer, Barbara—02/22/99.  
 Senator Grams, Rod—02/22/99.  
 Senator Kennedy, Edward M.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Lautenberg, Frank R.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Wyden, Ron—02/22/99.  
 Senator Crapo, Michael D.—02/22/99.  
 Senator Murray, Patty—04/14/99.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, as a member of the VFW Ladies Auxiliary post in Caribou, ME, and as the daughter of a World War II veteran who was wounded twice in combat, I am honored to lead the charge for this worthwhile legislation.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars traces its roots back to 1899, when veterans of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection returned home and banded together to establish a handful of local organizations intended to help secure medical care and pensions for their military service. These original foreign service organizations gradually grew in number and influence and in 1914 came to be known collectively as the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Mr. President, it was several years later, on June 24, 1921, when the VFW's chapter in my home State of Maine was chartered. Today, there are 84

VFW posts in Maine to which over 16,000 veterans belong.

Those small groups of veterans who organized in 1899 have today grown to over 2 million strong. During that time, VFW members have fought in every war, conflict, and military intervention in which the United States has been engaged during this century.

As we near the start of a new millennium, the VFW's members continue to live by the organization's creed of "Honor the dead by helping the living." They do so by representing the interests of veterans across the nation through an established network of trained service officers who, at no charge, help millions of veterans and their dependents secure the educational benefits, disability compensation, pension, and health care services to which they are rightfully entitled as a result of their distinguished service to our country.

This service also extends beyond veterans. The VFW's Community Service Program, through members in its 10,000 posts, serves communities, states, and the nation. During the past program year, for example, the VFW, working side by side with its Ladies Auxiliary, contributed nearly 13 million hours of volunteer service and donated nearly \$55 million to a variety of community projects. In addition, the VFW helps young men and women attend college by providing more than \$2.6 million in scholarships annually.

Mr. President, this Sunday, on the Fourth of July, we will celebrate the 223rd anniversary of the founding of the United States of America. I can think of no more appropriate time to honor the brave men and women who, while far from home, sacrificed so much that the dreams of our founding fathers might become, and remain, a reality. By urging the U.S. Postal Service to issue a commemorative stamp honoring the VFW's 100th anniversary, as was done for its 50th and 75th anniversaries, the Senate can take a small step toward remembering their service and showing our deep appreciation for their unwavering commitment to our country, both in peacetime and in times of conflict.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for working with me on this amendment. It is my understanding the amendment has been cleared and that it is acceptable to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As a life member of the VFW myself, and a sponsor of this amendment, I think it is an important statement to make, as my friend said, as we move to the Fourth of July weekend. I am happy to accept this amendment.

I yield to Senator DORGAN.

Mr. DORGAN. I think it is a good amendment. I have asked consent to be added as a cosponsor. I am happy to support the efforts of the Senator from Maine, and we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The amendment (No. 1202) was agreed to.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank my colleagues for their support and cooperation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, seeing no other Senators on the floor, I announce we would like to have them come down and offer their amendments. We will be happily expecting them.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will ask that a letter from Barry McCaffrey, Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, be printed in the RECORD. General McCaffrey has written to me and, I am sure, the chairman of the subcommittee because he is concerned about the funding level for the National Youth Antidrug Media Campaign.

As we indicated yesterday, that campaign will be funded in the subcommittee mark at \$145.5 million. That is about \$49 million below the administration's request.

General McCaffrey has a number of observations about that and makes the point in his letter that he hopes, in this process between the Senate and the House, somehow those funds might be restored to full funding at the President's request.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

Washington, DC, June 30, 1999.

Hon. BYRON L. DORGAN,  
 U.S. Senate,  
 Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DORGAN The purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention a precarious funding recommendation for the FY 2000 appropriation for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. This drug-prevention initiative is the centerpiece of the national effort to educate America's sixty-eight million children and adolescents about the risks associated with illegal drugs. Thanks to the Congress' full support of the campaign over the past two years, we have succeeded in harnessing the full power of modern media—from television to the Internet to sports marketing—to provide accurate and effective anti-drug information to children, adolescents, parents, and other adult influences.

We are pleased with the results obtained since the campaign was launched eighteen months ago.

The campaign's messages are being heard. 95 percent of our youth target audience is receiving an average of 6.8 messages a week. Among African American youth, we are doing even better—reaching 95 percent of the young people 7.8 times per week, 94 percent

of Hispanic youth are receiving messages in Spanish 4.8 times per week.

Our children are becoming more aware of the risks and dangers of drugs. Teens are indicating in response to surveys that campaign ads are providing them new information, increasing their awareness of the dangers associated with drugs, and making them less likely to try or use drugs. Parents state that the ads are providing new information and making them aware of the effects of drugs on their children.

The private sector is matching the federal government's investment. Over the past year, corporate America has provided \$217 million in pro-bono advertising and in-kind contributions. In the past twelve months, the campaign has generated 47,000 public service announcements and resulted in thirty-two network television shows including anti-drug messages.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended that the media campaign be funded at 25 percent below our request in FY 2000—\$145.5 million, \$49.5 million below the administration's request. This funding level would not allow the campaign to reach adolescents and parents with the message frequency required to fundamentally change attitudes towards illegal drugs and, eventually, reduce drug use by vulnerable adolescents and teens. The Committee's additional recommendation that \$49 million of proposed FY 2000 funds not be available to the Campaign until the final day of the fiscal year would result in a de facto 48 percent cut in campaign funds.

Now is not the time to make cuts in the Media Campaign. We are at a critical juncture in time. Drug use by our teens skyrocketed between 1992 and 1996 as risk perception declined. In the past two years, the Monitoring the Future survey and the National Household Survey of Drug Abuse suggest that our children are becoming more aware of the risks posed by illegal drugs and that adolescent drug use rates are declining. This campaign can be a catalyst for lower drug use rates by our children.

We need your leadership to ensure that the full Senate restores funding to the requested amount of \$195 million in FY 2000 for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. This is a sound investment in the well being of our sixty-eight million young people.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, also, to add to the comments made by Senator CAMPBELL, I believe we had something in the neighborhood of 20 amendments that were filed. The unanimous consent agreement required that amendments be filed by noon today. This subcommittee on appropriations has now, I believe, close to 20 amendments, perhaps 21 amendments, that have been filed. It is, I know, the intention and the interest of the leadership—the majority leader and Senator DASCHLE as well—to move ahead and finish this bill and finish some other business today.

My hope is that Members who have offered amendments—in fact, all the amendments have been filed on behalf of other Senators by Senator CAMPBELL and myself. I hope very much that those who asked us to file an amendment on their behalf will come now to the floor and offer those amendments so we can proceed to get through this piece of legislation.

Of the 20 amendments, some likely will be worked out, some will perhaps need votes. Senator CAMPBELL is absolutely correct, this is the right time for

people on whose behalf we have offered these amendments to come to the floor and begin debating them.

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

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1201

(Purpose: To authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women of a certain parcel of land in the District of Columbia.)

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I call up the Lott-Daschle amendment No. 1201, the conveyance of land to the Columbia Hospital for Women, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] for Mr. LOTT, for himself and Mr. DASCHLE, proposes an amendment numbered 1201.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

(a) ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES.—Subject to subsection (f) and such terms and conditions as the Administrator of General Services (in this section referred to as the "Administrator") shall require in accordance with this section, the Administrator shall convey to the Columbia Hospital for Women (formerly Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-In Asylum; in this section referred to as "Columbia Hospital"), located in Washington, District of Columbia, for \$14,000,000 plus accrued interest to be paid in accordance with the terms set forth in subsection (d), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those pieces or parcels of land in the District of Columbia, described in subsection (b), together with all improvements thereon and appurtenances thereto. The purpose of this conveyance is to enable the expansion by Columbia Hospital of its Ambulatory Care Center, Betty Ford Breast Center, and the Columbia Hospital Center for Teen Health and Reproductive Toxicology Center.

#### (b) PROPERTY DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The land referred to in subsection (a) was conveyed to the United States of America by deed dated May 2, 1888, from David Fergusson, widower, recorded in liber 1314, folio 102, of the land records of the District of Columbia, and is that portion of square numbered 25 in the city of Washington in the District of Columbia which was not previously conveyed to such hospital by the Act of June 28, 1952 (66 Stat. 287; chapter 486).

(2) PARTICULAR DESCRIPTION.—The property is more particularly described as square 25, lot 803, or as follows: all that piece or parcel of land situated and lying in the city of Washington in the District of Columbia and

known as part of square numbered 25, as laid down and distinguished on the plat or plan of said city as follows: beginning for the same at the northeast corner of the square being the corner formed by the intersection of the west line of Twenty-fourth Street Northwest, with the south line of north M Street Northwest and running thence south with the line of said Twenty-fourth Street Northwest for the distance of two hundred and thirty-one feet ten inches, thence running west and parallel with said M Street Northwest for the distance of two hundred and thirty feet six inches and running thence north and parallel with the line of said Twenty-fourth Street Northwest for the distance of two hundred and thirty-one feet ten inches to the line of said M Street Northwest and running thence east with the line of said M Street Northwest to the place of beginning two hundred and thirty feet and six inches together with all the improvements, ways, easements, rights, privileges, and appurtenances to the same belonging or in anywise appertaining.

#### (c) DATE OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) DATE.—The date of the conveyance of property required under subsection (a) shall be the date upon which the Administrator receives from Columbia Hospital written notice of its exercise of the purchase option granted by this section, which notice shall be accompanied by the first of 30 equal installment payments of \$869,000 toward the total purchase price of \$14,000,000, plus accrued interest.

(2) DEADLINE FOR CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.—Written notification and payment of the first installment payment from Columbia Hospital under paragraph (1) shall be ineffective, and the purchase option granted Columbia Hospital under this section shall lapse, if that written notification and installment payment are not received by the Administrator before the date which is 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

(3) QUITCLAIM DEED.—Any conveyance of property to Columbia Hospital under this section shall be by quitclaim deed.

#### (d) CONVEYANCE TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The conveyance of property required under subsection (a) shall be consistent with the terms and conditions set forth in this section and such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems to be in the interest of the United States, including—

(A) the provision for the prepayment of the full purchase price if mutually acceptable to the parties;

(B) restrictions on the use of the described land for use of the purposes set out in subsection (a);

(C) the conditions under which the described land or interests therein may be sold, assigned, or otherwise conveyed in order to facilitate financing to fulfill its intended use; and

(D) the consequences in the event of default by Columbia Hospital for failing to pay all installments payments toward the total purchase price when due, including revision of the described property to the United States.

(2) PAYMENT OF PURCHASE PRICE.—Columbia Hospital shall pay the total purchase price of \$14,000,000, plus accrued interest over the term at a rate of 4.5 percent annually, in equal installments of \$869,000, for 29 years following the date of conveyance of the property and receipt of the initial installment of \$869,000 by the Administrator under subsection (c)(1). Unless the full purchase price, plus accrued interest, is prepaid, the total amount paid for the property after 30 years will be \$26,070,000.

(e) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received by the United States as payments under this section shall be paid into the fund established by section 210(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)), and may be expended by the Administrator for real property management and related activities not otherwise provided for, without further authorization.

(f) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The property conveyed under subsection (a) shall revert to the United States, together with any improvements thereon—

(A) 1 year from the date on which Columbia Hospital defaults in paying to the United States an annual installment payment of \$869,000, when due; or

(B) immediately upon any attempt by Columbia Hospital to assign, sell, or convey the described property before the United States has received full purchase price, plus accrued interest.

The Columbia Hospital shall execute and provide to the Administrator such written instruments and assurances as the Administrator may reasonably request to protect the interests of the United States under this subsection.

(2) RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—The Administrator may release, upon request, any restriction imposed on the use of described property for the purposes of paragraph (1), and release any reversionary interest of the United States in the property conveyed under this subsection only upon receipt by the United States of full payment of the purchase price specified under subsection (d)(2).

(3) PROPERTY RETURNED TO THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—Any property that reverts to the United States under this subsection shall be under the jurisdiction, custody and control of the General Services Administration shall be available for use or disposition by the Administrator in accordance with applicable Federal law.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This amendment has been cleared on both sides of the aisle, and we are ready to adopt it. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1201) was agreed to.

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1215, 1216, AND 1217

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have three amendments, two of which were to be offered by Senator GRAHAM and one to be offered by Senator COCHRAN. The amendments were left in the Cloakrooms on a timely basis but were not part of the submissions that Senator CAMPBELL and I offered before the 12 noon deadline. Senator CAMPBELL and I ask consent that these three amendments be considered timely filed and offered.

I send the amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments will be numbered and laid aside.

Mr. DORGAN. 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. REED. 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. 1193

(Purpose: To enable the State of Rhode Island to meet the criteria for recommendation as an Area of Application to the Boston-Worcester-Lawrence; Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine, and Connecticut Federal locality pay area)

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment to the bill be called up at this time. It has already been laid down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for himself and Mr. CHAFEE, proposes an amendment numbered 1193.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 98, insert between lines 4 and 5 the following:

SEC. 636. Section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) For purposes of this section, the 5 counties of the State of Rhode Island (including Providence, Bristol, Newport, Kent, and Washington counties) shall be considered as 1 county, adjacent to the Boston-Worcester-Lawrence; Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine, and Connecticut locality pay area and the Hartford, Connecticut locality pay area.”.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this amendment I am offering, on behalf of myself and Senator CHAFEE, deals with a problem that is particular to Rhode Island. The problem involves what is known as locality pay. That is the differential pay that Federal employees are given because of higher costs in the area in which they live and work. Essentially it is a comparison between the labor cost in the private sector and the Federal sector. If there are higher private labor costs, there is a differential added to the paycheck of the Federal employee in the particular area.

The problem with Rhode Island is, because of the complicated rules of allocation, my entire State is excluded from locality pay. So Federal workers who work in Rhode Island do not receive locality pay, even though their fellow workers, in some cases just a few miles away, in Massachusetts or Connecticut, receive this differential locality pay.

Now, the reason the rules disadvantage Rhode Island is, essentially, to

qualify for locality pay, you have to have at least 2,000 workers in a county and that county has to be contiguous to another locality area. This is a map of New England and parts of New York. Because of the high cost of labor in Boston and in these major areas, such as New York City and Hartford, CT, because of the concentration of workers, these areas in blue represent locality pay areas. However, Rhode Island has been, in a sense, discriminated against because, for one thing, the managers of this program have stopped the locality line about 4½ miles from the border, in some cases. In a county in which we have 3,500 workers—we have enough workers in Newport County, but we are not contiguous to a locality pay area. In northern Rhode Island, we don't have 2,000 people in a certain county, but we are contiguous to another area. So the combination of these rules of numbers of Federal employees and being contiguous to a high locality pay area works to the detriment of Rhode Island.

Let me suggest something else that also I think is unique in the situation of Rhode Island. We, I think unlike every other State in the U.S., do not have county governments. We don't operate anything on a county basis. Rhode Island is the smallest State in the Union, roughly 70 miles long and 35 miles wide. The concept of county is something that really is not apropos. When you look at some of the larger States in the country where counties are of sufficient size, where they easily accommodate several thousand workers, then it makes a difference but not in Rhode Island.

The proposal that Senator CHAFEE and I have developed is quite simple; that is, to consider the entire State of Rhode Island as a county. Frankly, in the context of the United States, it is about the size of many counties. If we had that change in the law, we would have a situation where our workers in Rhode Island—we have approximately 6,000 Federal employees—would, in fact, be in an area contiguous to locality pay zones and would qualify for the extra pay. What does this mean in the paychecks of our workers? Essentially, what they are seeing is 3.45 percent less in their 1999 paychecks than people doing the same jobs in New London, CT, and in Boston, MA. In fact, Boston is about 40 miles from Providence. So we have this awkward situation. In fact, we have people who live in Rhode Island and work in Boston for the Federal Government and get paid higher than their neighbors who live in Rhode Island and work in Providence, RI. So this situation is both unfair and, I think, unfortunate.

Our amendment would correct that situation and it would do so in a way which, I think, would not do great damage to the overall structure of locality pay throughout the United States. After all, we are talking really about a unique situation—the smallest State in the country, which has no effective counties in it as a measure of

any governmental type of activity. So I suggest very strongly that we approach this with a legislative solution.

I must thank both the subcommittee chairman, Senator CAMPBELL of Colorado, and also the chairman of the authorizing committee, Senator THOMPSON. We have been talking with both individuals and they have been most helpful, as have their staffs. They have suggested that we can probably, with their assistance, make more progress by simply today discussing and describing the issue and then relying upon our mutual efforts to try to derive some type of administrative solution to this issue.

Let me say one other thing that makes this a very compelling problem to us. This is not simply going out and saying I want to have my workers treated the same way their brethren and sisters are treated just 30 miles away; there is something else here. We find it, in certain cases, difficult to recruit Federal workers to come into the Rhode Island area because if they have a choice between going to Boston or to parts of Connecticut, or parts of Long Island, NY, in the same region, they will choose these other regions because they will automatically get a 3, 4, 5 percent pay increase, simply by choosing to work in Boston rather than working in Providence.

We have, in the past, tried to recruit individuals to come into our FBI and our Secret Service office, and many, many qualified people have said: I would love to work there. The challenges are there, the career potential is there, but the problem is, how can I turn to my family and say I am going to take a 3, 4, 5 percent pay cut?

This really affects our ability to recruit those individuals that we need—as anyplace needs—to effectively run our Federal agencies. So both Senator CHAFEE and I are concerned about and committed to this issue. First, we recognize that this is something that, with the cooperation and the help of the Appropriations Committee and Senator CAMPBELL, and the authorizing committee with Senator THOMPSON, and their ranking members, we hope we can make progress on the administrative front.

At this time, unless the Senator from Colorado has comments, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator has that right.

The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 8 minutes.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dan Alpert, a

fellow in my office, be permitted floor privileges during the pendency of this bill and during the morning business time.

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

(The remarks of Mr. BINGAMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1315 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the time provided by the managers.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, while we are waiting for Senators to come to the floor with amendments, I would like to speak to two sections of the Treasury and general government appropriations bill that are, I believe, of great importance.

The first is called the GREAT Program—the Gang Resistance Education and Training, or GREAT Program. This is a program that is administered by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, in partnership with State and local law enforcement.

Unfortunately, gang activity has increased in our country in recent years, as the Chair well knows.

ATF has developed a program to give our children the tools they need to be able to resist the temptation to belong to a gang.

The GREAT program is only seven years old, but has already grown from a pilot program in Arizona to classrooms all over the United States—and in Puerto Rico, Canada, and overseas military bases. ATF estimates that about 1.7 million students have received GREAT training.

GREAT was designed to provide gang prevention and anti-violence instruction to children in a classroom setting. ATF trains local law enforcement officers to teach these classes, and provides grants to their offices to help pay for their time.

Needless to say, working policemen in classrooms do a lot to dispel the sometimes erroneous myths that children have about working policemen.

This program is having a positive effect on student activities and behaviors, and is deterring them from involvement in gangs. A side benefit is that the graduates seem to be doing a better job of communicating with their parents and teachers, and getting better grades.

Last year the Subcommittee on Treasury and General Government held a hearing on the GREAT Program. The highlight of the morning was listening to the students from Colorado, Wis-

consin, Arizona and a number of other States as they told about what they learned when they took the classes. It was very encouraging to hear how some of these kids actually turned their lives around because of this training.

For the second year in a row, the administration is requesting only \$10 million for grants for the GREAT program. Last year, Congress felt that wasn't enough to fund the many requests for help from State and local law enforcement and provided \$13 million for GREAT grants. \$10 million still isn't enough.

We are asking again in this bill to provide \$13 million. I urge my colleagues to support the effort of the committee to again provide \$13 million for grants to State and local law enforcement for this worthwhile and effective program.

The other section of the bill I would like to mention for the knowledge of my colleagues is what is called the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

This center was created in 1984, and is dedicated to finding every missing child and helping to prevent the abduction and sexual exploitation of all children.

Sadly, we are not 100 percent successful. Every year thousands of children are put at risk. In fact, every day in the United States 2,300 children are reported missing to different law enforcement agencies.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children works closely with three entities under the jurisdiction of this bill—the Customs Service, the Postal Inspection Service, and the Secret Service. I think it is important for my colleagues to be aware of the contributions of these different agencies.

In 1987, the Customs Service was the first Federal law enforcement agency to agree to be the contact point for tips and leads from the toll-free Child Pornography Tipline. Under direction provided by the committee, support for the Tipline will continue in the fiscal year 2000. This funding will be used for promotional brochures, public service announcements, and a campaign to educate teenage girls about the risks they may encounter and the ways to stay safer from crime.

In March of last year, the Customs Service and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children launched the new CyberTipline to allow parents to report incidents of suspicious or illegal internet activity. For the benefit of my computer literate friends, that internet address is "www.missingkids.com/cybertip."

The U.S. Postal Inspection Service and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children have a long-standing relationship in combating child pornography and sexual exploitation of children. For over ten years, information developed from the Child Pornography Tipline has been provided to the Postal Inspection Service for investigative purposes. In addition, the

Center has provided technical assistance when needed for specific investigations. The Postal Inspection Service has provided continuing assistance to the Center through training, development of publications, and outreach programs.

In late 1996, a cooperative agreement with the Secret Service Forensic Services Division resulted in the creation of the Exploited Child Unit. This unit focuses on combating child molestation, pornography, and prostitution. They raise public awareness about the problem of pedophilia and focus educational efforts on child safety on the internet.

This bill today gives ample opportunity to provide funding for both of these programs. This particular program will provide \$2 million for forensic support of investigations and \$1.996 million for the exploited child unit. This money will be well spent.

I know my colleagues will be willing to support this.

I yield the floor, and 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. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask of you, or the distinguished chairman of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, what the process is to call up one of the amendments that has been laid down, specifically No. 1195? Do I need to ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending business? What is appropriate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to call up his amendment.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1195

(Purpose: To increase by \$50,000,000 funding for United States Customs Service for salaries and expenses to hire 500 new inspectors to stop the flow of illegal drugs into the United States and facilitate legitimate cross-border trade and commerce)

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1195, dealing with the appropriation of additional funding for 617 Customs inspectors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL], for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. GRAMM, proposes an amendment numbered 1195.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 13, line 24, strike “\$1,670,747,000” and insert “\$1,720,747,000”.

On page 15, line 6, before the period, insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That \$50,000,000 shall be available until expended to hire, train, provide equipment for, and deploy 500 new Customs inspectors.”

On page 49, line 13, strike “\$38,175,000” and insert “\$36,500,000”.

On page 50, line 1, strike “\$23,681,000” and insert “\$22,586,000”.

On page 53, line 3, strike “\$624,896,000” and insert “\$590,100,000”.

On page 58, line 8, strike “\$120,198,000” and insert “\$109,344,000”.

On page 62, line 26, strike “\$27,422,000” and insert “\$25,805,000”.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, this is one of the amendments which was offered during the subcommittee markup but which we did not pursue because we had not identified offsets for the additional \$50 million being requested, and we wanted an opportunity to try to work it out before the bill came before the Senate.

We have not really worked out all of the details of this. Therefore, I am informed by the chairman of the subcommittee he may not be able to support this amendment at this time.

It is my intention to at least begin the process on behalf of myself and Senator HUTCHISON, who hopefully will be present shortly, so we can begin the discussion as to how to find a way to fund some additional Customs inspectors, particularly to be deployed on the southwest border.

Before I describe the problem and the reason for this, I commend the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for a really heroic effort to save existing Customs inspectors.

What had happened is, the way the administration's budget had been prepared, it was going to fund existing agents out of a fee structure that never had any chance of being passed by the Congress or implemented into law. Had not the chairman and ranking member acted quickly to find other sources of funding, we would have lost 617 existing Customs inspectors, but they were able to find that money elsewhere.

As a result, those positions have been saved at least for now. Where that leaves us is exactly even, with no increase in Customs officers, despite the huge increases in the number of people and the amount of commercial traffic crossing our border, particularly in the Southwest.

What that means is we are just literally dead in the water despite the efforts of the subcommittee chairman, Senator CAMPBELL.

That is why we wanted to find an additional \$50 million to hire 500 agents—only 500 agents—for next year to help with this problem.

Let me describe a little bit the problem on the Southwest border. As you know, we passed NAFTA. NAFTA has enabled us to dramatically increase commercial traffic between Mexico and the border, our four border States of the United States. But even without NAFTA, we would still have an increase in commercial traffic as well as the daily traffic between the communities south of the border and the American cities on our side.

I was somewhat amused that my colleague from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM, was very concerned about the situation on the Canadian border near Detroit. He was lamenting the fact we could end up with a situation where

there was a 2-minute delay for every car going through the border checkpoint—a 2-minute delay. Just think what that would mean with the large number of people who wanted to cross into the United States from Canada each day.

The reason I had to chuckle a little bit is, if we are successful, if we do get some additional agents, and the chairman of the subcommittee is successful in protecting what we have, our goal, stated by the Finance Committee, is to get to the point where we will only have a 20-minute delay per car at the Arizona border or at the Mexican-United States border.

A 20-minute delay every time you want to cross the border becomes onerous, particularly to people who live in the border communities and who every day cross the border for business or for family or pleasure reasons. There are literally hundreds and thousands of people who do that every day. This does not speak of the commercial traffic, which I will talk about in just a moment.

The point is, we are trying to get to a point where it only takes you 20 minutes to come into the United States or to go into Mexico. But we are talking specifically about coming into the United States. That is a very onerous situation when you are trying to promote commerce as well as more tourists coming to the United States, as well as families. So this is not something that is a luxury but something I think everyone would recognize is very important.

I will talk about some of the numbers because I think it is very instructive.

The traffic congestion at any of our border crossing points into Mexico—you just have to be there to see it. The number of commercial trucks, for example, that cross the border annually in my State of Arizona increased from 287,000 in 1994 to 347,000 in 1998. We do not have the personnel to keep up with that congestion.

For example, in San Luis, AZ, which depends very heavily on cross-border trade, you can easily wait 3 hours to cross. That is not unheard of at all, to sit there for 3 hours waiting to cross into the United States. This is during times when it is very critical, particularly for produce. Much of the commercial traffic that comes from Mexico to the United States is produce. It does not do any good for that produce to be sitting out there for 3 hours in the very warm sun south of Yuma, AZ, waiting to come in through the border crossing.

I ask my colleagues, if they had to wait 3 hours every time they wanted to get someplace on Capitol Hill, how long they would stand for it. Obviously, not very long.

We just don't have enough Customs inspectors, however, to staff that San Luis port even to stay open during some key hours. I point out, the commercial point is closed on Saturdays. So we are only talking about general business hours.



In effect, what ends up happening is, you get cancellations or reroutes hundreds of miles away to other ports when you have these kinds of long delays. The number of inspectors at this particular port of San Luis has increased. Do you want to know by how much it has increased? One inspector over the last 5 years. That is all. It went from 51 to 52. Obviously, we are not keeping up with the traffic.

The same is true of the port of Nogales, which is the largest port in Arizona. There the fresh produce industry is very big, both import and export. It is over \$1.5 billion a year. It is now the fifth busiest port on our Southwest border. But the Nogales port does not have enough inspectors. The number of inspectors there actually decreased last year by seven.

According to the Fresh Produce Association of America, there have been occasions, even during the low-produce season, where 6-mile truck backups have occurred down in Mexico. Just think about that for a moment—6 miles of trucks waiting to clear Customs. It is not at all uncommon for the truckers to come to the border and literally have to wait overnight before they can find a slot the next day to cross into the United States. And we are trying to encourage trade?

We understand that trade benefits people on both sides of the border. Obviously, we are not doing our part when the produce from Mexico cannot come into the United States because we do not have enough inspectors.

The lack of personnel on our borders is also a very serious problem with respect to the interdiction of illegal drugs and other contraband. As we all know, the Customs inspectors are really our first line of defense there. I have been on the border where you have these huge, long lines of traffic. Everybody is anxious to get through, and you just have a few ports with a few inspectors there struggling mightily to determine whether or not there may be some illegal drugs or contraband. We have given them some good high-tech equipment they can use, but it still requires manpower. Every week, they are able to stop some kind of traffic in which smuggling is going on, but they do not begin to catch even a fairly significant percentage of it.

Just to give you an idea what they have been able to accomplish, between 1994 and 1998 heroin seizures have gone up by 2,078 percent, marijuana seizures up 80 percent. It is clear that more Customs inspectors are needed to keep up with these increasing percentages of attempts to smuggle drugs and other contraband into our country.

As I mentioned a moment ago, the Finance Committee marked up its version of the Customs reauthorization bill not too long ago. In it, they approved legislation that Senators DOMENICI, GRAMM, HUTCHISON, and MCCAIN, and I and other border Senators introduced, to increase the Customs personnel in order to reduce the

wait times there to better fight the war on drugs and to enhance commerce to 20 minutes per vehicle.

When we can't even provide the funding to get the wait times down to 20 minutes per vehicle, we are derelict in our duty; we are failing in our responsibility; and the responsibility is on the Congress of the United States.

That is why Senator HUTCHISON and I have introduced this amendment to add \$50 million for 500 inspectors. We may take one item out to make it \$49 million so that the offsets we have provided would be more easily supportable by our colleagues, but this is an increase of merely 500 agents with this \$50 million. That is what it costs to get the equipment and the training and get this number of Customs inspectors actually on line at one of our ports of entry.

The amendment, as I said, will actually permit the deployment of these agents during the next year to one of these points of entry where they are needed for the Southwest border.

Just to focus a little bit more on the specific need with respect to commerce there, should my colleagues be interested, the number of trucks crossing the U.S. border annually has increased from 7.5 million in 1994 to over 10 million in 1998. That is a 40-percent increase. More than 372 million people crossed either the United States-Mexico or United States-Canadian border in the last fiscal year.

But even with this huge increase in the crossings, of both individuals and commercial traffic, the number of Customs inspectors and the canine enforcement officers—that is an important part of this, too—has only increased by 540 people between 1994 and 1998. That is simply not enough to keep up with the commercial traffic, let alone the missing of opportunities to seize illegal drugs.

Of the 3,400-plus pounds of illegal heroin seized last year, Customs seized 2,700 pounds. Of the 1.76 million pounds of marijuana seized, Customs seized just under 1 million pounds. And of the roughly 265,000 pounds of cocaine seized last year, Customs seized 148,000 pounds.

Clearly, this is where the first line of defense is in our war on drugs. I know my colleagues and I love to stand here and talk about how we need to get tougher in the war on drugs. This is our chance. The first line of defense in the war on drugs in the United States is at the point of entry where people attempt to bring this illegal contraband into our country and, because we are unwilling to fund the number of customs inspectors required, we don't have enough people on the border to check every vehicle and, therefore, to find and to stop these kinds of illegal drugs coming into our country.

I know the chairman of the subcommittee has talked a lot about the need to meet this need. I don't think there are any of us who don't appreciate what we have to try to do. It is

very difficult in a tough budget environment to find the money to do it.

What I have tried to point out is that we have to set priorities. If you look at all of the other parts of the budget, I can't find hardly any area in this particular budget that, in my view, has a higher priority than protecting our kids from drugs, than protecting our border from people who are literally invading our country with illegal substances to do detriment to our citizens. What is more important in this budget than that?

I, literally, challenge my colleagues who will oppose our amendment, defending appropriations that are in this mark for their particular area of interest, because we have had to provide \$50 million in offsets in order to fund this \$50 million for increased Customs agents. I challenge my colleagues to come to the floor and be willing to explain why what they are trying to protect in this budget is of a higher priority than stopping drugs at our border. I will be very curious to see how many of our colleagues are willing to come and vote against our amendment because it is taking funding out of something that is important to them, to explain to us why that is more important than this.

I am sorry to present that challenge as directly as I am. I think if we are going to be serious about this problem, rather than just talk about it, we have to address this in a very serious way that makes tough choices, that prioritizes. We can't just say, well, it is hard to do, and, therefore, we will try to do it next year. That is why we are so insistent on trying to accomplish this now.

There is much more I could say about this particular problem at this time. Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON is going to speak to this amendment as well. Perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee would like to address the issue now; I am not certain. Perhaps I could make that opportunity available, should the subcommittee chairman wish to avail himself of it.

If not, I am happy to speak to the issue more.

Let me stop at this point and see if Members might have any other conversation on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Arizona for bringing this to the attention of the Senate. I certainly understand and sympathize with him. My State borders his, and I spend a good deal of time in Arizona. I am fully aware of the problem we have with our borders. They are like a sieve, very frankly.

I wish we could have found the additional \$50 million he asked for, but, as he has already mentioned, we did have some budget constraints. We simply could not find it.

Let me tell my colleagues from where the Senator from Arizona would take the money to offset the \$50 million additional money he would like to

put in this account. He would take \$1,675,000 from the Federal Election Commission. He would take \$1,095,000 from the Federal Labor Relations Authority. He would take \$34,786,000 from the GSA. These are repairs and alterations that are badly needed for Federal buildings across the country. He would take \$10,854,000 from the GSA policy and operations account, and \$1,617,000 from the Merit Systems Protection Board.

I will talk for a few minutes about what we have done. First of all, in this bill the committee has provided \$1.67 billion in funding for fiscal year 2000 for the Customs Service. This level is \$263 million more than was requested by the administration and provides for maintaining current levels of funding and other related costs as well as non-related labor issues associated with the increase of inflation, with the exception of the fiscal year 1999 pay raise component.

The committee has provided new funding for the Customs integrity awareness effort, totaling \$4.3 million. In addition, the committee provided an additional \$2.5 million for the establishment of an assistant commissioner for training, which will provide in-service training and professional development of Customs personnel. There have been news reports about the breaches of integrity within the Customs Service. These programs are in response to those issues. This funding will assist the Customs Service in improving their hiring methodologies, ensuring that applicants are of the highest quality. In addition, the funding will improve the recruitment and redesign of the hiring process as well as support existing personnel.

The committee has continued level funding for the Customs Service child pornography efforts. The committee has been very pleased by the Customs Service's efforts, given the limited resources dedicated to that program. The committee has also provided \$19 million in funding for items associated with technology and staffing along the Southwest border, to which the Senator alluded.

Last year, as part of the fiscal year 1999 emergency drug supplemental funding, this committee provided an additional \$80 million for nonintrusive inspection equipment on top of the \$40.6 million for a variety of technologies for the Southwest border. This funding provided for the purchase of a mobile truck X-ray system, railcar inspection systems, gamma ray inspection systems, and higher energy, heavy pallet X-ray systems. Of the \$276 million of funds provided in that emergency supplemental, the Customs Service has not yet obligated all those funds. In fact, as of today, there is \$143 million that has not been spent in the account.

In addition, there is sufficient funding to cover the costs of the annualization of Operation Hardline and GATEWAY, as well as equipment

annualization for fiscal year 1999. This will allow Treasury to annualize the cost of these border-related positions.

In addition, there is \$1.29 million included to cover the cost for the mandatory workload increases during peak processing hours for the new crossings, including staffing and the dedicated commuter lane in El Paso, TX.

The committee has also included new funding for the Customs Integrity Awareness Program at \$4.3 million, so the total cost of the effort is now \$18 million. That is \$6 million in the base and \$4.3 million for this year for polygraphs and \$8 million for agent inspector relocations.

I wish we could have done more. Very simply, as everybody in this body knows, we were up against budget constraints. We simply did not have the money to fund all the things that we would like to.

I yield the floor.

Senator REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Texas is here to debate the Kyl-Hutchison amendment. I think that is appropriate. I want to respond briefly to Senator KYL's statement.

We are working under some very difficult budget constraints. There is a budget that is affecting the work we do on the floor that I didn't support. It was a budget that was given to us and passed by the majority. There are all kinds of problems we have with domestic discretionary spending, including more Customs agents. I would love to have more Customs agents. We need them very badly in Las Vegas, the most rapidly growing area in the whole country.

Remember, we, on this side of the aisle, did not vote for that budget. The budget we are working under is the budget that was given to us by the majority. With all of our domestic discretionary programs, we have a lot of problems, not the least of which is Customs agents.

I hope the American public is aware of the fact that veterans' benefits, as a result of the budget we have, are being stripped significantly. I hope there will be an effort made to have more money placed in the allocations to allow more appropriate and fair spending for domestic discretionary programs in all of our appropriations bills.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I hope we will be able to allocate the \$50 million in the Kyl-Hutchison amendment for the hiring of new Customs agents.

We have a terrible situation. I understand the position of Senator CAMPBELL and Senator REID in having to allocate this money. I think they have done a yeoman's job working within the budget constraints.

The fact of the matter is, in any budget, any family has to set prior-

ities. This administration has refused to set a priority of protecting our borders from illegal immigration and illegal drugs coming in. The fact is, they asked for no new Border Patrol agents this year, even though Congress has allocated 1,000 new Border Patrol agents every year for 5 years starting 2 years ago.

They didn't even hire the allocation in this year's budget. We authorized and paid for 1,000 Border Patrol agents in this year's budget, and this administration has only been able to hire 200 to 400 agents. Since we lose so many, we are worse off than we were when we started this fiscal year.

Now we come to Customs agents who are, once again, on the front line, particularly for illegal drugs because they are the ones responsible for searching trucks and cars that come in through the border. Once again, we have a request from the President for zero new Customs agents. The Customs Office itself asked for 617 new Customs agents. Look at what these Customs agents are doing. More than \$10 billion in drugs flow across the U.S.-Mexico border each year. Last year, the Customs Service seized 995,000 pounds of marijuana, 148,000 pounds of cocaine, and 3,500 pounds of heroin.

We are talking about not fully funding new agents, to not give these people on the front line the help they need in stopping the flow of illegal drugs into our country. In Laredo, TX, the biggest commercial port of entry on our southern border, there were over 1 million truck crossings last year. There are routine waits of 4 to 6 hours. At El Paso's Bridge of the Americas, the hours of operation are from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m., but because the Customs Service can't afford to pay overtime, they have to close at 4 so that they will be able to actually finish the people in the pipeline by 5. Trucks entering an import lot after 4 have to wait until 6 the next morning just to have their documentation cleared. This is hurting not only our ability to curb illegal traffic, but it is also hurting trade and free trade and ratcheting up the cost of goods coming in from the border. So it is very important that we look at Customs agents as the front line for getting illegal drugs stopped at our country's borders.

DEA Administrator, Tom Constantine, was before the Commerce, State, Justice Subcommittee this past March, and he said:

The vast majority of drugs available in the United States originate overseas. The international drug trade is controlled by a small number of high echelon drug lords, who reside in Colombia and Mexico. Most Americans are unaware of the vast damage that has been caused to their communities by international drug trafficking syndicates, most recently by organized crime groups headquartered in Mexico. At the current time, these traffickers pose the greatest threat to communities around the United States. Their impact is no longer limited to cities and towns along the Southwest border; traffickers from Mexico are now routinely

operating in the Midwest, the Southeast, the Northwest, and, increasingly, in the northeastern portion of the United States.

We need to have as a priority stopping illegal drugs coming through our borders. And if the administration continues to ask for zero new border patrol agents and zero new Customs agents, we are not going to be able to win the war on drugs. We cannot do it.

Senator KYL and I didn't choose to go in and take from other parts of the budget; that was our only option. When the President comes in with a budget that asks for no new Customs agents, we could do nothing but try to find offsets in order to maintain the integrity of the budget. So we went for administrative costs that were increases in spending over last year. It wasn't our choice to do this, but the difference between having increases in the GSA budget or increases in Customs agents who are going to be on the front line stopping illegal drugs from coming into our country, and to ease the flow of trade into our country, it seems to me, is pretty clear.

So I hope that we can make this a priority. I look forward to working with Senator CAMPBELL and Senator REID in the conference committee to try to mitigate the impact of any cuts that would be made in other budgets. I understand their position and having to defend this bill. They had hard choices to make. But we can't choose to walk away from law enforcement on our borders. This is a Federal responsibility. We can't fill in with local law enforcement officers. They don't have the capability to stem the flow of illegal drugs into our country.

So I hope our colleagues will support the Kyl-Hutchison amendment. We will do everything we can to mitigate the cuts that we are making in other areas, but it has to be our priority to get control of our sovereign borders, to keep illegal drugs from going into Cleveland, OH, or from going into Tacoma, WA, or Wilmington, DE, because that is where these drugs end up; they don't stay on the border. They infiltrate our country, and we must stop it. This is one of the ways we are going to try to do that.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I have to tell you, I have no quarrel with my colleagues from Texas and Arizona in my efforts and interests in reducing the use of drugs in America, since I helped write this bill and I have been on the forefront of trying to reduce drugs and putting money where it is most needed. But I remind my friend from Texas that, in fact, in this bill we put in \$263 million over the administration's request. In addition, as I have already said, of the \$276 million of funds provided in the emergency supplement, which was signed into law on May 31 of this year, Customs has still not spent \$143 million of that money. I know

some of it is for equipment, but certainly some of that could be transferred within the Department to areas that need it. We have done the best we can.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If the Senator will yield, I was thinking as we were talking about this, and as the Senator was making his point, perhaps we could look for offsets within Customs' budget, as well as some of these other areas. We would like to pass the amendment, but we also would like to maybe look for other ways that Senator KYL and I could set priorities within the Customs Department budget and maybe work something out that would not hurt another agency as much but we reprioritize within the budget.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We will be happy to work with the Senator from Texas and Senator KYL. If we can find the offsets within Customs' budget, we would be delighted to work with the Senator.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I just wanted to address a comment to the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator CAMPBELL. I made the point when I first began to speak that without his efforts, we would not have been able to save existing Customs inspectors. I misspoke and understated the nature of the problem and, therefore, the significance of what Senator CAMPBELL was able to accomplish. I think in the way I stated it, I said there were 617 additional inspectors that were at risk. Actually, I think the number is closer to 5,000.

Had Senator CAMPBELL and the other leadership of the subcommittee not gotten to the problem to find an additional \$312 million, as he pointed out, all 5,000 of those existing inspectors would have been at risk because they were being funded by a source which was not ever going to materialize and, in fact, which has not materialized. So in announcing the chairman's successes, I actually understated the nature of what he was able to accomplish. Senator HUTCHISON and I, therefore, take nothing away from the chairman of the committee, who has had to scramble very hard to try to help find a solution to this problem of Customs agents at our borders.

We have expressed, I think, in the strongest terms that we can, our appreciation for that. The chairman doesn't have to remind us of the hard work that he has put into that. We simply are of the view that we have to find a way to do more than tread water to stay even because, as both of us have pointed out, the traffic at the border is not staying even. The drug smugglers' efforts to bring more contraband into the country is not staying even. We have to try to keep up. The modest increase we are talking about is an effort to try to keep up with the nature of the problem that we have.

Point No. 1, the chairman is absolutely correct. They fought very hard

to get additional money just to save the status quo.

But I think the second point we are making is also valid; that is, preserving the status quo isn't good enough. We need to try to find a source to at least find another \$50 million for these additional Customs inspectors to at least try to keep pace with what is going on at our borders.

I ask the chairman, if there is no further discussion, we could simply defer a vote on this until afterwards. It is my understanding there will be a vote on the Lautenberg amendment in roughly 90 minutes or so. Perhaps we can simply conclude this conversation now and schedule any vote immediately after that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I move to table the Kyl amendment and ask for the yeas and nays. I further ask that the vote on the Kyl amendment take place immediately after the vote on the Lautenberg amendment, No. 1214, which we expect to take place later this afternoon.

However, I will be happy to work with my colleague, and if we can find a solution or a way to offset the money in the Customs' budget, at that time I will ask to vitiate this motion to table.

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent that the time prior to the motion to table amendment No. 1214, the Lautenberg amendment, be limited to 90 minutes to be equally divided in the usual form, and that no other amendments be in order to the amendment prior to the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I thank the manager of the bill for allowing me to do this.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for about 6 minutes to introduce a bill.

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

The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. AKAKA pertaining to the introduction of S. 1317 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, we have an agreement worked out on two amendments dealing with child care centers and Federal activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 1197

(Purpose: To ensure the safety and availability of child care centers in Federal facilities)

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask the Jeffords amendment No. 1197 be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], for Mr. JEFFORDS and Ms. LANDRIEU, proposes an amendment numbered 1197.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I'm pleased to join Senators JEFFORDS and LANDRIEU as a cosponsor of this amendment that helps address an issue affecting many lower pay-grade federal employees with young children: affordable child care. Often there are facilities available to fill this need, but the costs puts this option beyond the reach of these families. This amendment addresses this concern by allowing the use of appropriated funds to help these families. Though I am concerned that the House may be uncomfortable with the overall scope of this amendment, I look forward to working with Senators JEFFORDS and LANDRIEU to make sure this measure or a reasonable compromise is acceptable to both the House and the Senate.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise to reiterate the importance of an amendment that we agreed to earlier today by unanimous consent. This amendment offered by Senator JEFFORDS and myself will increase the availability, safety, and quality of Federal child care.

I firmly believe that the Federal Government should serve as a model for other employers to implement child care services in this country. These services must be affordable, safe, and be provided in an atmosphere that supports healthy development and growth of children. We have already made much progress within the Department of Defense with the enactment of legislation that ensures quality, safe and affordable child care to defense employees. The DoD program is now considered one of the finest in the world. It is now time to take this exemplary model and expand it to all Federal agencies.

The executive branch of Government has responsibility for over 1,000 child care centers—788 through the military, 109 through the General Services Administration, and 127 through other Federal departments. Over 215,000 children are being provided child care through these various Federal programs.

Unfortunately, almost 1/3 of Federal employees with young children may not have access to any Federal child care services. We need to ensure all children of Federal employees, not just those under the Department of Defense, have access to high quality and affordable child care.

Every parent should know that when they drop their children off at a Fed-

eral day care facility that their child is safe—because we have enacted uniform safety standards for these child care facilities.

We also must make efforts to ensure that child care is made available to every Federal employee regardless of their income. Now, more than ever, Federal employees are struggling to balance work and family obligations. They are also struggling to pay for the cost of child care. Currently, the cost of quality child care services ranges from \$3,000 to more than \$10,000, depending on where a person lives. In my State, this care ranges from \$3,000 to \$6,000. Unfortunately, many families in Louisiana cannot afford this cost. In fact, there are over 500,000 children throughout Louisiana whose families earn under \$27,000.

One of the first steps that the Federal Government can and should take is to provide a model for other employers to follow, so more individuals will have greater access to affordable and quality child care. Moreover, if the Federal Government is to remain a credible provider of child care services, Congress must enact this important amendment. I look forward to working my colleagues in the House and Senate to ensure adoption of this legislation in the conference report.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, this amendment will go a long way toward ensuring the safety and healthy development of children of federal employees who are cared for in federally sponsored or operated child care centers. The Senate passed this amendment last year on the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill by unanimous consent. Unfortunately, it was dropped during the last few hours of the conference. So I am back again this year.

In 1987, Congress passed the Triple amendment which permitted executive, legislative, and judicial branch agencies to utilize a portion of federally owned or leased space for the provision of child care services for federal employees. The General Services Administration (GSA) was given the authority to provide guidance, assistance, and oversight to federal agencies for the development of child care centers. In the decade since the Triple amendment was passed, hundreds of federal facilities throughout the nation have established onsite child care centers which are a tremendous help to our employees.

As you know, Federal property is exempt from state and local laws, regulations, and oversight. What this means for child care centers on that property are not subject to even the most minimal health and safety standards. Even the most basic state and local health and safety requirements do not apply to child care centers Federal facilities.

I find this very troubling, and I think we sell our federal employees a bill of goods when federally owned leased child care cannot guarantee that their children are in safe facilities. The Federal Government should set the exam-

ple when it comes to providing safe child care. It should not be turn an apathetic shoulder from meeting such standards simply because state and local regulations do not apply to them.

As Congress and the administration turn their spotlight on our nation's child care system, we must first get our own house in order. We must safeguard and protect the children receiving services in child care centers housed in federal facilities. Our employees should not be denied some assurance that the centers in which they place their children are accountable for meeting basic health and safety standards.

This amendment will require all child care services located in federal facilities to meet, at the very least, the same level of health and safety standards required of other child care centers in the same geographical area. That sounds like common sense, but as we all know too well, common sense is not always reflected in the law.

It should also be made clear that state and local standards should be a floor for basic health and safety, and not a ceiling. The role of the Federal Government—and, I believe, of the United States Congress in particular—is to constantly strive to do better and to lead by example. Federal facilities should always try to provide the highest quality of care. The GSA has required national accreditation in GSA-owned and leased facilities for years, and the majority of child care centers in GSA facilities are either in compliance with those accreditation standards or are strenuously working to get there. This is high quality of care towards which we should strive for in all of our Federal child care facilities.

Federal child care should mean something more than simply location on a Federal facility. The Federal Government has an obligation to provide safe care for its employees, and it has a responsibility for making sure that those standards are monitored and enforced. Some Federal employees receive this guarantee. Many do not. We can and must do better.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask the amendment be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1197) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1211 WITHDRAWN

Mr. CAMPBELL. I call up amendment No. 1211 by Ms. LANDRIEU, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 1211) was withdrawn.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent immediately following the

vote in relation to the Kyl-Hutchison amendment on the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, the Senate immediately proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Lawrence Summers to be Secretary of the Treasury, Executive Calendar No. 95.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. I now ask unanimous consent it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1214

(Purpose: To provide for the inclusion of alcohol abuse by minors in the national anti-drug media campaign for youth)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1214, which has been sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], for himself, and Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. JOHNSON, proposes an amendment numbered 1214.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ INCLUSION OF ALCOHOL ABUSE BY MINORS IN NATIONAL ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277) is amended—

(1) in section 101(h) of division A (the Treasury Department Appropriations Act, 1999), in title III under the heading “FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS—SPECIAL FORFEITURE FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)”, by inserting “(including the use of alcohol by individuals who have not attained 21 years of age)” after “drug use among young Americans”;

(b) OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998.—Section 704(b) of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (title VII of division C of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (14), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (15), by striking the period and inserting “; and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(16) shall conduct a national media campaign in accordance with the Drug-Free Media Campaign Act of 1998 (including with respect to the use of alcohol by individuals who have not attained 21 years of age).”.

(c) DRUG-FREE MEDIA CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1998.—The Drug-Free Media Campaign Act of 1998 (subtitle A of title I of division D of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)) is amended—

(1) in section 102(a), by inserting before the period the following: “, and use of alcohol by individuals in the United States who have not attained 21 years of age”; and

(2) in section 103(a)(1)(H), by inserting after “antidrug messages” the following: “and messages discouraging underage alcohol consumption.”.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. This amendment is being offered on behalf of myself, Senator BYRD, Senator HUTCHISON, Senator HOLLINGS, Senator JOHNSON, and Senator HARKIN. This amendment would require the drug czar’s office to include messages in his current media campaign to discourage children from engaging in underage alcohol consumption.

Running ads on national TV espousing the evil of drug use without even mentioning alcohol sends the wrong message to America’s children. It is the equivalent of telling kids, “Say ‘no’ to drugs, but this Bud’s for you.”

The fact is, consuming alcohol is illegal in all 50 States if you are under the age of 21. Among America’s youth, underage alcohol consumption is just as big of a problem as drug use.

The facts are revealing. For those who are not aware of the danger, alcohol kills six times more children ages 12-20 than all other illegal drugs combined. It was a surprise to me, and I suspect it is a surprise to millions of other Americans.

Underage alcohol consumption and its devastating effects on children paint a daunting picture. According to the Department of Health and Human Services, the average age at which children start drinking is 13. Even worse, the research shows that children who drink at the age of 13 have a 47-percent chance of becoming alcohol-dependent; if they wait until they are 21 to begin drinking, they have only a 10-percent chance of becoming dependent.

In all, there are nearly 4 million young people in this country who suffer from alcohol dependence. They account for one-fifth of all alcohol-dependent Americans.

The bottom line is that we dare not turn a blind eye when an opportunity comes along to address this problem. The drug czar’s media campaign is that opportunity.

Drug czar Gen. Barry McCaffrey has said:

[T]he most dangerous drug in America today is still alcohol.

Gen. McCaffrey has also said:

[Alcohol is] the biggest drug abuse problem for adolescents, and it’s linked to the use of other, illegal drugs.

Statistics support what General McCaffrey has been saying. According to the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, young people who drink alcohol are 7.5 times more likely to use any illegal drug and 50 times more likely to use cocaine than young people who never drink alcohol. In other words, alcohol is a gateway drug. Too often it leads to the use of marijuana, cocaine, and heroin by children. Since that is true, including ads addressing underage alcohol consumption in the media campaign would benefit the campaign and increase its overall effectiveness.

In advocating for this amendment, our voices are not alone. Surgeon General David Satcher recently wrote a letter to General McCaffrey:

I want to recommend that you include advertisements addressing underage drinking in the paid portion of ONDCP’s media campaign.

Surgeon General Satcher also stated:

It is time to more effectively address the drug that children and teens tell us is their greatest concern and the drug we know is most likely to result in their injury or death.

In addition to support from the Surgeon General, we have bipartisan support in the House. This same amendment was already added to the House version of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill by Congresswoman ROYBAL-ALLARD from California and Congressman WOLF from Virginia.

Editorials have also been written across this country supporting our position. Editorials have appeared in the Washington Post, the New York Times, Christian Science Monitor, and the Los Angeles Times, among other newspapers.

This effort on behalf of our children is further supported by more than 80 organizations, including Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Public Health Association, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, and the Crime Prevention Council.

The Senate has not been silent on the issue of underage drinking in the past, and we should not stand mute now. We have made clear on at least three occasions that it is the law of the land to prohibit the use of alcohol by those under the age of 21.

I am proud to have been the author of the 1984 law that made 21 the drinking age in all 50 States. As a matter of fact, I had an argument with a couple of my children who were less than 21 at the time. We had a long discussion. They said it might cut into their fun, their proms.

But I looked at the statistics and saw how many lives we could save. In the almost 16 years that law has been on the books, we have saved 15,000 kids from dying on the highways.

Later, in 1995, Senator BYRD led the charge on “zero tolerance” for underage alcohol consumption by writing the law that says if you are under 21, a .02 blood-alcohol level is legally drunk.

Our amendment is not prescriptive. It would not tell the drug czar which types of alcohol ads or precisely how many alcohol ads would be run. But it would require the drug czar to include the underage alcohol consumption message in its media campaign. And it would give General McCaffrey the authority to do so, authority he has claimed he currently lacks.

We want to send a strong message to America’s youth that neither underage alcohol consumption nor drug use is acceptable. We do not want to say there is a preference of one over the

other. We do not want to do that by being silent on alcohol.

Mr. President, the only successful path to winning the war on drugs is the one paved by preventing underage drinking. If we cannot muster the political will to tell our children that underage drinking is wrong, we will never win the war on drugs.

We must not accept underage drinking as a so-called rite of passage because it is a passage directly to illegal drugs such as marijuana, cocaine, and heroin; and it is a passage to a life of alcohol dependency.

What we have heard from colleagues who are not supporting us is that drugs are illegal. But so is drinking under the age of 21.

Tobacco is a legal product, but we have worked hard to try to stop young people from starting to smoke because we know eventually it often leads to respiratory failure, lung cancer, and other diseases, as well as premature death.

So I hope our colleagues will support this amendment. It is time to make young people aware of the facts. Underage drinking is not acceptable. It leads to addiction, and nothing is more painful to a parent than to see an addicted child.

We ought not to be deterred by any arguments that suggest that adding alcohol to the media campaign might detract from the message about drugs. What is the difference? Addiction is addiction is addiction. We do not want to lose our kids. We do not want them to lose control, and we do not want them to lose their lives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, before I speak to the Lautenberg amendment, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD. On several occasions in earlier debate I referred to the Kyl amendment No. 1195 as the Kyl amendment. I ask unanimous consent to correct that title to the Kyl-Hutchison amendment.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my friend from New Jersey. I came from an alcoholic family. Believe me, I know firsthand the devastating effects of what it does in a family. I have had over a dozen relatives, uncles, cousins and so on, including a sister, who have died from some form of alcohol-related abuse. I know the devastating effects on a whole community; on society as a whole. I know the cost and I do not think anybody detests it more than I do.

As my colleague, Senator DORGAN, knows, coming from a State in which there are many Indian reservations, fetal alcohol syndrome, which is an effect on children from mothers drinking too much, is literally hundreds of times worse on those reservations. On one reservation in America, 1 out of 4

children is born with some degree of fetal alcohol syndrome as opposed to the national average of 1 out of 500.

I am concerned, but the question for this body is not whether we want to reduce the use of alcohol by youngsters. Of course all of us want to do that. The question here is whether the ONDCP is the right vehicle or not. My view is it is the wrong vehicle.

I have been the chairman of this committee since the inception of this media campaign, when Senator KOHL was the ranking minority, and this project is something the committee originally had a great deal of difficulty in doing, because we wanted to make sure we got the best use of taxpayers' money when we set this up. I believe this amendment would simply dilute that mission. The committee did not provide as much as we would want this year. In fact, we are putting in \$50 million less this year than we did for the ONDCP last year. I believe the inclusion of an anti-alcohol campaign would simply decrease the funds available for the antidrug campaign more than we want to. The House, in my opinion, made a mistake when they pursued this action.

I also tell you we are, in my view, increasing the jurisdiction of the Office of National Drug Control Policy without legislative authority to do so. This is the wrong vehicle, as I mentioned, and I am seriously concerned that the precedent it would set would cause us a great deal of controversy, maybe open a Pandora's box of other amendments to broaden the ONDCP into areas it should not be.

This amendment expands ONDCP's jurisdiction into alcohol prevention. As I mentioned, they do not have a statutory mandate to do that. There are other agencies, such as the Center of Substance Abuse Prevention, that are better equipped to handle this kind of campaign. When we originally put the money into this campaign a few years ago, we wanted to make sure we could measure the effects. So there was a GAO study authorized, a 5-year study to review the media campaign and give the results to our committee about the ongoing effects, to see if we, in fact, were reducing the use of alcohol consumption by youngsters as a result of the campaign.

That study is only halfway through. It still has several years to go. I think if we dilute this message, if we start expanding the role, we are simply going to completely throw out the validity of that study the GAO is doing.

So, although I do appreciate the efforts of the Senator from New Jersey, and I look forward to working with him on other ways we can reduce alcohol use by youngsters, I, at this time, oppose the amendment. I will move to table after my colleague speaks.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I require to respond to my friend from Colorado.

He talks, as he said, with experience, having seen alcohol addiction and the

devastation it inflicts. But I want to respond specifically to the question the Senator from Colorado raises about dilution of message. We think that when a campaign is directed toward young people and it says "Say no to drugs," the omission of alcohol sends the wrong message. That's like saying, "Drugs are bad for you, but alcohol is not so bad."

So when we look at the statistics, and we see alcohol kills six times as many young people ages 12 to 20 than all of the illegal drugs combined, that tells us that the media campaign cannot deliver a thorough message unless it includes alcohol. Without including alcohol, the media campaign is a mere wink at underage drinking.

The drug czar is going to have \$1 billion, we hope, over the next 5 years to deliver a message. Mr. President, \$1 billion is a lot of money. So if the media campaign says "Say no to drugs," and it also says "Say no to alcohol," I see nothing wrong with that. And if there are ads portraying the horrific things that illegal drugs can do to kids, there should be ads portraying the same horrific things that alcohol can do to kids.

With the budget surpluses we have, we will keep on looking for additional funding for this campaign. One of the things that touches everybody in this Chamber, regardless of party, is interest in children, interest in protecting them from violence, interest in protecting them from disease, and interest in protecting them from addiction. So I think it is quite appropriate we combine the message on addiction to include all of the products that would be addictive, including alcohol.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the very distinguished Senator from New Jersey, Mr. LAUTENBERG. I compliment him on the battle he has been waging, and successfully, might I add. I am sorry he has elected not to return to this body. I wish he would change his mind on that score.

Let me just say at this point, I am pleased to join Senator LAUTENBERG in offering this amendment to the fiscal year 2000 Treasury and general government appropriations bill. The amendment would require that the Office of National Drug Control Policy's Anti-drug Youth Media Campaign include ads regarding illegal underage drinking. It is absurd to me that our federally funded media campaign fails to include the No. 1 drug choice amongst children; namely, alcohol. I do not know how that could escape anyone's attention. I cannot understand why that is not included.

Large numbers of young people are drinking. According to the 1997 Monitoring the Future Study conducted by



the University of Michigan, approximately 34 percent of high school seniors, 22 percent of tenth graders, and 8 percent of eighth graders, report being drunk at least once in a given month.

Yes, Mr. President, drunk. I know that is a shocking statistic. It is also one that we should not tolerate. Alcohol is a gateway drug. Young people who consume alcohol are more likely to use other drugs.

Statistics compiled by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University show that 37.5 percent of young people who have consumed alcohol have used some illicit drug versus only 5 percent of young people who have never consumed alcohol.

Early alcohol use results in alcohol problems in life. A report by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism indicates that when young people begin drinking before the age of 15, they are four times more likely to develop alcohol dependence than when drinking begins at age 21.

I noted in I believe it was either Roll Call or the Hill earlier this week there was a story about interns who are visiting the "watering holes"—visiting the watering holes. We all know what that means. These are not watering holes. These are places where these young interns are going to drink some form of alcohol, and many of them will end up getting drunk.

Most tragically, alcohol kills. It is deadly. Deadly! It takes the lives of more children than all other drugs put together. Yet, for some reason, this particularly lethal drug is left out of the media campaign. This administration has been leading a great campaign, a great crusade against tobacco, against smoking, and that is all right. That is well and good. But why doesn't the administration put its stamp on a crusade, on a great campaign against alcohol for youngsters? Why doesn't the administration lead in that crusade?

Let me repeat a story I have told many times. Russell Conwell, one of the great chautauqua speakers, told the story "Acres of Diamonds" 5,000 times. I have not told this story 5,000 times, but I have told it a number of times.

In 1951, when I was a member of the West Virginia Senate, I asked the warden of the State penitentiary in Moundsville to let me be a witness to the scheduled execution of a young man by the name of James Hewlett.

Under the laws of West Virginia at that time, a certain number of witnesses were required to be at an execution. The warden acceded to my request.

Why did I want to witness an execution? I often have the opportunity to speak to young people. I often speak to these pages who are sitting right now on both sides of the aisle looking at me. I speak with them out in the halls. I try to tell them wholesome stories from Tolstoy or from other great au-

thors. I try to give them good stories. I try to teach them good lessons so they will leave here having heard someone—and I am sure there are other Senators who do the same thing—talk with them about values.

It was for that reason that I wanted to see this execution. I often speak to young people in 4-H groups, Boy Scout groups, Girl Scout groups, and other groups, and I wanted to be able to tell them something that would help them in later life.

I went down and talked with the man who was to be executed. He had hired a cab driver to take him from Huntington, WV, over to Logan. On the way, he pulled a revolver and shot the cab driver in the back, robbed him, dumped him by the side of the road, and left him there to die.

Later, Jim Hewlett was apprehended in a theater in Montgomery. He was brought to trial, convicted, and sentenced to die in the electric chair.

He was asked if he would like a chaplain in his cell. He scoffed at the idea of having a chaplain in his cell. He did not want any part of it. But when the Governor declined to commute his sentence, then the young man became serious about a chaplain. He wanted a chaplain in his cell.

On this occasion, the warden permitted me to go down to the cell of the young man, and I talked with him. I told him I had the opportunity to talk with young people on many occasions, and I asked if he had something that he could tell me that would help these young people, some advice that I could pass on to them that might assist them in avoiding trouble in later life.

Jim Hewlett said yes. He said: "Tell them to go to Sunday school and church." He said: "If I had gone to Sunday school and church, I wouldn't be here tonight."

Our conversation was very short. The hour of 9 was rapidly approaching, and he was to step into the electric chair at 9 o'clock. As I started to go, after thanking him, he said, "Wait a minute. Tell them one more thing. Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank." Those are his exact words. I have spoken them hundreds of times: "Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank."

I said: "What do you mean by that?"

The chaplain spoke up and said: "Senator"—I was a State senator at that time—"Senator, you see that little crack on the wall up there? If he were to have a couple of drinks, he would try to go through that crack in the wall. That is what it does to him. He was drinking when he shot the cab driver."

I went back to the warden's office.

The rest of the story, of course, is obvious. The young man was executed, and I have been passing these words of Jim Hewlett from Fayette County, WV, on to young people during these almost 50 years since: "Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank."

Why do we have to tippy-toe around it? Why does the administration have

to tippy-toe around it? Why do the people in the administration who have responsibilities along this line have to tippy-toe around it? Alcohol kills! Not only does it sometimes kill the person who imbibes but it also kills others—wives, children, old people who are trying to go to the grocery store or to a child-care center. These are people who are innocent. They are not doing the drinking. But the person who drank and then got behind the wheel, that person has killed others.

Every year at commencement time, when high schools are holding their commencements all over the country, we read stories in the newspapers. They are the same year after year: a group of youngsters, having just graduated, have a big party, and they get drunk and they crash their automobile that is going at a speed of 100 miles per hour into a tree. The automobile wraps itself around the tree and there are the mangled, bleeding, dead bodies in the twisted wreckage. And in the car is also found some alcohol.

It is time this country awakens. It is time the churches of this country awaken and tell our young people: Don't do it.

When I give a Christmas message, I do not say: Don't drink and drive. I simply say: Don't drink. I am not expecting everybody to feel as I do or to do as I do, but at least we ought to do what we can to educate the young people of this country as to the evils, the dangers, and the sorrows that will come from the use of alcohol—alcohol.

There are some young people right now listening to me on the television somewhere who have heard me pass along the advice of the condemned man, Jim Hewlett: "Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank." I hope those young people will listen. I hope they will take it to heart and not drink alcohol.

This amendment is a commonsense amendment—a commonsense amendment—to address the staggering statistics regarding youth alcohol use. We need to send a strong message to the nation's youth that drinking has serious consequences, and all too often they are deadly consequences.

I thank Mr. LAUTENBERG for his statesmanship, for his courage, and for his common sense. I appreciate very much his allowing me to cosponsor this amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, on our time, I thank the Senator from West Virginia. He shows an interest in this subject that calls up our knowledge of experience with alcohol that none of us should ever have—the loss of a family member.

When you see the devastation of alcohol, you do not understand why it is a different class addiction than that which is drugs. It is easier to get into. It is less stigmatic. People do not say: Oh, look, he's an alcoholic.

A friend of mine has a granddaughter, 14 years old—14 years old—who started sniffing glue, drank alcohol. Now it is drugs. She is in an institution. It is the most heartbreaking thing one can imagine.

Mr. President, how much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes 34 seconds.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. I will use time allocated by Senator CAMPBELL.

Mr. President, it is a rare occasion when I rise to oppose an amendment on alcohol offered by my colleague from New Jersey. I just heard the moving comments by the Senator from West Virginia. On almost every other occasion on the Senate floor, I have supported their initiatives. The .08 national standard on drunk driving, I have supported it. You name it, I have supported it.

My mother was killed by a drunk driver. I have been in an accident caused by a drunk driver in which the car I was driving was totaled.

Senator BYRD described graduation parties. My cousin's son Jesse was at a graduation party one night—the night before he was to graduate from high school—a wonderful young boy, great golfer, slight of build, a handsome young man—and at midnight got in the wrong car, a car driven by a young man who had had too much to drink. They drove across a railroad track and were hit by a train, and that young boy lost his life.

I know about the scourges of alcohol. I know about drunk driving. I know about the disease of alcoholism. I also know about the issue of illegal drugs in this country and want to tell a story about that, if I might.

I visited Oak Hill Detention Center recently, within the last matter of weeks. Oak Hill Detention Center is not too far from this building. It is a half-hour drive. It houses some of the toughest young criminals who have committed crimes on the streets of the District of Columbia. These are kids, in many cases tough, hardened criminals but still kids.

I met a young man who at age 12 was dealing drugs and was addicted to hard drugs on the streets of the District of Columbia. He was shot a number of times, picked up, and convicted of armed robbery. At age 12, he was selling and addicted to hard drugs.

Across the table from him sat another young man who, at age 12, was also dealing drugs and convicted of armed robbery. Across the table was a young girl who, at age 13, was on hard drugs and selling drugs and had a baby—all in the first year of her teen-age life.

The security fellow in one of the areas of the Oak Hill Detention Center

said to me—and I could tell he liked these kids; he cared about these kids; he knew them, knew them well—said: You know, these are tough kids. These are kids who have done wrong, in most cases have had a tough life, but they are still kids. He said: What I regret most about this job is going to their funerals. There are too many funerals. After they serve their time at the Oak Hill Detention Center and they are back on the streets—too often relapsing back on hard drugs—I go to their funerals.

The common element to the discussions I had at that Oak Hill Youth Detention Center was hard drugs—addicted to drugs at a very young age and then followed a life of crime, and in most cases violent crime as well.

This country has a problem with drugs. One approach to addressing this problem was recommended by the administration and some in Congress to say: We know that television has an influence on people's lives. Television advertising, hundreds of billions of dollars of television advertising has an influence on what people buy, what they wear, how they look, and what they sing. If it has that kind of influence, can we use television in a way that can influence people with respect to drugs and how they view drugs?

So the proposal was to put together a \$1 billion program over 5 years to do intensive drug education television advertising. I support that.

This year, this subcommittee cut the funding for that by \$50 million. In other words, there will be \$50 million less than was requested for it and \$50 million less than was spent last year on this program.

This program ought to be allowed to work so we can determine with what effectiveness we can change people's vision and view about drugs, especially young people. We are in the third year. We need to allow this to work.

Cutting this program by \$50 million was the last thing we wanted to do, but the budget allocations would not allow us to fully fund it.

Now we are told by our colleagues, we want to add other things to it. I will support in an instant a proposal brought to the floor of the Senate that says let us do something of exactly the same scale on alcohol. I will support that in an instant. A \$1 billion program over 5 years to educate young people about alcohol, we ought to do that. But I don't think, having cut this program by \$50 million this year—understanding that when you talk to young people anywhere in this country who have been involved in violent crime, you will find out that the origin of that and the genesis of much of that behavior comes from addiction to drugs—now is the time to both cut this program by \$50 million, which is what has happened in this subcommittee, and then also add other responsibilities to that program.

I indicated that my family was visited by the horror of the phone call late at night saying that my mother

had been killed. Others in my family have been victims of drunk driving accidents. I understand all that. But the subject here is about drugs.

I have spoken on the floor about six times of a person I am going to speak about just briefly again, Leo Gonzales Wright. A young attorney with, I am sure, great hope and stars in her eyes moves to Washington, DC, to practice environmental law. In her early twenties, her name was Bettina Pruckmayr. Bettina Pruckmayr ended her life in this town with the kind of horror that is not visited upon many. She stopped at an ATM machine, was abducted by a man named Leo Gonzales Wright, and stabbed over 30 times by this violent felon.

Who was Leo Gonzales Wright? A man addicted to drugs, a man high on drugs, a man who had been convicted of murder before, let out of prison on patrol, tested positive for drugs but not put back in prison.

What do drugs mean? What do drugs do? It means that people on our streets, who are addicted to drugs and are willing to commit violent acts, murder innocent people like young Bettina Pruckmayr.

The origin of this is the problem of drugs. It is a very significant problem. The attempt was to decide whether we could alter behavior, educate young children with \$1 billion in a 5-year program of advertising dealing with drugs. I happen to think that makes sense. We have tried a lot of different things. It makes sense to try this.

Does it make sense to do a lot more on alcohol? Absolutely. I am willing to support that and do that. I don't think, however, it ought to be used to dilute this effort. This effort is an effort that is in its third year. We have already had to dilute it by reducing funding \$50 million.

I say to my colleague, with whom I voted on every occasion on this issue, let us find another way to fund this program and I will be with you. I understand the scourge of alcohol and alcohol addiction, the carnage it causes on American roads, and the devastation it causes to American families. I also think those who spoke about that with such gripping emotion today probably could tell us stories that they understand the carnage caused by drug addiction in this country to hard drugs and the number of families whose hearts ache tonight because their loved one was killed by someone high on drugs, addicted to drugs for a number of years in a circumstance where perhaps, had we done things differently, had we done things better, had we had more influence on those lives, we might have avoided having that person addicted to drugs and, therefore, committed to a life of crime.

That is what this effort is about. It is what General McCaffrey and the Office of Drug Control Policy, it is what we are trying to do in a 5-year period. I think we ought to continue to do that.

One final point: One of my regrets, standing as I am today, is a woman

named Carolyn Nunnallee, whom I consider a good friend. She is the national president of the Mothers Against Drunk Driving. She and her organization very strongly support the Lautenberg amendment. I almost never have disagreed with Mothers Against Drug Driving. I think they have done more in this country than most any other organization I know to influence and alter behavior dealing with the issue of drunk driving. I regret very much not supporting them on this issue.

For reasons I have already stated, I think we ought to stay the course on this question of drug addiction and education dealing with drug addiction among America's youth. At the same time, I want to join in and support in any way possible the efforts of Senator LAUTENBERG and Senator BYRD and others to add money to transportation bills on drunk driving issues, to add money to health bills on drunk driving. I will support a billion-dollar program in 5 years. Sign me up. But don't dilute this program. Let us let this program work to see, at the end of 5 years, whether we have altered the behavior and substantially changed the determination by some young people in this country to understand more about drugs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 30 minutes, 25 seconds; the Senator from New Jersey has 15 minutes 20 seconds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky and 10 minutes to Senator MCCONNELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Lautenberg amendment.

We all want to do what we can to fight underage drinking. At first glance this amendment might look like a good idea. Putting the office of national drug control policy and the drug czar on the case sounds like we are really taking action in the fight against underage drinking.

I believe that this amendment would actually hurt both the fight against underage drinking as well as our Nation's struggle with illegal drugs.

First of all, we're not even sure if the drug czar, General McCaffrey, really wants this amendment. We are hearing rumblings that the administration is against it, but no one seems to know for sure. Until we know, it doesn't make sense to pass the amendment.

If General McCaffrey, the man the President has asked to lead the charge in our anti-drug efforts, isn't sure about it, I think we need to be very careful.

In addition, we know that the bipartisan coalition for a drug-free America—headed up by Bill Bennett and

Mario Cuomo—the group that coordinates efforts with the drug czar and produces most of the Government's antidrug ads, does not support this amendment.

Bill Bennett and Mario Cuomo don't agree on much, and when they do we should take notice and listen.

Second, passing the amendment and adding underage drinking to the problems the drug czar has to tackle will just distract him from his principal focus—as Senator DORGAN said—the war on illegal drugs.

As Senator DORGAN, the ranking member on the subcommittee, pointed out last night, the drug czar's resources are already stretched to the limit.

Adding underage drinking to the drug czar's portfolio would only stretch his resources even further, and force him to take on another tough fight. I don't think that's what we want.

In fact, we know the Federal Government is already spending hundreds of millions of dollars through the various agencies to fight underage drinking, and the evidence shows we are making progress.

Over the past 10 years, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration reports that excessive drinking by underage kids has dropped significantly.

The Centers for Disease Control agrees. They report that underage drinking has dropped by more than 50 percent over the past two decades. A study by the National Institute on Drug Abuse on drinking among high school students reports similar progress.

Unfortunately, the evidence from the war on drugs is not as good. Over the past 5 years, the Department of Health and Human Services reports that illegal drug use has increased for high school kids.

We are turning the tide against underage drinking. What now is the compelling reason to involve the drug czar's office? He already has his hands full with the war on illegal drugs.

As I said earlier, it's an idea that sounds good at first, but I don't think anyone has laid out a compelling justification for it.

Mr. President, I applaud Senator LAUTENBERG for his fight against underage drinking. It is a fight, as is the war on illegal drugs, that we have to win. But I think he has taken the wrong approach on this amendment. It sounds like a solution in search of a problem. Let's keep fighting underage drinking with the tools we now have in place. They are working. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Lautenberg amendment.

I yield back my time.

Mr. MCCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, others have said it probably better than I can, but what is really at stake

is whether we are going to dramatically diminish, if not gut, the war on drugs.

The junior Senator from Kentucky has outlined the progress made on the teenage drinking front in the last 20 years, and it is, indeed, significant. No one argues with any of the observations that have been made by Senator BYRD and Senator LAUTENBERG, and others, about the devastating nature of the problem of teenage drinking, although it is encouraging that progress is being made.

The industry itself advertises against underage drinking extensively. The alcohol industry has spent \$100 million over the last 8 years, and the beer industry has spent \$250 million over the last 10 years, for a total of \$350 million, in their own financed effort to get at the problem of teenage drinking, which is a horrendous problem. But as Senator BUNNING has pointed out, it is a problem upon which we have made significant progress.

What is before us today with the Lautenberg amendment is whether we are going to gut the war on drugs. Regrettably, since President Clinton came to office, teenage drug use in this country has gone up 46 percent. We are going backwards in the war on drugs. While it may be an unintended consequence of what Senator LAUTENBERG is seeking to achieve today, the practical effect of this amendment is to gut the advertising campaign designed to go after teenage drug use, as Senator DORGAN has pointed out.

Let's have no misunderstandings; nobody is in favor of teenage drinking. Nobody thinks that we should not do more about this problem. However, the issue before us is: Are we going to gut the advertising effort in the war on drugs?

The National Youth Antidrug Media campaign is underway. This amendment, according to drug czar Barry McCaffrey, would undermine that. The Partnership for a Drug Free America, which is the nonprofit group that works with General McCaffrey to run this antidrug campaign, opposes this amendment.

General McCaffrey said just 3 weeks ago that proposals such as this amendment "could dilute the focus of the successful media campaign advertising effort to change attitudes of youth and parents toward illegal drug use." He also said, "An anti-underage drinking message to youth is largely a separate and distinct message from the anti-drug message, requiring a significantly different strategic approach based on scientific and behavioral knowledge."

So what we are doing is mixing up apples and oranges. A campaign, designed, properly researched, and underway, to deal with youth drug abuse would be diverted in an entirely different direction by the Lautenberg amendment.

Others have referred to the letters from Mario Cuomo, Bill Bennett, and Jim Burke, the coauthors of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. They

oppose the Lautenberg amendment. Obviously, it is not because they are in favor of teenage drinking, but they don't want to gut the effort to have an effective antidrug campaign among America's young people.

Chairman Burke, of the Partnership for a Drug-free America, said: "We don't believe . . . an effective campaign targeting underage drinking can be carved out of the current appropriation for the National Youth Antidrug Media Campaign.

He went on:

I can tell you that forcing the campaign to address underage drinking (something it was not originally designed to do) will seriously jeopardize the success of this effort.

He is referring to their effort to deal with teenage drug use, which, remember, is going up while teenage drinking is going down.

Cochairman Mario Cuomo, former Governor of New York, said this amendment "threatens the success of one media campaign by creating another that simply cannot and will not work given the current limitations."

Governor Cuomo also said that "this type of program will require hundreds of millions more dollars—if not billions—to be effective."

Governor Cuomo's cochairman, Bill Bennett, said:

Advocates are wrong to suggest that this enormous problem of teenage drinking can be addressed effectively within the current appropriation for the antidrug campaign. We read this amendment as the beginning of the end of the antidrug campaign.

Mr. President, we don't need to end the antidrug campaign. Drug use is going up; drug use among high school seniors has gone up 46 percent since 1992. It needs to be addressed. That is what this appropriation is for. Certainly, a program to address underage drinking, which all three of the men I have just quoted would tell us, would have to be of a tremendous size. That is an activity Congress would need to analyze carefully before embarking on.

I know that there are probably many Senators who are thinking that if they oppose the Lautenberg amendment, it is going to be very difficult to explain in a campaign contest. Let me say this. What would be even more difficult to explain, it seems to me, is a vote that would gut the effort to combat drug use in this country—teenage drug use in particular—which is on the increase. That is what this appropriation is designed to try to impact.

So if we are going to address teenage drinking, let's not do it at the expense of the war on drugs. The war on drugs has not been very effectively fought in the last few years. I am not here to cast any particular aspersions against anybody for that, but it is a cold, hard reality that teenage drug use has gone up 46 percent since 1992 in this country. It was previously tracking down. We need to get back on track and address this youth drug use. That is what the original appropriation was designed to do.

I hope we will resist the temptation to gut the war on drugs so that we can pursue it effectively. As evidence, we have the testimony of Jim Burke, Mario Cuomo, and Bill Bennett.

I ask that the record include copies of a letter from Bill Bennett of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, opposing the Lautenberg amendment; a letter from Mario Cuomo of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, opposing the Lautenberg amendment; and a statement of Richard D. Bonnette, President and CEO of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, opposing the amendment, along with a press release from the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

I ask unanimous consent that those be printed in the RECORD.

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

PARTNERSHIP FOR A  
DRUG-FREE AMERICA,  
Washington, DC, June 24, 1999.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: An amendment has been introduced in the House of Representatives that threatens the success of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, currently being coordinated by the Office of National Drug-Control Policy and the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. This amendment, now part of the Treasury & General Government Appropriations Bill, mandates the inclusion of alcohol-related messages in the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. As former Director of ONCDP in the Bush administration and as co-chairman of the Partnership, I write to urge you to oppose any similar provision that may be offered in your Appropriations Committee markup of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Bill.

Representative Royal-Allard and Representative Wolf, who introduced this amendment in the House are correct in their convictions about underage drinking. But advocates are wrong to suggest that this enormous problem can be addressed effectively within the current appropriation for the anti-drug campaign. Advocates of the amendment say it is simply designed to give Gen. McCaffrey statutory jurisdiction to address alcohol within the context of this campaign. We read this amendment as the beginning of the end of the anti-drug campaign.

If you wish to combat underage drinking, I urge you to support the development of a mass media campaign specifically targeting this issue through a separate appropriation. The marketing experts who comprise the Partnership believe it will take hundreds of millions of dollars to conduct a campaign designed to dissuade teenagers from drinking. The Partnership offers its assistance in this pursuit. But many things need to fall into place first—research, market-testing, and hundreds of millions in funding to do this correctly.

Should a version of the Roybal-Allard/Wolf amendment surface in the Senate, please help us keep the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign on track and focused. Please oppose any effort to require this campaign to do more than it was originally designed to do. As you may know, the Partnership receives no part of the federal money dedicated to the anti-drug campaign. The Partnership donates all its advertising to this federally-backed effort for free.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. BENNETT.

PARTNERSHIP FOR A  
DRUG-FREE AMERICA,  
New York, NY, June 23, 1999.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: An amendment has been introduced in the House of Representatives that threatens the success of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, currently being coordinated by the Office of National Drug-Control Policy and the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. This amendment, now part of the Treasury & General Government Appropriations Bill, mandates the inclusion of alcohol-related messages in the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

If Congress wishes to support developing a national advertising campaign targeting underage drinking, we stand ready to support you be offering the assistance of our entire organization. We do not believe, however, an effective campaign targeting underage drinking can be carved out of the current appropriation for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

As the former chairman and CEO of Johnson & Johnson and someone who has spent his entire career in marketing, I can tell you that forcing the campaign to address underage drinking (something that it was not originally designed to do) will seriously jeopardize the success of this effort. To undertake such an effort, extensive consumer-based research would be needed to determine effective advertising strategies. No such research exists. Additionally, to really change attitudes about alcohol, this type of effort would have to compete head-to-head with the billions spent to market alcohol products and, therefore, require significantly more funding.

Shaving money out of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign will not accomplish this. We do not question the rightness of addressing underage drinking. Our concerns focus on what we can and cannot accomplish with the current appropriation. We question the wisdom of seriously risking—and perhaps killing—the effectiveness of one media campaign to create another that simply cannot and will not work, given current limitations. Should a similar amendment be proposed in the Senate, I respectfully ask you to keep the anti-drug campaign focused on what it was designed to target: illegal, illicit drugs.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. BURKE.

PARTNERSHIP FOR A  
DRUG-FREE AMERICA,  
New York, NY, June 23, 1999.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: As you may know, the Partnership for a Drug-Free America—a non-profit coalition of professionals from the communications industry—has for the past 12 years demonstrated a remarkable expertise in the production of anti-drug advertising and the execution of a national anti-drug media campaign. The Partnership is currently donating all of its advertising to the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, being coordinated by the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The Partnership also provides ongoing strategic advice to the campaign, and receives no federal funds as part of this program.

The House Appropriations Committee will soon mark up its Treasury & General Government Appropriations Bill. An amendment has been added to this bill authorizing the inclusion of alcohol-related messages in the anti-drug campaign. As the Partnership has

demonstrated, advertising can be used to address teenage drug use. Backed by the proper research, advertising could also be used to address underage drinking. But please understand this: We cannot target both effectively within the current appropriation.

The alcohol industry spends billions each year on marketing and promotion. As it stands, \$185 million is authorized to fund the anti-drug campaign. Of this less than \$150 million is actually being spent on the purchase of media exposure for the campaign. If the Congress is interested in developing an effective campaign to address underage drinking, the Partnership stands ready to work with any and all concerned organizations and government agencies to see it through. But please understand that this type of program will require hundreds of millions more dollars—if not billions—to be effective.

Unless the House plans to increase funding significantly for the anti-drug campaign, the Partnership has urged members to vote to strip the Roybal-Allard/Wolf Amendment from the anti-drug media campaign appropriation. The amendment threatens the success of one media campaign by creating another that simply cannot and will not work, given current limitations. A fact sheet on the Partnership and our position on this amendment are attached for your convenience. If any similar provision is offered in your Appropriations Committee markup of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Bill, I encourage you keep the anti-drug campaign focused by opposing any such measure, unless significantly more funds are appropriated.

Sincerely yours,

MARIO M. CUOMO.

PARTNERSHIP FOR A DRUG-FREE AMERICA  
CO-CHAIRMAN

Mr. James E. Burke, Chairman Emeritus, Johnson & Johnson, Chairman, Partnership for a Drug-Free America, 405 Lexington Avenue, 16th Floor, New York, NY 10174, 212/973-3514, 212/697-1031 (Fax).

Governor Mario M. Cuomo, Former Governor, New York, Partner, Wilkie, Farr & Gallagher, 787 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10019-6099, 212/728-8260, 212/728-8111 (Fax).

Dr. William J. Bennett, Former Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy (Bush administration), Former Secretary of Education, US Department of Education (Reagan administration), Co-Director, Empower America, 1776 I Street, N.W., Suite 890, Washington, DC 20036, 202/452-8200, 202/833-0556 (fax).

STATEMENT OF RICHARD D. BONNETTE, PRESIDENT & CEO, PARTNERSHIP FOR A DRUG-FREE AMERICA ON THE ROYBAL-ALLARD/WOLF AMENDMENT

NEW YORK, June 7th—We wholeheartedly support the concept of developing a national advertising campaign targeting underage drinking. Alcohol abuse is a huge problem in America, and plays an undeniable role in substance abuse among children and teenagers. As the Partnership has demonstrated, advertising can be used to address teenage drug use. Backed by the proper research, advertising could also be used to address underage drinking. But it is simply not possible to target both effectively within the current appropriation for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

I base this perspective on more than 30 years in the advertising business, and 10 years of experience with the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. The Partnership is a coalition of communications professionals from advertising, marketing, public relations and related disciplines. This judgment

does not question the relevance of targeting underage drinking. It questions the wisdom of seriously risking—and perhaps killing—the effectiveness of one media campaign to create another that simply cannot and will not work, given current limitations.

Our overriding concern about the Roybal-Allard/Wolf amendment is that it will reduce the overall media exposure for the anti-drug campaign. The alcohol industry spends at least \$1 billion each year on marketing and promotion; the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is funded at \$195 million. Of this, less than \$150 million is backing the advertising campaign. Clearly, an alcohol-abuse advertising campaign would require significantly more money to compete with the marketing muscle of the alcohol industry. From a sheer marketing perspective, the chances of such a campaign having an impact within the context of the current appropriation are very, very slim.

The Partnership stands ready to support the development of a national advertising campaign on underage drinking. We have more than a decade's worth of experience in running a consumer-focused media campaign designed to change attitudes on drugs. We will help any and all groups interested in this type of campaign in every way we can. This type of campaign, however, must be done correctly.

The first step of any solid marketing effort is thorough research. We have 11 years of experience in the marketplace and 12 years of research on consumer attitudes about illegal drugs. While one could assume this model could work for alcohol abuse, extensive consumer-focused research would be needed to guide the development and execution of such a program. Currently, this type of research does not exist. The development and literature review backing the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign took more than 18 months. To insert an amendment requiring alcohol abuse be addressed, without the same thorough approach taken in the development of the anti-drug media campaign, ignores the fundamental need for research.

Children and teenagers have different attitudes about different drugs—marijuana, cocaine, inhalants, methamphetamine, heroin and other illegal drugs. Kids of different ages, races and genders view these drugs differently. Attitudes about certain drugs also vary by region in the country. We have no similar consumer insights into what kids think about alcohol—beer, liquor, malt liquor, etc.—and how these attitudes may differ by alcohol brand, by age of kids, race, etc.

Marketing to reduce alcohol abuse would be more difficult than marketing against illegal drugs. Alcohol, unlike illicit drugs, is legal. While not impossible to accomplish, changing attitudes about alcohol would be very challenging, given its widespread cultural acceptance and use (responsible and otherwise) of alcohol products. Alcohol use is widely glamorized in movies, television and music. Alcohol use is deeply ingrained in our culture—ritualized and commonplace.

We respect the opinions and passion of our colleagues working to reduce alcohol abuse. We do not have any ties with the beer and/or alcohol trade organizations opposing this amendment; we do not accept funding from the alcohol and/or tobacco industries. We are concerned about this amendment solely because it could significantly diminish the impact of the anti-drug campaign.

The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is being coordinated by the Office of National Drug Control Policy in cooperation with the Partnership for a Drug-Free America (PDFA). PDFA provides advertising to the campaign pro bono and receives no federal funding for its role in this effort. The amendment seeks inclusion of anti-alcohol

ads in this campaign, which is using federal funds to purchase media exposure for anti-drug advertising.

FACT SHEET

The Partnership for a Drug-Free America is a non-profit coalition of professionals from the communications industry, whose mission is to reduce demand for illegal drugs in America. Through its national anti-drug advertising campaign and other forms of media communication, the Partnership works to decrease demand for drugs by changing societal attitudes which support, tolerate, or condone drug use.

The Partnership is comprised of a small staff and hundreds of volunteers from the communications industry, who create and disseminate the Partnership's work. Advertising agencies create Partnership messages pro bono; research firms donate information services; talent unions permit their members to work for free; production professionals bring Partnership messages to life; a network of advertising professionals distribute the group's work to national and local media; public relations firms lend services to various Partnership projects; and media companies donate valuable broadcast time and print space to deliver Partnership messages to millions of Americans.

To date, more than 500 anti-drug ads have been created by our volunteers. From March 1987 through the end of 1998, the total value of broadcast time and print space donated to Partnership messages topped \$3 billion, making this the largest public service media campaign in history. The Partnership receives major funding from The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and support from more than 200 corporations and companies. PDFA accepts no funding from manufacturers of alcohol and/or tobacco products. The organization began in 1986 with seed money provided by the American Association of Advertising Agencies.

Research demonstrates that the Partnership's national advertising campaign has played a contributing role in reducing overall drug use in America. Independent studies and expert interpretation of drug trends support its effectiveness. The New York Times has described the Partnership as "one of the most effective drug education groups in the U.S."

Drastic changes in the media industry over the past decade have led to an overall decline in media exposure of public service advertising. This is one factor contributing to the Partnership's decision to participate in the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, coordinated by the Office of National Drug Control Policy in cooperation with PDFA. Through the leadership of Gen. Barry McCaffrey, director of the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, and the commitment of numerous, outstanding members of Congress, a total of \$380 million has been appropriated by Congress for this effort to date (\$195 million in FY '98, \$185 million in FY '99). The bulk of this money is being used to pay for the one thing that has eluded our campaign in recent years—consistent, optimal, national media exposure. PDFA receives no funding for its role in this campaign. The organization donates all advertising to the effort pro bono and serves as a primary strategic consultant (unpaid.)

In addition to its work on a national level, the Partnership has helped create 54 state- and city-based versions of its national advertising campaign through its State/City Alliance Program. Working with state/city governments and locally-based drug prevention organizations, the Partnership provides at no cost—the guidance, on-site technical assistance and creative materials necessary to shape a multimedia campaign tailored to the

needs and activities within the state or city. Several additional alliances are targeted for launch, which will expand the program's reach to 98 percent of the U.S.

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

Washington, DC.

ASSESSMENT OF THE POTENTIAL INCLUSION OF ANTI-UNDERAGE-DRINKING ADVERTISING IN THE ONDCP CAMPAIGN

An anti-underage drinking message to youth is largely a separate and distinct message from the anti-drug message, requiring a significantly different strategic approach based on scientific and behavioral knowledge. If we were to be asked to communicate an additional anti-underage-drinking message platform with the current media budget, we would fall below effective reach and frequency levels for all message platforms, thus risking the success of the entire campaign.

An anti-underage drinking message to youth would also require separate production, and this would incur a considerable investment (\$3-\$4 million).

An anti-underage drinking message to adults might more easily be incorporated in a strategic message focusing on encouraging good parenting, and the important role of youth influencers, in shaping positive behavior among youth. Ideally, of course, a separate effort targeting adults would be more effective.

While incremental advertising funds would absolutely be required to successfully mount an anti-underage drinking campaign, it would not be necessary to double the overall ONDCP advertising budget if the adult efforts are combined. Since the youth campaign represents about half of the campaign, the ideal incremental budget would be approximately \$100 million. This would include some funds for such needed expenditures as additional production, new behavior change expertise, and limited copy testing, tracking and evaluation. We would seek every possible efficiency between the anti-drug and anti-underage-drinking campaigns from a creative and media perspective (e.g., limiting the target to older teens).

If incremental funds are unavailable at this time, please be aware that the current campaign already includes a substantial percentage of anti-underage-drinking messages (e.g., MADD, DOT, OSAP, etc.). This proportion could be augmented, though this would obviously diminish other PSA efforts. The "match" airtime devoted to this advertising is every bit as good as that secured for the paid anti-drug units.

ISSUE PAPER

*Inclusion of alcohol in the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign*

Using appropriated funds to include an alcohol or tobacco component in the paid portion of the ONDCP National Youth Anti-drug Media Campaign, within existing budgets, would significantly dilute the campaign's emphasis on illicit drugs, the primary intent of Congress and the Clinton Administration in establishing this program.

The Media Campaign already addresses alcohol in several key areas.

When ONDCP purchases time on network or local television and/or radio stations, a condition of the media buy is a dollar-for-dollar contribution to ONDCP from the media outlet in the form of public service. Most comes in the form of donated public service slots in similar time periods, which ONDCP shares with other organizations that have drug-related messages (PSAs). The Media campaign is already using underage-

drinking and drunk driving public service announcements in its pro bono component. From July 1998 through January 1999 (the period for which data is available), about 15% of the television public service time given to the Media Campaign has been shared with four organizations involved with underage drinking and drunk driving (They are: National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), Recording Artists, Athletes and Actors Against Drunk Driving, and the Dept. of Transportation). These 20 PSAs were electronically coded and reports are generated to identify and track when and where each message is played. Computerized tracking reports indicate these messages have played over 7,000 times on local and network television, which is conservatively valued at \$8,000,000 in media time. ONDCP does not count any time donated in the middle of the night (1 a.m. to 5 a.m.) All of these PSAs were aired during appropriate time slots.

In addition, the Partnership for a Drug Free America has 53 State and local alliances 15 of which support programs that include alcohol messages as public service announcements. These messages include underage drinking, binge drinking, prenatal alcohol use, parental modeling, and other subjects that appear on television, radio, on billboards, on posters, and in print PDFA estimates that the total value of media time donated for these messages is approximately \$7,000,000.

ONDCP's media match also comes in the form of television programming. At least four national network television programs have focused on youth-alcohol related issues. For example, on May 16, the entire episode of WB's Smart Guy will concentrate on underage drinking. ONDCP's behavioral change experts have worked closely with the writers and producers of this program to ensure key message strategies were incorporated.

Much of the campaign's communications strategy to reach parents regarding youth drug are appropriate to reaching parents regarding underage drinking (knowing where your children are, who their friends are, establishing rules and values, etc.).

Substantial and costly changes in the communications strategy would be required. The existing campaign strategy was developed over an eight-month period in an expert driven process. The strategy emphasizes specific message platforms, techniques, and activities to address illicit drugs. Adding alcohol to the strategy would mean a substantial departure from current strategy, and would require additional time and research for development. For example, ads would need to be developed to address laws on underage drinking, issues of access to alcohol (point of sale), etc. This would dilute and delay the overall impact of the anti-drug ads by reducing their reach and frequency. Professional advertising and research staff have already alerted ONDCP that we may have too many strategic messages for the level of funds available. The addition of alcohol ads would further complicate efforts and delay the campaign from reaching its planned potential and strength.

Development of alcohol messages would place new, unanticipated requirements on our existing partners, require substantial time for production (behavioral briefs, focus groups and testing) and create additional expense. The Campaign was developed based on the Congressional expectation that all the messages used would be produced on a pro bono basis, primarily through the Partnership for a Drug Free America, whose agencies provide their creative work free of charge. PDFA does not produce national messages on alcohol use/abuse; thus, we would be required to pay for development costs

through an advertising agency (and no funding allocation exists for this). The costs and contractual effort required to undertake this would be substantial. Further it would undermine a principle upon which the campaign was based—the pro bono development of advertising messages.

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

Washington, DC, June 7, 1999.

McCaffrey SAYS INCLUSION OF UNRESEARCHED AND UNDER FUNDED ALCOHOL ADS IN YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN WOULD BE ILL-ADVISED

WASHINGTON, DC.—White House National Policy Director Barry McCaffrey today said that proposals to include alcohol prevention in the paid portion of the ongoing National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign "could dilute the focus of the successful media campaign advertising effort to change attitudes of youth and parents toward illegal drug abuse."

McCaffrey stated, "We share a concern about the terribly serious problem of underage alcohol use. We do not disagree with the desirability of a media campaign targeted against underage drinking. However, it would be a serious mistake to simply add alcohol messages to the ONDCP paid media campaign without significantly increasing the funding level. Behavioral scientists and youth and advertising experts advise us that our campaign will only be effective if we purchase a sufficient level of media exposure for each of our messages. The addition of paid alcohol ads—without new funds, staff and research—would only hamper the effectiveness of our campaign."

A commercial advertiser would not add a new product line to an advertising plan without increasing the advertising budget. We cannot simply add new alcohol messages without seriously endangering the effectiveness of the anti-drug youth campaign. There are several challenges that would make an anti-alcohol campaign an expensive proposition. Although at the initiation of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign there was a stockpile of illicit drug ads, there are very few ads currently available on underage drinking. We would need to develop and produce expensive new ads. Additionally, since alcohol is legal for adults, an effective anti-alcohol campaign would need an entirely different strategy than our existing media campaign, which has as its focus illegal substances.

When ONDCP purchases time on national or local media, we negotiate to achieve a dollar-for-dollar matching contribution. Most of this contribution comes in the form of donated public service announcement slots in similar time periods. ONDCP then passes these PSA opportunities to organizations that have anti-drug messages. From July 1998 through January 1999, roughly 15% of television public service time given to the ONDCP Media Campaign was shared with four organizations confronting underage drinking and drunk driving (National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, Recording Artists, Athletes and Actors Against Drunk Driving, and the Department of Transportation). These messages have played over 7000 times on local and network television, which is conservatively valued at \$8 million. In this concrete way, we have already generated the largest youth anti-alcohol media campaign in history. ONDCP has also used the match part of the campaign to urge networks to include anti-alcohol messages in entertainment programming. For example, the entire episode of WB's Smart Guy that



aired on May 16 concentrated on underage drinking."

We are now entering the second year of an increasingly successful youth anti-drug media campaign. Alcohol and tobacco use are clearly a major threat to the health and safety of our children. However, now is not the time to lose focus on the start of a massive, well designed and successful effort to reverse the disastrous increase in illegal drug use by American adolescents."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let us get on about the business of fighting teenage drug abuse. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to table.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, my colleague from Ohio is going to speak. I will give him 4 minutes to make his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank my friend.

Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Lautenberg amendment.

This is a commonsense amendment.

What are the essential facts? The essential facts are that underage drinking is a huge problem in this country. If you are worried about your child dying, this is a good place to start.

Statistics are absolutely unbelievable. The life expectancy of those between the age of 16 and 24 or 25 is not good. One of the main reasons it is not good is underage drinking. Most of the fatalities are connected with underage drinking.

Let me also state some other essential facts.

Advertising works. We all know it works. We know it works on campaigns. Where does the majority of the money that we raise for our campaigns go? It goes to advertising. Advertising is how we communicate with people. We know it works.

If we are serious about dealing with this problem, then we need to spend the money and we need to do the advertising.

One of the statistics that has been cited on this floor is very telling. It goes back to my question. If you are serious about this problem, if you are serious about protecting your kids, what do you do?

Here is one statistic. One study indicates that underage abuse of alcohol certainly has serious consequences. According to the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, underage drinking killed an estimated 6,350 young people between the age of 12 to 20. That was for the year 1994. All other illicit drugs killed 980 youth.

If these statistics are true—based on my experience as county prosecutor and someone who has been involved in this issue for many years, I think it is true—alcohol kills six times as many children than all other illicit drugs combined.

This is a very modest proposal because it does not compel the drug czar to spend money. What it simply says is that the drug czar spend some of the

money that they have that has been set aside for advertising. They can, in fact, spend it on this horrendous problem.

All you have to do to see this problem is to go to the hospital and talk to an emergency room physician. Ask an emergency room physician how often alcohol is related to what they see. They will tell you that on any Friday night, or any Saturday night, it dominates the emergencies; that the vast majority of the emergencies they see, particularly the serious ones, are alcohol related.

This is a leading killer of our young people. To say that we are not going to use this money that is available for advertising, which we know is effective, for this horrendous problem, frankly, makes absolutely no sense.

I appeal to my colleagues. While reasonable minds can differ—and I think my colleagues on the other side of this issue have made some very interesting and some good arguments—I believe that the statistics clearly indicate that alcohol is the drug of choice among young people.

For those who are underage, alcohol is the drug of choice. It is the most serious drug in this country, and it is also a gateway drug, which simply means it is the drug that most young people start with, and then they "advance" to other drugs.

To be able to mount a successful and a good advertising campaign—to take the words from the amendment, the message of "discouraging underage alcohol consumption," that is what this amendment would allow.

I urge my colleagues to allow this permissive use of the money. I believe it will save lives. I believe it is the right thing to do.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, what time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has 11 minutes 1 second. The Senator from Colorado has 15 minutes 39 seconds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I think we have no further speakers on the issue on our side. We are prepared to yield back the time, unless someone shows up in the next minute or two.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I think that we can move to conclude this debate. I will take just a couple of minutes. Unless there are further Members who want to speak, I will then yield back the time.

This is one of those debates that I really do not enjoy because the friends who are opposing this are not people who are against what we want to do. They are not against eliminating underage drinking—not at all. What we are arguing about is somewhat about process.

Frankly, though, we are on the same side of the issue. But I see them as having an argument that I can't buy, and I don't think the American people will buy. We are saying let's preserve as much of the \$1 billion that we have to fight drugs through the media campaign, plus all of the other money

spent on fighting drugs, even though we are not doing it quite successfully.

But we ought to be looking more critically at how we deal with the drug problem. We are building more jails. We are penalizing those in institutions and jails, or in other facilities of incarceration, who are not drug addicts. We are spending billions of dollars. And we don't put alcoholics in jail. We don't punish them. We don't stigmatize them the same way we do drug users.

But I point out that alcohol kills six times more children ages 12 to 20 than all other illegal drugs combined.

What does that say? Does that say that the children who die from alcohol are worth less to us as a society than those who die from illegal drugs? I don't think that is the message that we want to convey.

There is a \$1 billion anti-drug media campaign. That \$1 billion, in light of this surplus, could grow. But because the drug czar does not even have the authority, he cannot issue messages about underage drinking. There is something wrong with that. Why can't an ad that shows a picture of a degenerated adult brain from drug use say that also happens from alcohol?

In many cases, we see violence from alcohol that does not always kill. But it enrages people and causes fights. Alcohol is the product largely responsible for spousal abuse and internal family fights. Alcohol does it every time.

We have 4 million alcoholics between the ages of 13 and 20—4 million. That is a lot of young people. Yet, we are not waging the same war against alcohol as we are against drugs.

By the way, in the message that we heard from the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, he mentioned outstanding citizens, Jim Burke and Mario Cuomo, as people who are on the other side. But that doesn't mean that they are right in this fight. I disagree with them and have great respect for both of them. I know them personally.

The fact of the matter is, when we don't mention that alcohol is a scourge, as are illegal drugs, then it is assumed to be by young people something not so bad. We know it is terrible: Six times more fatal to young people than all of the illegal drugs combined.

What keeps the message from getting out there? I don't know that there is anybody lobbying for illegal drugs. But I know that there are people lobbying to keep this anti-alcohol message away from children. When I see the Budweiser lizards talking on television, it is a pretty attractive picture. But it is not a lot different from Joe Camel attracting kids to smoking. Young people laugh. They like those commercials. I know it goes right from the television into young people's minds.

Those commercials make people think, "Beer is cool." But it is not cool when it is a 13-, 14-, or 15-year-old kid. As they say, a child who starts drinking at age 13 has a 47-percent chance of becoming an alcoholic. Those who wait

until age 21 have only a 10-percent chance.

Why don't we respond to this epidemic? We can talk about programs that can make a difference, but we are not. But we are spending \$1 billion on an anti-drug campaign. Yes, there has been a cutback, but I see that being restored. If those funds grow, the drug czar can't add alcohol to the campaign, because he doesn't have the authority. This amendment gives him the authority. It doesn't tell him how to do it. It says tell young people out there, you hurt your brain, you hurt your family, you hurt your society, and you hurt yourself if you use alcohol.

The law is age 21. I wrote that law against terrific opposition in 1984. It was a Republican President. President Reagan was President, and Elizabeth Dole was the then-Secretary of Transportation. We worked together to get it done because they saw alcohol as a scourge.

I hope we are not put off by the argument that you can't do two things at the same time: "No to drugs" on one side of the screen; "no to alcohol" on the other side of the screen. I don't think that hurts anybody, and it could help somebody. That is the issue.

I hate to disagree with some of my friends who have taken the other side. I know they feel the problem deeply. I think they have chosen to dismiss an opportunity that I think is the only one that exists for us. We will not have an anti-alcohol program. Can you see trying to get that through this place with all of the friends of the alcohol industry? There is not a chance.

This is the time to do it. We ought to step up and vote the right way. Give the drug czar an opportunity to say no to alcohol, as well as to drugs.

I ask unanimous consent that a series of editorials be printed in the RECORD, including one from the New York Times, as well as a list of over 80 responsible organizations—many of them religious, a lot of them social—who are on our side of the issue, as well as the Surgeon General's letter.

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

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1999]

#### THE ANTI-DRUG CAMPAIGN'S MISSING LINK

Gen. Barry McCaffrey, President Clinton's director of national drug policy, has declared flatly that under-age drinking is the single biggest drug problem among adolescents, and is intimately linked to the use of illegal drugs. But as things stand now, the \$195 million national media campaign that General McCaffrey is running this year to dissuade youngsters from using illicit drugs will not spend a penny in Federal funds to warn teenagers about the dangers of drinking.

The White House's Office of National Drug Control Policy offers two reasons for not including alcohol in the anti-drug campaign. The first is that it would dilute the basic message, which is that kids should avoid illegal drugs. That is strange reasoning, given the solid evidence showing that teen-age drinking is often a gateway to illicit drug use. Indeed, the first goal of the White House's national drug strategy is to "edu-

cate and enable America's youth to reject illegal drugs as well as alcohol and tobacco." It also notes that adults who started drinking as children are nearly eight times more likely to use cocaine than adults who did not do so.

The second reason is that Mr. McCaffrey believes that the statute granting his office authority to combat controlled substances leaves him no room to target alcohol. That rigid interpretation is open to question. In any case, the statutory problem can be quickly remedied by legislations. Representatives Lucille Roybal-Allard, Democrat of California, and Frank Wolf, Republic of Virginia, have introduced a measure that would explicitly give General McCaffrey the authority to include under-age drinking among the campaign's targets.

Ms. Allard and Mr. Wolf have lined up powerful support from groups like the American Medical Association. The National Beer Wholesalers' Association opposes the measure, as does the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, a nonprofit coalition of advertising firms that has been working on the campaign. The Partnership argues that an anti-alcohol message would dilute the anti-drug message, but some of the Partnership's members earn lucrative fees for promoting alcohol products.

The measure, an amendment to an appropriations bill, deserves support. If warning about the dangers of excessive drinking is not statutorily part of General McCaffrey's job, it ought to be.

[From The Washington Post, June 18, 1999]

#### BEER LOBBY AT WORK

If beer lobbyists have their way in Congress, an expensive taxpayer-funded campaign against youth drug use—\$1 billion over five years for a prime-time advertising blitz—will go through Congress without a penny to combat the No. 1 drug choice among young people. In the eyes of the National Beer Wholesalers Association—the group responsible for killing legislation last year to toughen drunk-driving standards—alcohol doesn't count when it comes to warning kids about illegal drug use.

Karalyn Nunnallee, national president of Mothers Against Drunk Driving, points out that alcohol kills six times more young people in this country than all illicit drugs combined "and is the primary gateway drug for other illicit drug use." Yet the campaign conducted by Gen. Barry McCaffrey, President Clinton's director of national drug policy, in cooperation with the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, has excluded any references to alcohol. The partnership, a nonprofit, non-federally funded, non-industry-supported coalition of advertising firms, favors a separate campaign against drinking by kids. It argues that anti-alcohol messages would inevitably dilute the focus on "culturally" very different drugs.

Still, an anti-drug campaign that can't mention alcohol—or binge drinking, a serious problem across America—is flawed. Reps. Lucille Roybal-Allard of California and Frank Wolf of Virginia are sponsoring an amendment before the House Appropriations Committee that would free Gen. McCaffrey of this restriction. Their point is not to detract from anti-drug messages but to add to their effectiveness by reflecting reality. Taxpayer dollars ought not be spent by the hundreds of millions to talk about drugs but to remain mute on the danger of illegal alcohol use by kids.

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 4, 1999]

#### SAY 'NO' TO UNDERAGE DRINKING, TOO

States uniformly ban the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors because they are not

considered mature enough to drink responsibly and safely.

That bit of wisdom seems to have been lost on Congress, which by sleight of hand banned the federal government from mentioning alcohol in a \$195 million anti-drug media blitz aimed at kids.

A two-word phrase deep in the legislation establishing the White House's Office of National Drug Control Policy—the so-called "drug czar"—limits its activities to "controlled substances." Liquor is not one, and so the federal government can't spend a nickel to warn kids about alcohol's potential dangers.

A bill introduced this month by U.S. Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-Calif.) would correct that and allow the drug czar to include alcohol warnings in anti-drug messages to children. It's a sensible amendment, reflecting national concerns about underage drinking, and it ought to be approved.

Leading the crusade against the Roybal-Allard bill is the National Beer Wholesalers' Association, whose tiresome refrain is that liquor is a legal product and the federal government has no business criticizing it in any forum.

Nonsense. Alcohol sales to minors are not legal, and the dangers of alcohol abuse by adolescents are universally recognized. "It's the biggest drug abuse problem for adolescents, and it's linked to the use of other, illegal drugs," said drug czar Barry McCaffrey at a Feb. 8 news conference.

Among other research, a 1998 University of Michigan study reported that 74 percent of high school seniors had already tried alcohol—about twice as many as had smoked marijuana—and nearly a third admitted getting drunk during the previous month.

Still, a spokesman for the drug czar's office argues that adding "... and alcohol" to the federal ad campaign for kids would muddy its anti-drug message.

That's an inane distinction. Alcohol, in the hands of children or teens, is a dangerous drug they should be warned about. It's sufficiently dangerous in fact, that if more money is needed to broaden the federal media blitz, Congress should provide it.

Honesty has to be the trademark of a campaign against substance abuse, particularly one aimed at kids. Playing phony games with the definition of "dangerous substance" undermines the credibility of the effort and also its effectiveness.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 16, 1999]

#### BOOZE AND ITS BACKERS

Federal drug czar Barry R. McCaffrey has launched a \$1-billion media campaign to dissuade youngsters from substance abuse. Not a penny, however, will address the substance that today's teenagers are abusing the most: alcohol.

With youth consumption on the rise since the early 1990s, even McCaffrey acknowledges that alcohol leads to more teenage deaths than other drugs combined. Nevertheless, he insists that including alcohol in the campaign would only dilute its basic message, that kids should avoid illegal drugs.

That's hard to swallow, given federal studies showing that 67% of children who start drinking alcohol before age 15 end up using illicit drugs. And that adults who started drinking as children are nearly eight times more likely to use cocaine than those who did not.

That's why the House Appropriations Committee should pass an amendment by Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-Los Angeles), requiring McCaffrey to include underage drinking in his campaign's targets.

Ideally, the government would not be spending any money at all to reach the

American people on TV and radio: Broadcasters promised in 1996 to offer more free public-service spots, just before Congress gave them, without cost, a portion of the supposedly public airwaves that would have fetched \$70 billion on the open market. Given that McCaffrey's money has already been allocated, however, Congress' focus should be on how he can spend it wisely.

The people scrambling to defeat Roybal-Allard's amendment are unable to offer any sound reason why alcohol should be excluded from McCaffrey's campaign. But they do have a clear stake in opposing the amendment. Leading the charge against it is Rep. Anne M. Northrup (R-Ky.). She received nearly twice as much campaign money from the alcoholic beverage industry in 1997 and 1998 as any of her colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee. At her side is a coalition of advertising firms, called the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, that have benefited handsomely from the \$1 billion the alcohol industry spent last year on promotions.

On Thursday, the executives of those firms will meet at the annual American Advertising Conference in Washington. In a valid illustration of the capital's incestuous world, the opening speaker will be Gen. Barry McCaffrey.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 4, 1999]

#### THE MONITOR'S VIEW—DON'T SOFT-PEDAL ALCOHOL

The United States government will spend \$195 million this year to persuade young Americans to avoid addictive drugs. Is there any good reason why some of that money should not be used to point out the dangers of the substance most abused by the young—alcohol?

A couple of members of Congress thought not. That's why they put forward legislation to give the country's chief antidrug official, Barry McCaffrey, the authority to use some of the advertising money available to the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy to steer kids away from beer, wine, and liquor.

But these matters are not so clear-cut as they seem—or as they ought to be. No sooner has Reps. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D) of California and Frank Wolf (R) of Virginia offered their amendment than a political-defense mechanism lurched into action. Alcoholic beverages have a powerful lobby on Capitol Hill, and their producers and distributors contribute faithfully to campaign war chests.

Opposition to the amendment is coalescing in Congress around the argument that including alcohol would dilute or distort the antidrug message. How so, since alcohol destroys more young lives than any other drug, and people who use "hard" drugs typically have tried alcohol first? Binge drinking, threatening order and individual lives, has become an increasing problem on college campuses.

No, what's kicking in is "Big Alcohol's" political clout and America's ambivalence about its most popular over-the-counter addictive drug, which is relentlessly pitched to the young via TV beer ads. Sadly, McCaffrey's office is ambivalent, hardly leaping to support the amendment. Leaving alcohol out of the antidrug campaign creates a gap in common sense and effectiveness. Representatives Roybal-Allard and Wolf get high marks for working to fill it.

[From the Record, June 7, 1999]

#### OVERLOOKED TYPE OF ABUSE—FAR MORE YOUNGSTERS DRINK THAN USE DRUGS

Common sense doesn't always win in Congress. How else can you explain some of the

reactions to an amendment directing the Federal Government to spend some of its anti-drug advertising dollars to discourage underage drinking? Unless, of course, campaign contributions are a factor.

Many people believe that underage drinking is a far more serious problem than drug use by youngsters. And there's evidence to support their view. For example, nearly three-quarters of the high school seniors surveyed by the University of Michigan last year said they had consumed alcohol in the previous year, compared with the 38 percent who reported smoking marijuana. A third admitted to being drunk in the previous month.

Gen. Barry McCaffrey, director of federal drug policy, has called underage drinking the "biggest drug abuse problem for adolescents." He has said it is "linked to the use of other, illegal drugs."

Yet while the federal government this year plans to spend \$195 million on a national media campaign to fight the use of illicit drugs, no money has been set aside for an advertising campaign to combat underage drinking.

Earlier this month, Lucille Roybal-Allard, a California Democrat, introduced legislation to make underage drinking a target of the federal anti-drug media campaign. Her measure is supported by the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Society of Addictive Medicine, and Mothers against Drunk Driving.

But several members of Congress and the beer wholesalers oppose it. Even the White House's Office of National Drug Control Policy has questioned it.

Why? The beer industry says it already spends hundreds of thousands of dollars to combat the problem. It says the drug czar should focus only on illicit drugs. Rep. Anne Northrup, R-KY, agrees and has promised to fight the measure when it comes up for a vote. Ms. Northrup says her opposition has nothing to do with the nearly \$40,000 in contributions she has gotten from liquor and beer interests in the past two years.

The Partnership for a Drug-Free America, the coalition that coordinates the anti-drug media campaign, says it supports the concept of targeting underage drinking. But it says federal efforts would be dwarfed by the \$3 billion a year the beer industry spends promoting its products. The Partnership says \$195 million is not enough to do two effective campaigns, and that one good campaign is preferable to two weak ones.

Maybe, but it's hard to see how targeting underage drinking would dilute the message against drugs. If the two are connected—as Mr. McCaffrey says—discouraging youths from drinking might also prevent some from using drugs.

[From The Boston Globe, June 22, 1999]

#### BEER PRESSURE

The same lobby that killed a proposal last year to standardize blood alcohol levels for drunken driving is now trying to keep underage drinking out of a youth education campaign sponsored by the nation's drug czar, General Barry McCaffrey.

The National Beer Wholesalers Association opposes the inclusion of underage drinking in the \$195 million media campaign, claiming that alcohol is a legal substance and should not be lumped with marijuana, cocaine, and other illegal drugs. But drinking under age 21 is illegal in every state, and alcohol abuse is far more common than any other drug among young people.

General McCaffrey himself has said alcohol is "the biggest drug abuse problem for adolescents." But his office has been strangely

circumspect about adding underage drinking to the campaign, saying the drug czar's charter limits his mandate to fighting controlled substances. This is why Congress should favor an amendment sponsored by Representatives Frank Wolf of Virginia, a Republican, and Lucille Roybal-Allard of California, a Democrat, that authorizes McCaffrey to include underage drinking in the education campaign.

The alcohol lobby is terrified of being regulated like that other legal killer, cigarettes, with warning labels on beer cans and limits on marketing to teenagers. It points to its voluntary public service ads that urge responsible drinking. But the alcohol industry spends nearly \$3 billion a year on marketing and promotion. Against that backdrop, "responsibility" needs all the help it can get.

The facts about underage drinking are sobering. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration reports 16,100 alcohol-related fatalities in 1997—one person killed every 32 minutes. Intoxication rates were highest for the youngest drivers. Although the universal drinking age of 21 has helped reduce fatalities, motor vehicle crashes remain the number one cause of death for teenagers.

June—prom season—is the month when most of these tragic deaths occur. It would be a good month for Congress to do something about it.

#### STATEMENT OF ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING INCLUSION OF ANTI-UNDERAGE DRINKING MESSAGES IN THE YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN

An effective antidrug prevention program directed at America's young people must include a significant effort to discourage underage drinking. Alcohol is the leading drug problem among young people in America, and a "gateway" to the use of other drugs.

We therefore call on Members of Congress and the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) to work together to insure that a series of underage drinking prevention messages is included as a substantial part of the federally paid portion of the "Anti-Drug Youth Media Campaign."

#### NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Adventist Health Network  
American Academy of Addiction Psychiatry  
American Academy of Pediatrics  
American College of Nurse-Midwives  
American College of Preventive Medicine  
American Dance Therapy Association  
American Health and Temperance Association  
American Medical Association  
American Medical Student Association  
American Medical Women's Association  
American Public Health Association  
American School Health Association  
American Society of Addiction Medicine  
Center for Science in the Public Interest  
Child Welfare League of America  
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints  
Consumer Coalition for Health and Safety  
Consumer Federation of America  
Face Truth and Clarity on Alcohol  
Join Together  
Latino Coalition on Alcohol and Tobacco  
The Marin Institute  
Mothers Against Drunk Driving  
National Alliance of Pupil Service Organizations  
National Association of Addiction Treatment Providers  
National Association of Evangelicals  
National Association for Public Health Policy  
National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselors

National Association on Alcohol, Drugs, and Disability  
 National Crime Prevention Council  
 National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence  
 National Drug Prevention League  
 National Families in Action  
 The National Road Safety Foundation  
 National Woman's Christian Temperance Union  
 Partnership for Recovery:  
 The Betty Ford Center  
 Caron Foundation  
 Hazelden Foundation  
 Valley Hope Association  
 Security on Campus  
 Service Employees International Union (AFL-CIO)  
 Seventh-day Adventist Church of North America  
 Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission  
 United Methodist Church, Board of Church & Society  
 Youth Power (formerly: Just Say No, International)

## STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

AGC/United Learning (Evanston, ILL)  
 Alabama Council on Substance Abuse  
 Alcohol Research Information Service (MI)  
 Alcohol Services, Inc. (Syracuse, NY)  
 Break Free Outpatient, Inc. (Hollywood, FL)  
 'Cause Children Count Coalition (Washington, DC)  
 Charlotte-Mecklenburg [NC] Drug and Alcohol Fighting Back Project  
 Christian Citizens of Arkansas  
 Communities that Care—Somerset County (PA)  
 Dauphin County Regional Alcohol/Drug Awareness Resources (PA)  
 Florida Association of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselors  
 Georgia Alcohol Policy Partnership (GAPP)  
 Hillsborough County Community Anti-Drug Coalition (Tampa, FL)  
 Indiana Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking  
 Institute for Health Advocacy (San Diego, CA)  
 Illinois Churches in Action  
 Lake County (FLA) Citizens Committee for Alcohol Health Warnings  
 Lancaster County Drug and Alcohol Commission (PA)  
 Lebanon County Drug & Alcohol Prevention Program (PA)  
 Los Angeles County Commission on Alcoholism  
 Maryland Underage Drinking Prevention Coalition  
 National Capitol Area Coalition to Prevent Underage Drinking (DC)  
 Network of Alabama Prevention Professionals  
 New Haven Fighting Back  
 Newark Fighting Back Partnership, Inc.  
 New Visitors/Mercy Hall Chemical Dependence Program (Johnstown, PA)  
 PAR, Inc. (Pinellas Park, Florida)  
 Pennsylvanians Against Underage Drinking  
 Pennsylvania Council on Alcohol Problems  
 Pennsylvania Prevention Director's Association  
 Perry (County) Human Services (PA)  
 Phase: Piggy Back, Inc. (New York)  
 PRIDE—Omaha  
 Somerset County Department of Human Services (PA)  
 St. Vincent College Prevention Projects (Latrobe, PA)  
 TODAY, Inc. (Vensalem, PA)  
 Vallejo Fighting Back Partnership (CA)  
 The Village (Miami, FL)

Youth As Resources (Somerset County, PA)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND SURGEON GENERAL,

Washington, DC, June 11, 1999.

HON. BARRY F. MCCAFFREY,  
 Director Office of National Drug Control Policy,  
 Executive Office of the President, Washington, DC.

DEAR GENERAL MCCAFFREY: I congratulate you for your excellent work in developing the national anti-drug media campaign and demonstrating such strong leadership in support of our nation's youth. I am confident that the effectiveness of this program as a means of educating and motivating children and their families will be enhanced by a greater commitment to the problem of underage drinking. Thus, I want to recommend that you include advertisements addressing underage drinking in the paid portion of ONDCP's media campaign.

Alcohol is the drug most frequently used by American teenagers. It is consumed more frequently than all other illicit drugs combined and is the drug most likely to be associated with injury or death. Alcohol is a drug that can affect judgement, coordination and long-term health. It is involved in teen automobile crashes, homicides, and suicides; the three leading causes of teen deaths. No comprehensive drug control strategy for youth can be complete without the full inclusion of underage alcohol use and abuse.

The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse reports that there are 11 million drinkers between the ages of 12 and 20. Over fifty percent of high school seniors report having been drunk in the past year. Among 12-17 year olds, less than half perceive great harm in consuming five or more drinks once or twice a week. In light of the prevalence of underage drinking, it is little surprise that alcohol consumption by youth so often results in risky behaviors which lead to unplanned pregnancies, sexually transmitted diseases, involvement with law enforcement, and worst of all, death and the death of others. These are the immediate impacts on society and do not include the even more costly, long term impact of alcohol abuse or dependence on individual health and the state of families.

A recent study from the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism sheds even greater light on the implications of these figures. Youth who begin drinking before the age of 15 are four times as likely to become alcoholic as those who wait until age 21 or later to begin drinking. This research also indicates that every year of delayed drinking onset will result in a significant reduction in risk for alcohol abuse or alcoholism. Underage drinking is a shadow that threatens the health, safety and adolescence of our nation's youth.

We should utilize a public health media campaign to send youth and their families messages which will educate them about the health and social consequences of underage drinking. Through the ONDCP strategy, we can utilize this effective medium for altering youth attitudes about underage drinking and for supporting community-based prevention activities that will help young people adopt lifestyles that eschew the use of alcohol and other drugs. The evidence of need is overwhelming.

I stand ready to work with you to develop a powerful media campaign that will effectively deglamourize underage drinking. I have established a Surgeon General's Staff Working Group to bring together the resources of the Department to create an effective campaign to curtail the incidence of un-

derage and binge drinking. This campaign will be successful only if it can receive the national dissemination available through a paid media campaign. It is time to more effectively address the drug that children and teens tell us is their greatest concern and the drug we know is most likely to result in their injury or death.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID SATCHER, M.D., PH.D.

Assistant Secretary for Health  
 and Surgeon General.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I want to explain my opposition to the Lautenberg amendment giving ONDCP's National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign jurisdiction to include underage alcohol consumption for the purposes of the media campaign. Like all my colleagues, I have seen the results of underage drinking, and I deplore them. Young lives should not be wasted, and I challenge the White House and my colleagues to continue to take action to curb this problem.

However, I do not believe this amendment is the correct way to solve the underage drinking crisis. The Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is not the right vehicle for anti-alcohol messages. The Office of National Drug Control Policy fights the war on drugs, not alcohol. I agree with Drug Czar Barry McCaffrey that there is an important distinction between illegal drugs and alcohol, which is a legal substance. Additionally, simply adding anti-alcohol messages to the ONDCP's Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign without appropriating more funds for this purpose will dilute the anti-drug efforts. Resources which are badly needed to fight drugs will be rerouted to fight underage drinking. I cannot support a bill which chooses to fight alcohol at the expense of illegal drugs.

I have supported in the past, and will continue to support, programs that discourage underage drinking. In fact, I want to applaud the efforts of alcohol distributors, who have initiated many of these important programs.

Let us find a different way to take action against underage alcohol consumption that does not compromise our actions against the use of illegal drugs.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield the remaining 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I compliment him on his foresight for bringing this amendment up.

We will have a 5-year media campaign, with \$1 billion targeted at youth so they don't get into drugs and start taking drugs. The drug czar himself, General McCaffrey, said that alcohol is the gateway drug. Mr. President, 42 percent of Iowa teens seeking substance abuse treatment in 1998 were being treated for alcohol addiction; three out of five teens have had an alcoholic drink in the last month.

We have a 5-year, \$1 billion ad campaign to tell teens don't take cocaine, don't take meth, don't smoke marijuana, and we are not going to say anything about beer and alcohol? These are the first drugs these kids take.

That is what the Senator from New Jersey is saying. Let's require in this package of ads over 5 years that they also target drinking by kids.

I understand that the amendment is supported by Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselors, and the National Association of Alcohol, Drugs, and Disability.

It is time we took teen drinking seriously. I heard that the National Beer Wholesalers Association is opposed to the amendment. If I am wrong, someone please correct me. It is this association that has always said they are against teen drinking. If they are against teen drinking, why would they be opposed to this amendment to put ads out showing teens what happens if they drink?

Eight young people every day die in alcohol-related car crashes. It is time to stop this epidemic.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes 33 seconds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Let me reiterate that the practical effect of the Lautenberg amendment is to gut the effort to reduce teenage drug use.

I wouldn't argue with a single thing that any of our colleagues has said about the importance of combating teenage drinking. Everybody thinks it is important to combat teenage drinking. Fortunately, over the past 20 years teenager drinking has gone down. However, according to a highly respected University of Michigan study, teenage drug use has gone up 46 percent since 1992.

We should let this effort to combat teenage drug use, which is dramatically on the increase, go forward. On another day in another contest, let's pursue an effort to deal with teenage drinking.

This amendment, regretfully, would gut a very important campaign to combat teenage drug use. That is not me speaking. That is Mario Cuomo and Bill Bennett, chairman of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, who oppose this amendment, which is not to say that either one of those men is in favor of teenage drinking.

Let's keep this antidrug effort intact and let what we hope will be an effective advertising campaign go forward.

I thank Senator CAMPBELL for yielding time to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me make just a couple of concluding comments, again reiterating I am really quite uncomfortable in the position of opposing Senator LAUTENBERG. But I

do not think this is a forced choice of the type he suggests we make; I do not think this is a choice that we ought to be required to make. One might at some point put together a program, which I would fully support, to say let us do \$1 billion advertising in 5 years, targeted to Americans, especially America's kids, dealing with alcohol abuse. I would support that. Then one would say, perhaps, coming to the floor of the Senate: This program you have dealing with alcohol abuse, why doesn't it include drugs? Or, Why doesn't it include addiction to smoking cigarettes? I would support that as well.

But we ought to do them as programs we can measure and evaluate. The program we are talking about now is a program dealing with drugs. It is 3 years into the program. People say: Why doesn't it include alcohol? Let's do a program on alcohol. I will support that.

The story I told earlier, about going to the Oak Hill Detention Center and seeing these young children, kids on drugs who were convicted of violent crimes, do you know the other thing about their stories? In every case, they were 12 or 13 years old and they were addicted to drugs, selling drugs, shooting people, committing armed robbery, being involved in violent crimes; and the other common denominator in every single case was they had parents addicted to drugs. They came from homes, often with only a single parent, in which that parent was addicted to drugs, died at a young age, and was an abusive parent because of being addicted to drugs. There is a common denominator.

This program is a program designed to say to America's youth, through drug education by television commercials: Don't do drugs. We know television advertising works. We all use it. Hundreds of billions of dollars a year are spent on television ads to convince people to listen to certain kinds of music, wear certain kinds of jeans, to buy certain kinds of food. We know it works. I think it will work with respect to this issue of drugs as well.

We are 3 years into the program. I will support gladly, and with great excitement, a program on alcohol. I have supported every initiative dealing with alcohol abuse and drunk driving in this Senate. I will support it as well dealing with the addiction to cigarettes. The targeting of alcohol and cigarettes, both legal products, to this country's youth, is unforgivable.

But this is a separate issue. We have a campaign underway. It is 3 years in progress. It is designed very deliberately to change the understanding and the culture dealing with drugs. I think it has a chance of working. So let us do that. We had to cut it \$50 million this year alone just on this issue. Let us allow this to work. At another time I will be happy to join my colleague from New Jersey and others in designing an identical program dealing with alcohol abuse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Senator DORGAN and I find ourselves in a strange debate indeed, because I think we as much as anyone in this body want to reduce teenage drinking. All of us have had personal tragedies in our families. As I say, as a former deputy sheriff and as a volunteer prison counselor, I know all the horror stories. We know a lot of them today. I don't deny any of them. I am sure they have created terrible problems in families and in society, too. But I think we are missing the point I tried to make a while ago. It is not whether we want to reduce teenage drinking. We all do. It is whether this is the right vehicle; and it is not.

I mentioned a while ago that ONDCP does not have statutory authority. If we are going to add statutory authority and just bypass the legislative part of this body, why don't we do away with the legislative part of this body and just do all legislation in appropriations bills?

I would join my friend from New Jersey if he wanted to introduce a bill to add alcohol to the ONDCP's agenda. That would be fine with me, to add more money to it, too. I would be a cosponsor. I will be more than willing to fight the battle with him to make sure we reduce teenage drinking in any kind of ad campaign that would be effective. I hope we will do that, too. But I believe this is the wrong vehicle for it. We ought to do it through the authorizing committees.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will yield, let me make one final observation. He mentions the issue of alcohol. He comes from a particular perspective, being a Native American.

I want to tell him just about two people, and I will do it in 30 seconds. I toured a hospital one day. He talks about fetal alcohol syndrome. A young Native American woman had just given birth to a baby. The woman was an alcoholic. The baby was born with a .21 blood-alcohol content, a young baby born dead drunk. This woman, having had a third baby, wanted nothing to do with that child, didn't want to see that child. That child will probably have fetal alcohol syndrome.

But I was down at a hospital not far from this building and I saw babies born from crack-addicted mothers, and I saw babies born drug addicted, addicted to hard drugs. The doctors told me what those babies are like as they try to shed this addiction, being born of mothers who had taken drugs during this pregnancy.

We have problems in all of these areas. I do not deny that. But this program deals with drugs. I think it has a chance of working. I hope we can allow that to happen with this vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the Senator for those eloquent comments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the first vote, there be 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form between the remaining votes.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I see no further speakers. I yield the remaining time, and I move to table the Lautenberg amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 1214. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 194 Leg.]

#### YEAS—58

Abraham	Dorgan	Mack
Allard	Enzi	McConnell
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Baucus	Frist	Nickles
Bennett	Gorton	Robb
Bond	Graham	Roberts
Breaux	Gramm	Santorum
Brownback	Grassley	Sessions
Bunning	Gregg	Shelby
Burns	Hagel	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Hatch	Smith (OR)
Chafee	Hutchinson	Snowe
Cochran	Inhofe	Thomas
Collins	Jeffords	Thompson
Conrad	Kerrey	Thurmond
Coverdell	Kyl	Torricelli
Craig	Lincoln	Voinovich
Crapo	Lott	Warner
Daschle	Lugar	
Domenici		

#### NAYS—40

Akaka	Harkin	Moynihan
Bayh	Helms	Murray
Biden	Hollings	Reed
Bingaman	Hutchison	Reid
Boxer	Johnson	Rockefeller
Bryan	Kennedy	Roth
Byrd	Kerry	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kohl	Schumer
DeWine	Landrieu	Specter
Dodd	Lautenberg	Stevens
Durbin	Leahy	Wellstone
Edwards	Levin	Wyden
Feingold	Lieberman	
Feinstein	Mikulski	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

McCain

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Under the previous order, there are 2 minutes of debate before a motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL. Who yields time?

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate my motion to table the Kyl-Hutchison amendment No. 1195. During the break we were able to finalize some language for the amendment.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time prior

to the motion to table amendment No. 1200 by Senator DEWINE be limited to 45 minutes, to be equally divided in the usual form, and no other amendments be in order to the amendment prior to the motion to table the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

The question is on the amendment by the Senator from Colorado, Mr. KYL.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have reached agreement, but we don't have the modification printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask that the amendment be laid aside?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, I make that request, Mr. President.

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

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF LAWRENCE H. SUMMERS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now vote on the nomination of Lawrence H. Summers to be Secretary of the Treasury. There will be 2 minutes evenly divided on that nomination. Who yields time?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Chair.

This is a fine moment for the Senate. We are here to confirm Mr. Lawrence Summers as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. He has had a fine career in Government. He was on the staff of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Reagan. He was Under Secretary for International Affairs of the U.S. Treasury under Secretary Lloyd Bentsen, our former colleague. Since 1995, he has been Deputy Secretary of the U.S. Treasury. If my revered colleague and chairman were present at this moment, he would want to point out that his nomination was reported out from the Finance Committee unanimously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? Who holds the time on the majority side?

If not, by unanimous consent, all time is yielded back. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lawrence H. Summers, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Treasury? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 195 Ex.]

#### YEAS—97

Abraham	Feingold	Mack
Akaka	Feinstein	McCain
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Baucus	Frist	Mikulski
Bayh	Gorton	Moynihan
Bennett	Graham	Murkowski
Biden	Gramm	Murray
Bingaman	Grassley	Nickles
Bond	Gregg	Reed
Boxer	Hagel	Reid
Breaux	Harkin	Robb
Brownback	Hatch	Roberts
Bryan	Helms	Rockefeller
Bunning	Hollings	Roth
Burns	Hutchinson	Santorum
Byrd	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Campbell	Inhofe	Schumer
Chafee	Jeffords	Sessions
Cleland	Johnson	Shelby
Cochran	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
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
Edwards	Lugar	
Enzi		

#### NAYS—2

Allard Smith (NH)

#### NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will return to legislative session.

#### TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 2000—Continued

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, is there going to be a modification to the Kyl amendment before we go to the Y2K liability?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, we have an agreement on that, if Senator KYL is ready.

AMENDMENT NO. 1195, AS MODIFIED

Mr. KYL. I have a modification of amendment No. 1195. I note for the record that this modification is cosponsored by Senators FEINSTEIN, MCCAIN, ABRAHAM, GRAHAM, GRAMM, DOMENICI, and GRASSLEY, along with Senator HUTCHISON and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), for himself, and Senators HUTCHISON, FEINSTEIN, MCCAIN, ABRAHAM, GRAHAM, GRAMM, DOMENICI, and GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 1195, as modified.

The amendment (No. 1195), as modified, is as follows:



SEC. 119. *Provided further*, That the Customs Service Commissioner shall utilize \$50 million to hire 500 new Customs inspectors, agents, appropriate equipment and intelligence support within the funds available under the Customs Service headings in the bill, in addition to funds provided to the Customs Service under the FY99 Emergency Drug Supplemental.

At the appropriate place, at the end of Title I, insert the following on page 38, after line 5 insert the following:

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to thank the chairman and committee for their willingness to work with Senators KYL, HUTCHISON, me, and others to include in the Treasury appropriations bill to hire 500 more inspectors and agents, along with appropriate intelligence support and equipment. It is my understanding, in addition, that if there is a difference between the House and Senate bills in this regard that the Committee will do what it can in conference to ensure that the funding for these increases will be found outside of the Customs budget.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank my colleague from Iowa. The committee has faced a lot of tough decisions in this bill and I appreciate my colleagues' flexibility. The Senator is correct. I will do what I can in conference to support the additional funding for Customs increased by this amendment, and to try to identify appropriate sources of funding outside the U.S. Customs Service budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate or discussion on the amendment?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, the majority supports the amendment.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we have reviewed the amendment and the modification, and we have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1195), as modified, was agreed to.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I just wanted to say that this is a very important amendment. We will have 500 more Customs agents for our drug control. I think that it is very important that we were able to make this a priority.

I appreciate Senator DORGAN and Senator CAMPBELL working with us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a concurrent resolution to the desk calling for the conditional adjournment of Congress. I ask that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The concurrent resolution is agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, July 1, 1999, Friday, July 2, 1999, or Saturday, July 3, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, July 12, 1999, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, July 1, 1999, or Friday, July 2, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Monday, July 12, 1999, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Majority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the DeWine amendment, which comes after Y2K is dispensed with, I be able to bring my amendment to the floor.

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

### NOTICE

***Incomplete record of Senate proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's Senate proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.***

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 12, 1999

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday, July 12. I further ask that on Monday, following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then proceed to a period of morning business until 1 p.m.

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

#### PROGRAM

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate

will reconvene at 12 noon on Monday, July 12, and will immediately proceed to a period of morning business until 1 p.m.

By previous consent, the Patients' Bill of Rights will be the pending business at 1 p.m. Amendments to that legislation are possible.

Any votes ordered, however, will not take place until Tuesday, July 13, at a time to be determined by the two leaders.

As previously announced by the majority leader, there will be a cloture vote on the pending lockbox amendment to S. 557 on Friday, July 16.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORTON. 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 provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 43, following the remarks of my distinguished and extremely patient colleague, Senator BYRD.

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

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 12, 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate now stands adjourned until noon on Monday, July 12.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:24 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 12, 1999, at 12 noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 1, 1999:

##### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CURT HEBERT, JR., OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2004. (REAPPOINTMENT)

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

EARL E. DEVANEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, VICE ELJAY B. BOWRON, RESIGNED.

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LAWRENCE H. SUMMERS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR



RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND; UNITED STATES GOVERNOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT.

JAMES B. CUNNINGHAM, OF PENNSYLVANIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

HARRIET L. ELAM, OF MASSACHUSETTS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL.

J. RICHARD FREDERICKS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO SWITZERLAND, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN.

BARBARA J. GRIFFITHS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ICELAND.

GREGORY LEE JOHNSON, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF SWAZILAND.

JIMMY J. KOLKER, OF MISSOURI, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BURKINA FASO.

SYLVIA GAYE STANFIELD, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BRUNEI DARUSSALAM.

#### FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE AGENCIES INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED, AND ALSO FOR THE OTHER APPOINTMENTS INDICATED HEREWITH:

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SUSAN HERTHUM GARRISON, OF FLORIDA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BERYL C. BLECHER, OF FLORIDA  
DAVID L. GOSSACK, OF WASHINGTON  
JOSEPH B. KAESSHAEPER, JR., OF FLORIDA  
AMER M. KAYANI, OF CALIFORNIA  
RONALD L. SORIANO, OF CONNECTICUT

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PAUL A. FOLMSBEE, OF TEXAS

#### UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

EDWARD J. KULAKOWSKI, OF VIRGINIA  
CONRAD WILLIAM TURNER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

MARTIN G. PATTERSON, OF VIRGINIA

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

STEPHEN E. ALLEY, OF TENNESSEE  
ROBERT D. BANNERMAN, OF FLORIDA  
JOEL N. FISCHL, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
GWEN B. LYLE, OF TEXAS  
MICHAEL L. MCGEE, OF TENNESSEE

#### UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

MARY K. OLIVER, OF ARKANSAS  
JOHN ROBERT POST, OF WASHINGTON  
JO ANN ELAINE SCANDOLA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

HELEN D. LEE, OF VIRGINIA  
KAREN S. PILMANIS, OF COLORADO  
HARRY L. TYNER, OF VIRGINIA

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARY EMMA ARNOLD, OF VIRGINIA

JOSEPH ALEXANDER BOSTON III, OF MARYLAND  
PAUL DAVID BURKHEAD, OF NEW YORK  
BART DAVID COBBS, OF CALIFORNIA  
MICHELE ONDAGO CONNELL, OF OHIO  
JULIE DAVIS FISHER, OF CALIFORNIA  
ELLEN JACQUELINE GERMAIN, OF NEW YORK  
TODD C. HOLMSTROM, OF MICHIGAN  
WILLIAM M. HOWE, OF ALASKA  
BRYAN DAVID HUNT, OF VIRGINIA  
SANDRA JEAN INGRAM, OF OHIO  
HENRY VICTOR JARDINE, OF VIRGINIA  
DAVID ALLAN KATZ, OF CALIFORNIA  
JAMES L. LOI, OF CONNECTICUT  
VALERIE LYNN, OF COLORADO  
MANUEL P. MICALLER, JR., OF CALIFORNIA  
KATHERINE ELIZABETH MONAHAN, OF CALIFORNIA  
MARK D. MOODY, OF MISSOURI  
GEOFFREY PETER NYHART, OF FLORIDA  
DANIEL W. PETERS, OF ILLINOIS  
CHRISTOPHER TODD ROBINSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA  
LORI A. SHOEMAKER, OF TENNESSEE  
MICHELE MARIE SIDERS, OF CALIFORNIA  
SHAWN KRISTEN THORNE, OF TEXAS  
MICHAEL CARL TRULSON, OF CALIFORNIA  
GRAHAM L. WEBSTER, OF FLORIDA  
BRUCE C. WILSON, OF CALIFORNIA  
DAVID JONATHAN WOLFF, OF FLORIDA

#### UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

COLLETTE N. CHRISTIAN, OF OREGON  
CAROLYN B. GLASSMAN, OF NEVADA  
MAUREN MATTER HOWARD, OF WASHINGTON  
PATRICIA KOZLIK KABRA, OF CALIFORNIA  
MARYANN MCKAY, OF CALIFORNIA  
JEAN T. OLSON, OF FLORIDA  
LAURA BAIN PRAMUK, OF COLORADO  
ANN N. ROUBACHEWSKY, OF MARYLAND  
EDWINA SAGITTO, OF MISSOURI

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND STATE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND/OR SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AS INDICATED:

CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MARTIN J. AVERSA, OF VIRGINIA  
TODD B. AVERY, OF FLORIDA  
JOSEPH R. BABY, OF CALIFORNIA  
REBECCA M. BALOGH, OF VIRGINIA  
ANTHONY THOMAS BEAVER, OF OHIO  
MEGAN BEECHAM, OF MARYLAND  
LOUIS LAWRENCE BONO, OF NEW YORK  
KIRSTEN AILSA LESLIE BROOKS, OF FLORIDA  
CHARLES R. BROOME, OF VIRGINIA  
EMILY BRUNO, OF PENNSYLVANIA  
MICHELLE A. BURTON, OF NORTH DAKOTA  
ROBIN BUSSE, OF VIRGINIA  
SIGRID NELSON CALANDRA, OF VIRGINIA  
MATTHEW VICTOR CASSETTA, OF VIRGINIA  
STEVEN M. CORLESS, OF WASHINGTON  
WENDY GRACE CROOK, OF OREGON  
PHILIP MARTIN CUMMINGS, OF CALIFORNIA  
RICK A. DELAMBERT, OF CALIFORNIA  
GENE J. DEL BIANCO, OF MASSACHUSETTS  
STEVEN E. DE VORE, OF ILLINOIS  
JASON ANTHONY DONOVAN, OF TEXAS  
WILLIAM ERSKINE DUFF III, OF VIRGINIA  
ROBERT NICHOLS FARQUHAR JR., OF OREGON  
TERRENCE ROBERT FLYNN, OF MINNESOTA  
DANA JANET FRANCIS, OF MASSACHUSETTS  
DAN O. FULWILER, OF WASHINGTON  
MATTHEW E. GOSHKO, OF MARYLAND  
BRIAN EDWARD GREANEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
BRIAN WHITE HAMILTON, OF MARYLAND  
DANIEL ORDWAY HASTINGS, OF CALIFORNIA  
DANIEL A. HEM, OF VIRGINIA  
MELISSA PRESTON HORWITZ, OF NEW YORK  
DAE B. KIM, OF CALIFORNIA  
GENE L. KLINE, OF VIRGINIA  
GARY KONOP, OF PENNSYLVANIA  
JUDY HAIGUANG KUO, OF CALIFORNIA  
WENDY RENEE LAURITZEN, OF VIRGINIA  
HARVEY W. LAWHORNE, OF VIRGINIA  
ANDREA MICHELLE LEWIS, OF FLORIDA  
JEFFREY P. LODINSKY, OF NEW YORK  
JENNIFER L. LUKAS, OF VIRGINIA  
JOHN H. MCCORMICK, OF MARYLAND  
PATRICK T. MCNEIL, OF ILLINOIS  
SANDRA D. MIED, OF VIRGINIA  
MICHELLE BEGETT MILLS, OF VIRGINIA  
DAVID GEORGE MOSBY, OF ILLINOIS  
ANDREW HUANG NISSEN, OF VIRGINIA  
LAWRENCE D. OWEN, OF MICHIGAN  
NICHOLAS PAPP III, OF FLORIDA  
JOSEPH ANTHONY PARENTE, OF NEVADA  
BRADLEY SCOTT PARKER, OF CALIFORNIA  
ROY ALBERT PERRIN III, OF LOUISIANA  
MARCO GLEN PRUTY, OF WASHINGTON  
BHASKAR KOLIPAKKAM RAJAH, OF ILLINOIS  
ERICA RENEW, OF TEXAS  
BENJAMIN A. ROCKWELL, OF ILLINOIS  
KENNETH T. ROGERS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
SUSANNE C. ROSE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
ELISABETH N. ROSENSTOCK, OF NEW YORK  
JOSE K. SANTACANA, OF MASSACHUSETTS  
GREGORY F. SEGAS, OF VIRGINIA  
PHILIP FRANZ D. SEITZ, OF VIRGINIA  
DENISE SHIPMAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA  
ALISON MOIRA SHORTER-LAWRENCE, OF VIRGINIA  
DANIEL E. SLAVEN, OF ARIZONA  
EDITH ARLENE SPRUILL, OF NEW YORK  
RHETT D. TAYLOR, OF TEXAS  
ANNE MARIE THOMAS, OF VIRGINIA

STACY R. TOWNSLEY, OF VIRGINIA  
MICHAEL T. TROJE, OF FLORIDA  
MARKO G. VELIKONJA, OF WASHINGTON  
JEROME B. WEINFELD, JR., OF MARYLAND  
EDWARD A. WHITE, OF GEORGIA  
YVETTA J. WOODBURY, OF VIRGINIA  
RICHARD TSUTOMU YONEOKA, OF NEW YORK

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SALLY KATZEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE G. EDWARD DESEVE.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Q. TODD DICKENSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS, VICE BRUCE A. LEHMAN, RESIGNED.

#### EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

CLIFFORD GREGORY STEWART, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

#### CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

ANTHONY MUSICK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE, VICE DONN HOLT CUNNINGHAM, RESIGNED.

#### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MICHAEL COHEN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE GERALD N. TIROZZI, RESIGNED.

#### MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

MAJOR GENERAL PHILLIP R. ANDERSON, UNITED STATES ARMY, TO BE A MEMBER AND PRESIDENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 2 OF AN ACT OF CONGRESS, APPROVED JUNE 1879 (21 STAT. 37) (33 USC 642).

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AND ASTERISK (\*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 531:

#### To be Lieutenant Colonel

MILTON C ABBOTT	PHILLIP P. BACA
LARRY N. ADAIR	JEFFREY L. BACHMANN
DONNELL E. ADAMS	DONALD J. BACON
MICHAEL E. ADAMS	VALENTINO BAGNANI III
JOE V. ALDIZ, JR.	RICHARD J. BAGNELL
BRUCE C. ALEXANDER	DAVID L. BAKER
DAVID L. ALEXANDER	DAVID T. BAKER
FRANK ALI	NORMAN J. BALCHUNAS, JR.
BRUCE A. ALLEN	LYNNE E. BALDRIGHI
COURT C. ALLEN	JEFFREY K. BALL
ROBERT C. ALLEN, JR.	JOE G. BALLARD
MERRIL J. ALLIGOOD, JR.	DANIEL F. BALTRUSAITIS
JOHN C. ALLISON	LENNIE M. BANE
MARK L. ALLRED	CARL D. BANER
DAVID W. ALLVIN	RICHARD T. BANKS II
MARK B. ALSID	ROBERT G. BARLOW
STEPHEN G. ALSING	JUDY D. BARNES
MARK D. ALTENBURG	PATRICK BARNES
ROBERT L. ALTMAN	RUSSELL C. BARNES
DONATO J. ALTABELLI, JR.	KEVIN D. BARON
STEVEN L. AMATO	JAMES A. BARR
CURTIS R. AMBLE	MICHAEL J. BARRETT III
JOHN M. AMIDON	GARY S. BARRON
TRACY A. AMOS	ROBERT K. BARRY
HUGH A. AMUNDSON	CHARLES J. BARTLETT
KELLY E. ANDERSEN	PAUL K. BARTLETT, JR.
E WEST ANDERSON	BURT A. BARTLEY
GARY D. ANDERSON	PETER P. BARTOS
JOHN EDWARD ANDERSON	WILLIAM H. BATEMAN
LYNDON S. ANDERSON	THOMAS B. BAUCKMAN
ROBERT A. ANDRES	FRANKLIN W. BAUGH
PHILIP R. ANDREWS	BRIAN T. BAXLEY
TALENTINO C.	KRISTIN D. BEASLEY
ANGELOSANTE	LAWRENCE A. BECKER
BILLIE J. ANTES	ROBIN E. BECKER
CHRISTOPHER M. APPLEY	THOMAS J. BEDNAREK
JAMES H. APPEYARD, JR.	KEVIN A. BEBEE
MICHAEL P. ARCENEAUX	TERRI C. BEBLERSAUCEDO
LEE J. ARCHAMBAULT	SUZANNE M. BEERS
GARY B. ARNOLD	BENJAMIN W. BEESON
RICHARD W. ARNOLD	PAUL T. BEISSER III
STEVEN J. ARQUETTE	PAUL G. BELL
WILLIAM W. ARRAMSMITH	HOWARD D. BELOTE
HUGH W. ARSENAULT	LISA M. BELUE
EDNA E. ARTIS	CHRISTOPHER J. BENICE
HOWARD L. ASHFORD	NANNETTE BENITEZ
BRADLEY K. ASHLEY	PAUL V. BENNETT
MARK R. ASHPOLE	RICKEY B. BENNETT
VIRGINIA B. ASHPOLE	TERRY R. BENNETT
ROBERT P. ASHTON	DONALD H. BERCHOFF
DAVID C. ASSELIN	PAUL D. BERG
MARK A. AVERY	THOMAS C. BERG
JAMES R. AYERS	WAYNE F. BERG, JR.
BRADLEY E. BABB	

WILLIAM J. BERG  
KEITH BERGERON  
THOMAS A. BERGHOFF  
JOHN C. BERRY  
WARREN D. BERRY  
KEVIN T. BETZ  
JAMES BIERSTINE, JR.  
DONALD F. BILLARD  
BRUCE S. BISHOP  
JUDITH D. BITTICK  
MARK C. BIWER  
BRIAN M. BJORNSON  
DALE A. BLACKBURN  
RICHARD E. BLACKBURN  
LESLIE A. BLACKHAM  
DANIEL C. BLAETTLER  
HARRY H. BLANKE III  
THOMAS L. BLASE  
MARY A. BLAZEK  
VIRGINIA V. BLAZICKO  
CARL H. BLOCK  
MAX J. BLOOD  
MATHIAS C. BODDICKER, II  
LANCE E. BODINE  
TODD A. BOESDORFER  
MICHAEL F. BONADONNA  
ROBERT G. BONO  
JOHN K. BORLAND  
DANA H. BORN  
KARL S. BOSWORTH  
MICHAEL N. BOUCHER  
ROBERT H. BOULWARE  
JEFFREY B. BOWLES  
HUGH D. BOWMAN  
JAMES C. BOYD  
MARCUS G. BOYETTE  
WILLIAM J. BRANDT  
CHRISTOPHER N.  
BRANTLEY  
DONALD D. BRATTON, JR.  
SHAWN P. BRAUE  
PAUL A. BRAUNBECK, JR.  
ANNE E. BRELANI  
ERIC R. BRIENKERT  
\*ERIN S. BRETT  
MICHAEL D. BRICE  
ELIZABETH J. BRIDGES  
AARON C. BRIDGEWATER  
ROBERT T. BRIGANTIC  
JACK L. BRIGGS, II  
DANIEL C. BRINK  
HARRIS L. BRISBON  
SALLEE A. BRITTON  
JAMES S. BROADWAY  
MONTY L. BROCK  
GREGORY N. BRODMAN  
EDWARD M. BROLIN  
BU D. BROOKS  
CHRISTOPHER K. BROOKS  
KAREN D. BROOKS  
JAMES L. BROOME, III  
PAUL B. BROTEN  
FRANCIS M. BROWN  
MARY E. BROWN  
STEVEN M. BROWN  
VIRGINIA G. BROWN  
RAYMOND J. BROYHILL  
RICHARD M.C. BRUBAKER  
SANDRA L. BRUCE  
DANIEL K. BRUNSKOLE  
MICHAEL P. BRYANT  
MARK A. BUCCIGROSSI  
DAVID J. BUCK  
KEVIN W. BUCKLEY  
JOHN G. BULICK, JR.  
BRENDA R. BULLARD  
CASSINE JAY P. BULLOCK  
EDWARD J. BURBOL  
ISMAEL BURBOS, JR.  
RICHARD J. BURKE  
ROBERTA B. BURKE  
LEE C. BURKETT  
MICHAEL D. BURNES  
DAVID M. BURNS  
DENISE L. BURTON  
PETER L. BUSSA  
ROBERT F. BUSSIAN  
LUIS E. BUSTAMANTE, JR.  
JAMES W. BUTTS  
RUDOLPH T. BYRNE  
ANDREW S. CAIN  
SEAN P. CAIN  
LARRY E. CAISON  
LISA C. CAMP  
CRAIG F. CAMPBELL  
RICKY L. CAMPISE  
ROBERT A. CANFIELD  
JOHN E. CANADAY, III  
LOUIS A. CAPORICCI  
LORRIE J. CAPELLINO  
ZYNA C. CAPTAIN  
DAVID L. CARLON  
BRIAN L. CARLSEN  
CARL R. CARLSON  
GRANT E. CARLSON  
THOMAS L. CARLSON

TODD L. CARNAHAN  
DAVID L. CARRAWAY  
RICHARD J. CARRIER  
JAMES J. CARROLL  
GREGORY W. CARSON  
DONALD C. CARTER  
JESSE D. CARTER  
SUE B. CARTER  
THOMAS C. CARTER  
ALLAN R. CASSADY  
PETER H. CASTOR  
RONALD J. CELENTANO  
JAMES J. CHAMBERS, JR.  
DAVID W. CHANDLER  
VONDA F. CHANEY  
DENNIS W. CHENEY  
JULIE A. CHESLEY  
BARRY R. J. CHEYNE  
KEVIN T. CHRISTENSEN  
FRANCIS K. CHUN  
STEPHEN A. CILEA  
PETER A. CIPPERLY  
DAN L. CLARK  
JASON L. CLARK  
RICHARD M. CLARK  
WESLEY J. CLARK  
JOHN G. CLARKE  
MARGARET A. CLAYTOR  
KAREN A. CLEARY  
JAMES D. CLIFTON  
WILLARD E. CLITES III  
MARLA A. COAN  
WILLARD D. COBLE  
RICHARD J. COCCIE  
WALTER E. COCHRAN  
JAMES M. COHEN  
TRACY W. COLBURN  
LINDA R. COLE  
RAYMOND E. COLLINS  
THEODORA L. COLLINS  
JOHN C. COLOMBO  
THOMAS R. COMER  
MAVIS E. COMPAGNO  
JOHN H. COMTOIS  
KATHLEEN O. CONCANNON  
CURTIS C. CONNELL  
MICHAEL F. CONNER  
MICHAEL P. CONNOLLY  
SUSAN E. CONNOR  
JEFFREY P. CONNORS  
KATHLEEN C. CONRAD  
ROBERT S. COOK  
WILLIAM T. COOK, JR.  
KENNETH C. COONS, JR.  
CHARLES E. COOPER  
PAUL S. COPELAND  
FRANCIS C. CORCORAN  
REBECCA F. CORLENGY  
CHARLES P. CORLEY  
JOAN H. CORNUET  
CHARLES D. CORPMAN  
JOHN F. CORRIGAN  
COLIN B. COSGROVE, JR.  
JOHN F. COSTA, JR.  
GERALD R. COSTELLO  
FRANCIS COX  
KEVIN S. COX  
KIMBERLY S. COX  
SUSAN A. COX  
MATTHEW L. CRABBE  
PHYLLIS KAY CRAFT  
ROBERT L. CRAIG  
RODNEY L. CROSLEN  
THOMAS G. CROSSAN, JR.  
MICHAEL P. CROWLEY  
SHANNON B. CROWLEY  
CRAIG A. CROXTON  
JESSE K. CRUMP  
ROBERT E. CRUZ  
MICHAEL T. CULHANE  
ROBERT J. CULHANE  
PATRICK E. CUMMINS  
JENNIFER D. CUNNINGHAM  
GERALD D. CURRY  
JAMES M. CURTIS  
RANDY K. CURTIS  
ROBERT L. CUSHING, JR.  
BRIAN P. CUTTS  
WALTER CYKTIK, JR.  
TERRI J. CZENKUS  
MARK R. DAGUHTT  
DAVID J. DAHL  
DENNIS E. DALEY  
DOUGLAS H. DALSOGLIO  
RAYMOND T. DALY, JR.  
KEVIN B. DAMATO  
DONNA L. DANIELSON  
JAMES R. DARBY III  
DOUGLAS W. DAUER  
THOMAS P. DAVENPORT  
KENNETH J. DAVID  
PETER D. DAVIDSON  
WILLIAM D. DAVIDSON  
DONNIE G. DAVIS, JR.  
KIMBERLY A. DAVIS  
MARK L. DAVIS

MICHAEL D. DAVIS  
ROBIN DAVIS  
SHUGATO S. DAVIS  
STEVEN TODD DAVIS  
LILLI D. DAVIDOWICZ  
STEVEN O. DAWSON  
KATHRYN A. DAY  
RONALD J. DEAK  
JAMES W. DEAN  
JOHN F. DEAN, JR.  
MARY K. DEATHERAGE  
MICHAEL V. DEATON  
LAURIE A. DEGARMO  
KEVIN D. DEGNAN  
MICHAEL P. DEGREEF  
GUS W. DEIBNER  
MARKUS R. DEITERS  
WILLIAM G. DEKEMPER  
DENIS P. DELANEY  
WILLIAM P. DELANEY  
THOMAS DELAROSA  
STEPHEN J. DELLIES  
ANNE C. DEMENT  
SCOTT L. DENNIS  
PAUL DENNY  
DAVID M. DENOFRIO  
LEE K. DEPALO  
LEE E. DEKEMER  
JAMES L. DEW, JR.  
DEBRA A. DEXTER  
KIRK E. DICKENSON  
JAMES R. DICKERSON  
MICHAEL R. DICKEY  
MARK C. DILON  
JON C. DITTMER  
KATHLEEN T. DOBY  
GREG R. DODSON  
ELAINE R. DOHERTY  
ARLEN L. DOHMAN  
THOMAS J. DOMNEY  
ROBERT A. DOMINGUEZ  
JOHN T. DONESKI  
JOHN F. DONNELLY  
CHRIS E. DONOVAN  
JOHN A. DORIAN  
CHARLES S. DORSEY  
EDWARD K. DOSKOCZ  
JOHN W. DOUCETTE  
SAUEL R. DOUGLAS  
PAUL E. DOWDEN  
MARIA J. DOWLING  
BENJAMIN H. DOWNING  
\*KONNIE M. DOYLE  
GREGORY F. DRAGOO  
JOHN D. DRIESNACK  
WILLIAM A. DRUSCHEL  
SCOTT C. DUDLEY  
SEAN P. DUMAS  
DENNIS DUMAS  
MARY E. DUNCAN  
RONALD D. DUNIC  
DIEP N. DUONG  
THEOPHILE DUPECHAIN, JR.  
THOMAS L. DUQUETTE  
JON DURESKY  
DARREN P. DURKEE  
DAVID J. DUVAL  
MICHAEL S. DUVAL  
GREGORY M. DZOBA  
THOMAS J. EANNARINO  
ERIC M. EARNST  
DAVID J. EASTMAN  
LINDA L. EBLING  
ROBERT J. EGBERT  
GERARD W. EGEL  
RANDY D. EIDE  
CRAIG A. EIDMAN  
ANGELO B. EILAND  
RICHARD C. EINSTMAN  
ASHLEY S. ELDER  
JAMES M. ELDRIDGE, JR.  
NEIL R. ELTON  
BRUCE C. EMIG  
RANDALL M. EMMERT, JR.  
MARK D. ENGEMAN  
JON L. ENGLE  
ROBERT S. ENGLEHART  
CHARLES M. ENNIS, JR.  
DAVID ENNIS  
ARNEL B. ENRIQUEZ  
DAVID A. ERCHINGER  
LESLIE D. ERICKSON  
MARK S. ERICKSON  
TERESA A. ERICKSON  
KAREN C. EVERS  
DEBORAH Y. EVES  
WALTER G. FARRAR, III  
WALTER M. FARRELL  
DONALD G. FARRIS  
MICHAEL A. FATONE  
DANIEL C. FAVORITE  
JAMES V. FAVRETT  
DAVID A. FEESER  
RICHARD W. FEESER  
DOUGLAS H. FEHRMANN

JOSEPH B. FENTRESS  
DANIEL R. FERNANDEZ  
KENNETH H. FIELDING  
FRANK E. FIELDS  
EDWARD A. FIENGA  
DANIEL L. FIGUEROA  
DAVID A. FILIPPINI  
HERBERT J. FINCH  
KENNETH J. FISCHER  
CRAIG H. FISHER  
EDWARD L. FISHER  
GREGORY L. FISHER  
STEPHEN M. FISHER  
TIMOTHY E. FISK  
CLIFFORD B. FITTS  
JOHN H. FLETCHER  
DIANA R. FLORES  
STEVEN W. FLOWERS  
DAVID J. FOELKER  
DANIEL T. FOGARTY  
BRIAN R. FOLEY  
CHARLES M. FOLSOM  
DOUGLAS C. FORBES  
NORMAN J. FORBES  
MARK S. FORRESTER  
JAMES F. FORREST  
JOHN K. FORSYTHE, JR.  
DEBORAH A. FORT  
CINDY L. FOSSUM  
JOSEPH FOSTER  
BOBBY G. FOWLER, JR.  
KEVIN J. FOWLER  
TIMOTHY J. FOWLER  
DEAN C. FOX  
ERIC EDWARD FOX  
BRUCE D. FRANK  
DONALD  
FRANKENBERRY  
HOELL R. FRANZ  
JOHN H. FRANZ  
MARK C. FRASSINELLI  
DAVID C. FRAZEE  
KEITH D. FREDERICK  
BARRY A. FREDERICK  
TIM B. FREEMAN  
PATRICIA ANN  
FREEMANFORD  
KARL L. FREERKS  
GERALD J. FRISBEE  
JACKIE D. FRISBYGRIFFIN  
PATRICK E. FROST  
RICH. FUKUOKA  
CLAUDE V. FULLER, JR.  
DONALD J. GALE  
BRYAN J. GALLAGHER  
MARK A. GALLAGHER  
RONALD J. GARAN, JR.  
SCOTT R. GARDNER  
WONZIE L. GARDNER, JR.  
ROBERT F. GASS  
DANIEL J. GATES II  
RICHARD W. GATES  
SANDRA E. GATEWOOD  
KERMIT J. GETZ  
JAMES F. GEUTS  
DAVID C. GEUTING  
DAVID S. GIBSON  
RANDY L. GIBSON  
ROBERT M. GIESKEN  
ROBERT C. GIFT  
DENISE L. GILLEN  
WILLIAM S. GILLEY  
DAVID S. GIMORE  
THERESA GIORLANDO  
FREDERICK M. GIBBERT  
ALAN G. GLOGOWSKI  
DAVID M. GLOGOWSKI  
JOHN E. GOCHENAUR  
RICHARD A. GODDARD  
JAMES D. GODWIN  
THOMAS W. GOFFUS  
TERRY L. GOLD  
LIESEL A. GOLDEN  
FRANCINE P. GOODE  
JOHN T. GOODE  
GERALD S. GORMAN  
MARK N. GOSE  
PATRICK A. GOULD  
WAYNE E. GRACHEK, JR.  
LARRY M. GRANT  
MARION P. GRAVELY III  
DAVID L. GRAVES  
MICHAEL R. GRAY  
JOHN R. HIGGS, JR.  
DOUGLAS D. HIGH  
JOHN T. HILDEN  
CHRISTINE O. HILL  
DOUGLAS E. HILL  
JOEL H. HILL  
NORAH H. HILL  
RAYMOND R. HILL, JR.  
ROBERT L. HINKLE  
DONALD P. HINKSON  
DONALD W. HINTON  
GREGORY H. HINTON  
SUSAN E. HIRST

TIMOTHY A. GUIDEN  
MICHAEL J. GUIDRY  
JAMES P. GUINAN  
DANA L. GUNTER  
ERIC V. GUNZINGER  
RANDALL H. GUPTON  
MICK R. GUTHALS  
GARY M. GUTOWSKY  
ROBERT L. HAASE, JR.  
DANIEL V. HACKMAN  
MICHAEL D. HAEFNER  
JEFF L. HAGENS  
DEAH T. HAGMAIER  
JAMES C. HAHN  
CHRIS E. HAIR  
MARVIN C. HAIRE  
KATHRYN E. HALL  
PAMELA J. HALL  
SUSAN R. HALL  
THOMAS J. HALL, II  
DAVID C. HAM  
JOHN J. HAMBEL  
STEVEN E. HAMMOCK  
BRUCE A. HANESSIAN  
JERROLD J. HANNA  
JAMES L. HANNON  
THOMAS M. HARKENRIDER  
BRUCE F. HARMON  
JOSEPH F. HARMON, JR.  
JOSEPH H. HARRELL  
BRIAN D. HARRIETT  
JEFFREY L. HARRIGIAN  
CHARLES H. HARRIS, JR.  
DAVID A. HARRIS  
JACKSON S. HARRIS, JR.  
JERRY D. HARRIS, JR.  
JOHN D. HARRIS  
RAY P. HARRIS  
ROBERT HARRIS  
WILLIAM S. HARRIS  
JOHN C. HARRISON  
JAMES A. HARROLD  
JACQUELINE C. R. HARRY  
DAVID E. HARSHMAN  
EDWARD R. HARTMAN  
PAUL G. HARTMAN  
RICHARD W. HARTMAN  
ROBERT J. HARTNETT, JR.  
\*MICHAEL C. HARTZELL  
TINA M. HARVEY  
ROGER A. HARVILLE  
MARK R. HASARA  
MICHAEL R. HASS  
ARTHUR G. HATCHER, JR.  
BRENDA A. HAVEN  
ANGELO T. HAYGOOD  
ROBERT L. HEAD, JR.  
THOMAS Y. HEADEN  
LAURIE S. HEALY  
SEAN V. HEATHERMAN  
JOEL C. HECK  
KEITH L. HEDGEPETH  
BART H. HEDLEY  
MARK A. HEDMAN  
WARD E. HEINKE  
JULIE A. HEITZMAN  
LENORE M. HEMINGWAY  
MICHAEL G. HEMLER  
ANTHONY L. HENDERSON  
DAVID E. HENDERSON  
JAMES L. HENDERSON  
SCOTT A. HENDERSON  
GEORGE M. HENKEL  
KIRSCHBAUM JOANNE  
HENKENIUS  
PAUL R. HENNING  
EUGENE H. HENRY  
KEVIN M. HENRY  
MICHAEL W. HENRY  
JOHN J. HEPNER  
SHARON M. HERMAN  
MICHAEL F. HERMSEN  
BRADLEY P. HERREMANS  
SHERRY A. HERRERA  
MARK S. HERSHMAN  
GARY D. HETLAND  
BRUCE E. HEYLMUN  
ROLLINS G. HICKMAN  
KYLE E. HICKS  
MANUEL A. HIDALGO  
MELISSA A.  
HIGGINBOTHAM  
JOHN R. HIGGS, JR.  
DOUGLAS D. HIGH  
JOHN T. HILDEN  
CHRISTINE O. HILL  
DOUGLAS E. HILL  
JOEL H. HILL  
NORAH H. HILL  
RAYMOND R. HILL, JR.  
ROBERT L. HINKLE  
DONALD P. HINKSON  
DONALD W. HINTON  
GREGORY H. HINTON  
SUSAN E. HIRST

MICKIE S. HO  
CLEOPHAS S. HOCKADAY, JR.  
RICHARD E. HOEFERKAMP  
JEFFREY A. HOFFER  
GREGORY J. HOFFMAN  
ROBERT K. HOFFMANN  
KENNETH E. HOGAN  
WILLIAM E. HOGAN  
RICHARD A. HOLCOMB  
MELVIN A. HOLLAND, III  
KIRBY R. HOLMES  
\*BARBARA J.  
HOLMSTEDT  
MARK  
DAVID L. HOLT  
MICHAEL A. HOMAN  
GARY L. HOPPER  
STEVEN L. HOPPER  
LELAND R. HOPSON  
DANIEL J. HORACK  
GEORGE S. HORAN  
ANNE T. HOUSAL  
MICHAEL J. HOUSEHOLDER  
RICHARD K. HOUSTON  
RALPH D. HOWARD  
MARILYN H. HOWE  
JAMES E. HUBBARD  
JEFFREY A. HUBBARD  
JAMES A. HUBERT  
LINDA K. HUGGLER  
BRIAN D. HUIZENGA  
BENJAMIN J. HULSEY III  
JEFFREY A. HUNT  
ERIC C. HUPPERT  
DAVID M. HUSBAND  
STEPHEN L. HUTCHENS  
OTTIS L. HUTCHINSON, JR.  
JAMES M. HUTTO  
JEFFREY J. INGALLS  
JOHN R. INGHAM  
KAREN A. INSKIP  
DON C. IRWIN  
TROY V. IRWIN  
STEVEN M. ISENHOUR  
EILEEN M. ISOLA  
MARK E. ISRAELITT  
ARMAND G. IZZO  
KEVIN E. JACKSON  
TIMOTHY M. JACOBS  
JAY A. JACOBSON  
THOMAS E. JACOBSON  
WILLIAM J. JACOBY, III  
DAVID R. JACQUES  
LISA A. JACQUES  
THOMAS A. JAEGER  
\*MICHAEL JAENSCH  
RONALD J. JAKOVAC  
ALLEN J. JAMPERSON  
DEREK D. JAQUISH  
\*DEWEY W. JENKINS, JR.  
ERIC R. JENKINS  
GEORGE R. JENKINS  
ROBERT Q. JENKINS  
STEVEN S. JENKINS  
MARK L. JENNER  
THOMAS W. JENSEN  
JAMES W. JERNIGAN  
HERMAN O. JETT  
DAVID D. JIVIDEN  
DAVID L. JOHANSEN  
BRENT A. JOHNSON  
BRIAN L. JOHNSON  
EUGENE O. JOHNSON, JR.  
GREGORY GENE JOHNSON  
GREGORY H. JOHNSON  
JON E. JOHNSON  
KARL B. JOHNSON  
MILTON W. JOHNSON  
RICHARD T. JOHNSON  
SUSAN J. JOHNSON  
TERRY L. JOHNSON  
DOUGLAS L. JOHNSTON  
CHRISTOPHER A. JONES  
DAVID L. JONES  
DRUSSELL B. JONES  
FRANK E. JONES  
JACK L. JONES  
NATHAN H. JONES  
STEPHEN R. JONES  
THOMAS A. JONES  
MICHAEL JOY  
PAUL R. JOYCE  
SETH M. JUNKINS  
BRIAN J. JURKOVAC  
KURT J. KAISLER  
THOMAS A. KALDENBERG  
JAMES D. KANABAY, JR.  
GERARD F. KANE  
REBECCA A. KANTER  
BYRON J. KAPPE  
LAURA M. KARANOVICH  
JAMES R. KASMER  
ROBERT A. KAUCIC, JR.  
EDWARD KEEGAN

ROBERT L. KEITH  
STEVEN E. KEITH  
JULIE I. R. KELLER  
RICHARD C. KELLOGG  
ERIC D. KELLY  
JAMES M. KELLY  
FRED C. KELSEY  
DOUGLAS L. KENDALL  
JAMES M. KENDLER  
MICHAEL W. KENNEDY  
VAN D. KEPLEY, JR.  
JERRY D. KERBY  
BART R. KESSLER  
THOMAS R. KETTLER  
KENNETH V. KIBURIS  
\*JOHN A. KILDEW  
MICHAEL E. KILLION  
MAURICE L. KILPATRICK,  
JR.  
STEVEN A. KIMBRELL  
ANITA M. KING  
EDMUND T. KING II  
EDWARD R. KING  
ROBERT W. KING  
KAREN J. KINLIN  
SHEILA M. KINTY  
KEVIN R. KIRKPATRICK  
MICHAEL R. KIRPES  
ANTHONY T. KITT  
DENNIS K. KITTERMAN  
ERIC A. KIVI  
GARY W. KLABUNDE  
TERRY D. KLINE  
EDWARD J. KLINENBERG  
STEPHEN S. KMIECIK  
RICHARD P. KOEPEKE  
BETH Y. KOHSIN  
WILLIAM A. KOLAKOWSKI  
KEITH E. KOLEKOFSKI, JR.  
JEFFREY A. KOONZ  
PHILIP L. KOPPA  
JOHN M. KORLASKE  
RICHARD A. KOSANKE  
STEVEN T. KOTAN  
DIANE L. KOVACH  
STEWART J. KOWALL  
MARK D. KRAMER  
PAUL A. KRAUSE  
MICHAEL V. KRAUT  
JOHN H. KRESEK, JR.  
WOLFGANG K. KRESSIN  
THOMAS W. KRISSE  
MARK S. KROSS  
JOHN C. KRUEGER  
DANA C. KUECKER  
DAVID E. KUGLER  
KARL W. KUSCHNER  
GARY R. KUWASHIMA  
KURT R. KUZNICZKI  
ROBBY A. KYROUAC  
THOMAS P. LACOMBE  
THOMAS M. LAFFEY  
ANDREW D. LAGRONE  
ROBERT A. LALA  
JOHN D. LALUMIA  
RAYMOND E. LAMARCHE,  
JR.  
MICHAEL A. LAMBERT  
SCOTT V. LANDIS  
PHILLIP T. LANMAN  
WILSON DAVIS LANNOM,  
JR.  
FRANK H. LARA  
MARK J. LAROSE  
BRUCE A. LARSEN  
DAVID M. LARSON  
DEBORAH L. LARY  
STEPHEN LATCHFORD  
ANITA E. LATIN  
STUART T. LATTA  
JOHN W. LAVIOLETTE  
THOMAS J. LAWHEAD, JR.  
NAOMI T. LAWLESS  
ROBERT G. LAWS  
GREGORY E. LAXTON  
PETER C. LEAHY  
TIMOTHY J. LEAHY  
PATRICK G. LEE  
RONALD A. LEE  
JOHN D. LEEZER  
RANDY J. LEFEVRE  
SCOTT J. LEMPE  
BABETTE M. LENFANT  
MARIACRISTINA C. LEONE  
NATHAN A. LEPPER  
MARK W. LEVSKY  
JEFFREY L. LEWIS  
PAULA A. LEWIS  
THEODORE P. LEWIS  
DARCY L. LILLEY  
SOLEDAD LINDOMOON  
MARK W. LINDSEY  
LANCE J. LINDSLEY

PETER E. LINNEMANN  
JOHN LIPINSKI  
RAUL A. LIRA, JR.  
SCOTT C. LOCKARD  
RANDALL L. LONG  
WAYNE D. LOOSBROCK  
ADELAIDA LOPEZ  
MARK J. LORENZ  
JOHN E. LOSCHIAVO  
JAMES A. LOTT  
MICHAEL G. LOUGHLIN  
CATHERINE T. LOVELADY  
WYLLIE E. LOVELADY III  
ANDRE L. LOVETT  
RAY DON LOWE II  
JEFFREY D. LOWERY  
RONALD P. LOWTHER  
EDWARD W. LOXTERKAMP  
JOSEPH R. LUBIC  
DAVID E. LUCIA  
LOUISE M. LUNDVAA  
ROALD F. LUTZ  
STEPHEN P. LUXION  
CHRISTOPHER H. LYONS  
DOUGLAS J. LYPEK  
BRIAN D. MAAS  
ROBERT J. MACDONALD  
PRATRIVA V. MACK  
S. THOMPSON MACKENZIE  
KRISTIAN G. MACKEY  
KEMMIT C. MACLEAN  
BARRY S. MACNEILL  
BRIAN MAGAZU  
DONALD J. MAGEE  
WILLIAM J. MAHONY, JR.  
ROBERT W. MAHOOD  
KARL B. MAJOR  
MYRON V. MAJORS  
JERALD T. MALLERNEE  
RICHARD L. MALLICK  
CHRISTOPHER R. MALOY  
FILEMON S. MANANSALA  
KATHRYN S. MANCHESTER  
MARK A. MANELEY  
JAMES E. MANCKER, JR.  
MARK T. MANNEY  
CHARLES A. MANSWILL II  
WALTER B. MANWILL  
HOWARD K. MARDIS  
JAMES R. MARRS  
NATHAN W. MARTENS  
JAMES F. MARTIN, JR.  
LAWRENCE M. MARTIN, JR.  
LESLIE C. MARTIN  
RONALD G. MARTIN  
STEVEN W. MARTIN  
DAVID W. MARTINEZ  
GLEN S. MARUMOTO  
JAMES K. MASON  
SHARI L. MASSENGALE  
STEPHEN M. MATECHIK  
ERIC S. MATHEWSON  
DONALD F. MATTNER, JR.  
JUAN M. MAURTUA  
KATHY L. MAXWELL  
DANITA C. MCALLISTER  
EVERETT B. MCALLISTER  
GARY D. MCALUM  
PATRICK W. MCANDREWS  
PETER M. MCCABE  
JOHN M. MCCAIN  
RANDY MCCANNE  
MICHAEL J. MCCARTHY  
JAMES E. MCCCLAIN  
JOSEPH S. MCCCLAIN  
DAVID B. MCCORMICK  
TIMOTHY R. MCCORMICK  
CLEVELAND R. MCCRAY  
CARLOS L. MCDADE  
CARL E. MCDANIEL, JR.  
LOUIS N. MCDONALD III  
GUY W. MCGEE  
MICHAEL B. MCGEE, JR.  
TERESA M. MCGONAGILL  
DONALD A. MCGOUGH, JR.  
MAURA THERESA  
MCGOWAN  
JOSEPH H. MCGUGAN  
LAWRENCE J. MCGUIN  
TIMOTHY J. MCILHENNY  
FRANCIS L. MCILWAIN, JR.  
BRIAN K. MCINTOSH  
JANET E. MCINTOSH  
PAUL D. MCINTYRE  
STEPHEN M. MCINTYRE  
TIMOTHY P. MCINTYRE  
MICHAEL V. MCKELVEY  
MATTHEW P. MCKEON  
CHRISTOPHER M.  
MCLAUGHLIN  
JOHN A. MCLAUGHLIN, JR.  
MONTE C. MCMEANS  
\*SARAH P. MCENAMIN

ROY D. MCMICKELL, JR.  
ROBERT H. MCMILLAN III  
ROBERT D. MCMURRY, JR.  
SEAN T. MCNAMARA  
RICHARD G. MCSPADDEEN,  
JR.  
WILSON G. MCWHIRTER III  
LINDA R. MEDLER  
SCOTT D. MEISINGER  
STEPHAN J. MELTZ  
GREGORY L. MELTON  
MARK A. MELVILLE  
MICHAEL R. MENDONCA  
ANN E. MERCER  
STEVEN J. MERRILL  
DONALD C. MERTZ, JR.  
DARRYL C. METZ  
DANIEL D. MEYER  
EDWARD F. MEYER  
JEFFREY W. MEYER  
RICHARD E. MEYER  
RONALD J. MIKRU  
JAMES D. MILBURN  
CHARLES B. MILLER  
CYNTHIA L. MILLER  
DOUGLAS W. MILLER  
JAMES S. MILLER  
MIKEL M. MILLER  
RANDOLPH P. MILLER  
RICHARD C. MILLER  
THOMAS J. MILLER  
MICHAEL K. J. MILLIGAN  
ARTHUR G. MILLS  
DIANE M. MILLS  
ROBERT F. MILLS  
ERNEST M. MILTON  
EDWARD M. MINAHAN  
STEPHEN L. MITCHELL  
SUSAN E. MITCHELL  
WILLIAM L. MITCHELL  
ZANE W. MITCHELL, JR.  
EUGENE W. MITTUCH  
MATTHEW H. MOLLOY  
JEFFREY M. MOODY  
JAMES M. MOORE  
LARRY B. MOORE  
SCOTT W. MOORE  
STEVEN G. MOORE  
TIMOTHY S. MOORE  
WILLIAM A. MOORE  
LUIS F. MORALES  
ROBERT E. MORIARTY  
DANIEL P. MORIN  
ANNE R. MORRIS  
KAREN P. MORRIS  
MICHAEL F. MORRIS  
GARY P. MORRISON  
DAVID L. MORROW  
PATRICIA G. MOSELEY  
WILLIAM A. MOSS  
URSULA P. MOUL  
JAMES C. MOULTON  
MARK W. MOUV  
PATRICK O. MOYLAN  
RONALD J. MOZZILLO  
MICHAEL R. MUELLER  
MARK D. MULLEN  
BARRY E. MULLINS  
RICHARD F. MUNSELL  
TRACY M. MURAKAMI  
KEVIN M. MURPHY  
TIMOTHY W. MURPHY  
BRIAN K. MURRAY  
JEFFREY M. MURRAY  
PATRICK H. MURRAY  
EDEN J. MURRIE  
BARBARA L. MYERS  
BROOKS A. MYERS  
RICHARD R. NEEL  
MICHAEL L. NEELEY  
THERESA M. NEELY  
JAMES B. NEES  
GEORGE J. NELSON, JR.  
JULIA E. NELSON  
MARY S. NELSON  
JEFFREY L. NEUBERGER  
VISHNU V. NEVREKAR  
JOHN F. NEWELL III  
MATTHEW P. NEWMAN  
JOSEPH W. NICHOLS  
STUART G. NICHOLS  
PHILIP G. NICHOLSON  
DAVID A. NICKELS  
CLARA L. NIELSEN  
STEPHEN J.  
NIEMANTSVERDRIET  
LAWRENCE J. NIKOLAUS  
WESLEY L. NOLDEN II  
BRIAN S. NORMAN  
CYNTHIA L.A. NORMAN  
JON A. NORMAN  
CLETUS G. NORRIS  
JAN A. NORTH

KEVIN W. NORTON  
JAMES R. NORWOOD  
STEVEN R. NOTTOLI  
MARK C. NOWLAND  
KEVIN W. OATLEY  
CHARLES E. O'BRIEN  
EDWARD P. O'CONNELL  
MAURICE T. O'DONNELL  
DONALD E. OFFILL  
JAMES H. OGDEN  
TERENCE N. OHERON  
PAUL M. OLDE  
ROBERT I. OLSON  
TIMOTHY A. OLSON  
ROBERT C. O'NEAL  
ELAINE ORABONA  
VIRGINIA A. ORR  
ROBERT L. ORWIG, JR.  
PHILLIP L. OSBORNE  
TERRENCE J.  
O'SHAUGHNESSY, JR.  
BRADLEY D. OSWALT  
WILLIAM F. OVERBEY, JR.  
KELLY J. OWENS  
MARC E. OWENS  
JOSEPH G. PACHECO  
DUANE A. PADRICK  
LEON D. PAGE, SR.  
WILLIAM J. PALIWODA  
NORMAN H. PALLISTER  
MARGUERITE J. PALMER  
ROBERT C. PALMER  
GUY M. PALUMBO  
ROBERT E. PANNONE, JR.  
RONALD B. PANTING  
GLEN J. PAPPAS  
ORLANDO J. PAPUCCI  
JAMES E. PARKER  
MICHAEL K. PARKER  
MONTE R. PARKER  
VICTOR F. PARKER  
JOHN B. PARKES III  
ANTHONY T. PARLATI  
DAVID R. PATTERSON  
JACK D. PATTERSON  
SPENCER H. PATTERSON,  
JR.  
ERIC M. PAULSON  
GEORGE L. PAVELKO, JR.  
JONATHAN S. PAYNE  
DAVID W. PEAIRIE  
BRADLEY J. PEARSON  
ALEX S. PEAT  
MICHAEL W. PEEL  
PATRICK E. PENCE  
DAVID C. PENNY  
PHILIP E. PEPPERL  
JOHN J. PERICAS  
GREGORY M. PERKINSON  
GARY R. PERRY  
JENNIFER HANSELL PERRY  
LAWRENCE J. PETER  
EUGENE G. PETERSON, JR.  
MARK R. PETERSON  
DAVID PETRILLO  
HANS J. PETRY  
WILLIAM G. PFEIFFER, JR.  
KURT P. PFITZNER  
DAVID D. PHILLIPS, JR.  
DON E. PHILLIPS  
GARY E. PHILLIPS, JR.  
RONALD B. PHIPPS  
RONALD H. PICKETT  
CHARLES K. PIGG  
ALAN J. PINEAULT  
JOHN P. PINO  
CURTIS O. PIONTKOWSKY  
\*GARY F. PIPER  
STEVE E. PITCHER  
LEE PLOWDEN  
MARK A. POHLMEIER  
TODD J. POLLARD  
JOHN D. POLLEY  
CHRISTOPHER J. POOCK  
TIMOTHY G. POOLE  
PATRICIA L. POPPINO  
CHARLES E. POTTER  
RONALD K. POWELL, JR.  
DONNA L. POWERS  
WINSTON D. POWERS  
MARK R. PRICE  
PAUL A. PRICE  
PHILIP J. PRICE  
JOSEPH J. PRIDOTKAS  
ELEGEAR J. PRIMUS  
MICHAEL E. PRIVETTE  
DENISE M. PROCTOR  
JOSEPH F. PUGLIESE  
PETER PUEK  
JAMES R. PULLIAM  
SCOTT T. PURDIE  
ROBERT A. PURKHISER  
STEVEN O. PURTILE

JOHN C. PYRYT  
WILLIAM P. QUINONES  
MICKEY L. QUINTRALL  
SUZANNE T. QUIRAO  
RICHARD J. RAGALLER  
JEFFREY A. RALSTON  
ANTHONY RAMOS  
FRANKLIN D. RAND  
TAMRA L. RANK  
KEVIN D. RASMUSSEN  
GREGORY J. RATTRAY  
JEFFREY RATTRAY  
BRIAN S. RAY  
GREGORY MARK RAY  
JOEL D. RAY  
TIMOTHY M. RAY  
ANTHONY P. REARDON  
ANDREW M. REDMOND  
HERRIE L. REED, JR.  
RICHARD A. REED  
RODNEY E. REED  
SCOTT A. REED  
JOEL S. REESE  
KENNETH W. REESE  
MATTHEW F. REESE  
HOWARD A. REID  
MARGARET A. REILLY  
BRADFORD M. REINERT,  
SR.  
BRADY R. REITZ  
DAVID REMENDOWSKI  
DAVID RESENDEZ  
TERRI J. REUSCH  
CHRISTOPHER J. REVIS  
DAVID L. REYNOLDS  
GEORGE F. RHAME  
ALBERT N. RHODES III  
CLIFTON D. RHODES  
DANIEL J. RICHARD  
MARC D. RICHARD  
NANCY S. RICHARDS  
DANNY B. RICHARDSON  
BRENT A. RICHERT  
BRET G. RIDER  
GILBERTO G. RIOS  
JOSE RIVERA  
ROBERT J. RIZZA  
SCOTT M. ROBERTS  
DAVID D. ROBERTSON  
DAVID M. ROBERTSON  
BRENDA M. ROBINSON  
JAMES T. ROBINSON  
JOHN B. ROBINSON  
LOUIS J. ROBINSON, JR.  
RANDALL L. ROBINSON  
EVELYN A. ROCKWELL  
JEFFREY A. ROCKWELL  
DAVID A. RODRIGUEZ  
WILLIAM RODRIGUEZ  
JOHN C. ROELOFS, III  
ANDY D. ROGERS  
LANE T. ROGERS  
PETER T. ROGERS  
JOACHIM A. ROGL  
EDWARD H. ROHLK  
MICHAEL S. ROMEO  
NYDIA A. ROSADO  
ALLEN E. ROSE  
RANDY E. ROSE  
CHARLES W. ROSS  
HUBERT A. ROSS  
KEVIN D. ROSS  
TERRY L. ROSS  
FRANK J. ROSSI, JR.  
CONSTANCE M. ROTHER  
MAX R. ROTHMAN  
MARIANNE C. ROWE  
JONATHAN D. RUDEMAN  
BRUCE A. RUSCIO  
FLOYD RUSSELL III  
HOWARD R. RUSSELL  
MARK A. RUSSELL  
PATRICK E. RYAN  
TIMOTHY L. SAFFOLD  
CASSANDRA R. SALVATORE  
BRIJ B. SANDILL  
CRAIG A. SANDS  
ROBERT A. SANFORD  
MARK B. SANSOUCI  
MARC A. SARCHET  
CLAIRE M. SAUCIER  
EDWARD G. SAUVAGEAU  
NORMAN P. SCHAFFER  
JUDITH SCHAFFER  
KURT W. SCHAKE  
MARGARET E. SCHALCH  
RANDALL A.  
SCHERMERHORN  
GREGORY J. SCHMIDT  
JEFFREY E. SCHMIDT  
MARCEL T. SCHMIDT  
MARK J. SCHMITZ

FREDERICK W.D.  
SCHMOKEL  
EUGENE H. SCHNIPKE  
ERIC J. SCHNITZER  
JOHN H. SCHOENWOLF  
HEATHER W. SCHOLAN  
PAUL R. SCHOMBER  
THORNTON C. SCHULTZ  
PETER H. SCHWARZ  
SUSAN L. SCHWEISS  
PETER W. SCHWYHER  
JAMIE C. SCOTLAND  
LYNN R. SCOTT  
THOMAS A. SCOTT  
JOHN C. SELL  
PHILIP M. SENNA  
PATRICIA L. SEROKA  
HUGH G. SEVERS  
WARD W. SEVERTS  
DANIEL B. SHAFFER  
MICHAEL R. SHANAHAN  
ANN D. SHANE  
JOSEPH R. SHANAHAN  
SCOTT T. SHARP  
MICHAEL R. SHAW  
CURTIS L. SHELTON  
FREDERICK L. SHEPHERD  
III  
SCOTT F. SHEPHERD  
STEVEN M. SHEPRO  
IVAN L. SHERARD  
DANIEL R. SHERRER  
BRIAN D. SHIMEL  
HENRY H. SHIN  
LUKE A. SHINGLEDECKER  
DAVID L. SHINKLE  
JOYCE M. SHIVELY  
GREGORY A. SHOALLES  
KEITH A. SHOMPER  
BILLY R. SHRADE  
STEPHEN D. SICKING  
KIMBERLY B. SIEVERS  
SCOTT A. SILLIMAN  
JAY B. SILVERIA  
BRIAN J. SIMES  
VERNON N. SIMMONS  
MARK A. SIMON  
PHILIP S. SIMONSEN  
GARY J. SINGLER  
JAMES C. SINWELL  
JAMES L. SISSON  
DEBRA S. SITES  
KERRY L. SITLER  
DANIEL R. SITTERLY  
MICHAEL A. W. SIZOO  
JOHN P. SKINNER  
DAVID A. SLADE  
PAUL A. SMILEY  
ANTHONY J. SMITH  
ARTHUR C. SMITH  
BILLY R. SMITH  
BRADLEY J. SMITH  
BRIAN K. SMITH  
DALE R. SMITH  
DOUGLAS D. SMITH  
ERNEST P. SMITH  
GARLAND D. SMITH  
GREGORY A. SMITH  
KEVIN C. SMITH  
KYLE J. SMITH  
LANI M. SMITH  
NEIL F. SMITH  
PATRICK J. SMITH  
RICARD K. SMITH  
SANDRA M. SMITH  
THOMAS H. SMITH, JR.  
THOMAS J. SMITH  
TIMOTHY S. SMITH  
CURT D. SMOLINSKY  
CHAPMAN JAMILYN J.  
SMYSER  
CRAIG H. SMYSER, JR.  
JOHN W. SNOODGRASS  
RICHARD W. SNYDER  
JAMES T. SOHAN  
LORI L. SOUTH  
STEPHEN F. SOVAIKO  
VIC A. SOWERS  
BRADLEY D. SPACY  
WILLIAM L. SPALLY II  
THOMAS P. SPELLMAN  
GEORGE E. SPENCER III  
LOUIS R. SPINA  
HAROLD L. SPRINGS, JR.  
BRIAN S. SQUYRES  
JOHN R. STAFFORD  
MICHAEL C. STANLEY  
MICHAEL B. STARK  
WILLIAM C. STARR  
CYNTHIA S. STAUFFER  
CAROL E. STEDNIS  
ANTHONY L. STEADMAN  
GOODWIN LINDA STEEL

JOHN H. STEENKEN, JR.  
KENNETH T. STEFANEK  
JEFFREY L. STEPHENSON  
PAUL R. STEPHENSON  
BARRY E. STERLING  
DOUBLAS E. STEWART  
NOYES C. STICKNEY III  
JOHN W. STIERWALT  
CHARLES B. STILL  
JOHN G. STIZZA  
TIMOTHY A. STOCKING  
DANIEL W. STOCKTON  
KATHERINE E. STODDARD  
DANIEL J. STOEHR  
RICHARD B. STONESTREET  
STEPHAN G. STRINGHAM  
DIANE K. STRUCK  
RICHARD M. STUCKEY  
CHARLIE R. STUTTS  
JOHN E. STUWE  
TERRENCE L. SUNNARBORG  
STANLEY B. SUPINSKI  
RICHARD A. SUPPES  
DANIEL A. SURREWITZ  
JOSEPH C. SUSSINGHAM  
ROLAND O. W. SUTTON  
CARL J. SWANSON  
MATTHEW D. SWANSON  
JOHN T. SWINSON  
ROBERT W. SWISHER  
CARLA S. SWITVESTER  
JERRY R. S. TACKETT  
WENDEL H. TAKENAKA  
ANTHONY G. TALLIANICH  
MICHAEL E. TALLENT  
MARK S. TALLEY  
DEAN C. TANO  
HALBERT F. TAYLOR, JR.  
LUCILLE P. TAYLOR  
MICHAEL D. TAYLOR  
NANCI M. TAYLOR  
WILLIAM D. TAYLOR  
ROGER W. TEAGUE  
DONALD D. THARP  
MICHAEL T. THAYNE  
ERIC E. THEISEN  
SUSAN E. THIBODEAU  
DENNIS R. THOMAS  
LAWRENCE D. THOMAS  
MICHAEL L. THOMAS  
ROBERT D. THOMAS  
WILBERT J. THOMAS, JR.  
MARY C. THOMASSON  
ANGELA L. THOMPSON  
DAVID D. THOMPSON  
JEROME B. THOMPSON  
KEITH A. THOMPSON  
FRANK B. THORNBURG, III  
MICHAEL H. THORNTON  
DEAN W. THORSON  
MICHAEL W. THYSSEN  
JOHN J. TILLIE  
DAVID L. TIMM  
GREGORY S. TIMS  
KENNETH R. TINGMAN  
JAMES E. TINSLER, JR.  
MARK S. TISSI  
DAVID M. TOBIN  
DANIEL R. TODD  
JAMES H. TOLER  
KIMBERLY K. TONEY  
MARK E. TOPP  
CHRISTOPHER M. TOSTE  
STEPHEN M. TOURANGEAU  
HENRY TOUSSAINT  
ANDREW C. TRACEY  
HAU T. TRAN  
DARRYL G. TREAT  
JOHN E. TRIMMER, JR.  
JAMES A. TRIPP  
MICHAEL W. TRUNDY  
ALLANT T. TUCKER, JR.  
KATHERINE K. TUCKER  
MONA LISA D. TUCKER  
DWAYNE R. TURMELLE  
GAYLENE B. UJCIK  
CHARLES L. ULLESTAD  
TERRY A. ULRICH  
WILLIAM A. ULRICH  
DONALE M. UTCHEL  
DAVID R. UZZELL  
DANIEL M. VADNAIS  
JAMES P. VAKOS  
FLORENCE A. VALLEY  
BUSKIRK DAVID J. VAN  
SCOTT C. VANBLARCOM  
SCOTT A. VANDERHUMM  
JOHN W. VANDERHOVEN  
STAN L. VANDERWERF  
KENNETH J. VANTIGER  
MICHAEL E.  
VANVALKENBURG  
PETER M. VANWIRT  
EMILIO VARCARCEL  
JAMES W. VAUGHT, JR.  
RENNIE VAZQUEZ  
KATIE D. VEAZIE  
TIMOTHY A. VEEDER  
DAVID VEGA  
RAMON G. VEGA, JR.  
ROBERT J. VERRICA, JR.  
NANCY R. VETERIE  
ROSE M. VICKERY  
THELMA D. VINCENT

WYNE B. WALDRON  
MICHELLE L. WALDROND  
JEFFREY K. WALKER  
RICHARD F. WALKER  
ROY E. WALKER, JR.  
STEVEN J. WALKER  
JEAN A. WALLACE  
JOHN E. WALLIN  
JUDSON E. WALLS  
JOSEPH T. WALDROND  
ROSS E. WALTON  
MARK D. WARD  
SCOTT F. WARDELL  
STEVEN E. WARE  
JEFFREY J. WARNEMENT  
FRED L. WARREN, III  
JONATHAN E. WASCHKE  
LESLIE E. WASHER  
JEFFREY W. WATSON  
REGINA L. WAYSON  
MICHAEL L. WEBB, III  
MARSHALL B. WEBB  
EDWARD V. WEBER  
JAMES M. WEBER  
BRADLEY N. WEBSTER  
THOMAS M. WEBSTER, JR.  
CHARLES D. WEEKES  
ROBERT M. WEESNER  
CHRISTOPHER P.  
WEGGEMER  
GEORGE E. WEIL  
ROBERT J. WEILAND, JR.  
JAMES R. WEIMER  
JAMES W. WEISSMANN  
DAVID L. WEISZ  
MICHAEL F. WELCH  
MICHAEL F. WELDON  
BILL C. WELLS  
GEOFFREY M. WELLS  
MARK W. WELLS  
TIMOTHY S. WELLS  
JAMES E. WELTER  
JON S. WENDELL  
JOSEPH C. WENDLERBERGER  
TRACY L. WENTWORTH  
MICHAEL J. WERMUTH  
DAVID C. WESLEY  
BRUCE A. WEST  
ROBERT J. WEST  
MARK W. WESTERGREN  
EDWARD B. WESTERMANN  
TODD D. WESTHAUSER  
KEITH R. WEYENBERG  
MARY E. WEISENHUNT  
DONALD J. WHITE  
JEFFREY D. WHITE  
JOHN W. WHITE  
THOMAS P. WHITE  
MARY K. WHITTENBURG  
CHARLES L. WICHLAC  
RONALD C. WIEGAND  
ARVIN W. WIERENGA, JR.  
WILLIAM WIGNALL  
PHYLLIS T. WILCOX  
TIMOTHY G. WILEY  
WILLIAM B. WIELM  
DONALD R. WILHITE  
AARON L. WILKINS  
ANTHONY R. WILLIAMS  
CHARLES KEITH WILLIAMS  
CLIFFORD V. WILLIAMS  
DONALD S. WILLIAMS  
FREDERICK L. WILLIAMS  
JACK G. WILLIAMS  
RICHARD J. WILLIAMS  
THOMAS J. WILLIAMS  
CRAIG J. WILLITS  
JAMES R. WILLISIE  
DARRELL R. WILSON  
GARY L. WILSON  
KELLY W. WILSON  
MICHAEL G. WILSON  
SCOTT A. WILSON  
CRAIG S. WINDORF  
KELLY A. WING  
DAVID R. WINKLER  
STEVEN W. WINTERS  
VANESSA WISE  
EDWARD W. WITHERSPOON  
CLAYTON W. WITTMAN  
JAMES S. WOLCOTT  
GARY A. WOLVER  
HOWARD L. WONG  
EMMETT C. WOOD  
ROBERT R. WOODLEY  
COENRIG F. WOODS  
DAVID S. WOODS  
PENNY L. WOODSON  
DAVID W. WOODWARD  
RUDI D. WOODWARD  
DANIEL WOOLEVER  
MATTHEW F. WOOLLEN  
MICHAEL S. WOOLLEY  
DAVID J. WORLEY  
GEORGE H. WOLEY  
CAMERON H. G. WRIGHT  
DANNY C. WRIGHT  
DAVID L. WRIGHT, JR.  
MARCUS D. WROTH  
LEE O. WYATT  
FRANCIS V. XAVIER  
ROBERT A. YAHN, JR.  
DENNIS D. YATES  
BRIAN D. YOLITZ  
BRADFORD P. YOUNG

CHARLIE R. YOUNG  
DAVID M. YOUNG  
JUDY A. YOUNG  
BARR D. YOUNKER, JR.  
DEBORAH L. ZAMORASOON  
RAYMOND B. ZAUN

DAVID F. ZEHR  
MARK D. ZETTLEMOYER  
DANIEL B. ZIEGLER  
CAROL A. ZIENERT  
ANDREW G. ZINY  
SCOTT J. ZOBRIST

## CONFIRMATIONS

### Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 1, 1999:

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

GARY S. GUZY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIANE EDITH WATSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL STATES OF MICRONESIA.

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CAROLYN L. HUNTOON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT).

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JOHN T. SPOTILA, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

LAWRENCE H. SUMMERS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

#### SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

ALBERT S. JACQUEZ, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS.

#### CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

MARY SHEILA GALL, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM OCTOBER 27, 1998.

ANN BROWN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM OCTOBER 27, 1999.

ANN BROWN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION.

#### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

JOHN T. HANSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (PUBLIC AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS).

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

TIMOTHY FIELDS, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF SOLID WASTE, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

#### UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

MELVIN E. CLARK, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 1999.

DONALD LEE PRESSLEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DONALD W. KEYSER, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, FOR RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING TENURE OF SERVICE AS SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR NAGORNO-KARABAKH AND NEW INDEPENDENT STATES REGIONAL CONFLICTS.

LARRY C. NAPPER, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, FOR RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING TENURE OF SERVICE AS COORDINATOR OF THE SUPPORT FOR EAST EUROPEAN DEMOCRACY (SEED) PROGRAM.

FRANK ALMAGUER, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS.

JOHN R. HAMILTON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PERU.

GWEN C. CLARE, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ECUADOR.

OLIVER P. GARZA, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND

PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NICARAGUA.

JOYCE E. LEADER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA.

DAVID B. DUNN, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA.

M. MICHAEL EINIK, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA.

MARK WYLEA ERWIN, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MAURITIUS, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF THE COMOROS AND AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SEYCHELLES.

CHRISTOPHER E. GOLDSWORTHY, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHAD.

JOSEPH LIMPRECHT, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ALBANIA.

PRUDENCE BUSHNELL, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA.

DONALD KEITH BANDLER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS.

JOHNNIE CARSON, OF ILLINOIS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KENYA.

THOMAS J. MILLER, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA.

BISMARCK MYRICK, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA.

MICHAEL D. METELITIS, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CAPE VERDE.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

#### FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

PETER S. WOOD, OF CALIFORNIA

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING CONSTANCE A. CARRINO, AND ENDING RUTH H. VANHEUVEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 23, 1999.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING BRIAN E. CARLSON, AND ENDING LEONARDO M. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 24, 1999.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING DALE V. SLAGHT, AND ENDING ERIC R. WEAVER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 24, 1999.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JOHNNY E. BROWN, AND ENDING MEE JA YU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 12, 1999.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JAY M. BERGMAN, AND ENDING ROBIN LANE WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 11, 1999.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSON OF THE AGENCY INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF THE CLASS STATED, AND ALSO FOR THE OTHER APPOINTMENTS INDICATED HEREWITH: FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
STEPHEN A. DODSON, OF TEXAS

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING KAREN AGUILAR, AND ENDING LAURIE M. KASSMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 1999.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive message transmitted by  
the President to the Senate on July 1,

1999, withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

G. EDWARD DESEVE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE JOHN A. KOSKINEN, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON FEBRUARY 12, 1999.