



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 23, 2001

No. 51

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 24, 2001, at 2 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, APRIL 23, 2001

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Presiding Officer, the Honorable JUDD GREGG, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Yaweh our Adonai, how excellent is Your name in all the Earth. Today, as we return from recess and at the beginning of Jewish Heritage Week, we praise You for the immense contribution Jews have made to America. We remember the first Jewish community in Newport, Rhode Island comprised of Sephardim, persecuted Spanish and Portugese Jews who arrived in the spring of 1658. This group of refugees began to worship together in private homes or rented buildings until a synagogue building, the Touro Hebrew Congregation, was constructed. On the wall of this synagogue is a letter from George Washington expressing his belief in religious freedom as the standard for civil liberty: "To bigotry give no sanction, to persecution no assistance." We also echo the words of Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island: "All men may walk as their consciences persuade them, everyone in the name of his God."

On this day we thank You for the ten Jewish Senators and their strong moral and social consciences. May Your shalom rest upon us all. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable HARRY REID, a Senator from the State of Nevada, 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 23, 2001.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDD GREGG, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 2 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee.

The Senator from Nevada.

BROWNFIELDS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an important piece of legislation that I believe we should be working on today, certainly tomorrow. This legislation, the bipartisan brownfields bill, S. 350, was reported from the Environment and Public Works Committee on February 27 by a vote of 15-3. This legislation now has 66 cosponsors. It is ready for floor action and has been for more than a month. There were a couple of people in committee who voiced concerns about specific bill language, particularly Senator VOINOVICH. I indicated at that time that we would work with him prior to the bill being ready for floor action to satisfy any problems he might have, and we did that. We worked with him, and I think Senator VOINOVICH is satisfied. Actually we worked day and night to reconcile these differences.

The bill is very important. The bill would produce almost 600,000 jobs around our country. It would increase annual tax revenues up to \$2.4 billion. This is important environmental legislation. We need to move forward immediately. There has been a lot of controversy over what President Bush has done and what he has not done, but the one thing that he campaigned on was this legislation. He campaigned on the importance of this legislation. This is a

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3773

bill the administration endorses. This is a bill the Clinton administration endorsed. This is legislation that we should move forward. I see no reason we cannot. We are ready on this side to move forward. We hope that our friends on the other side of the aisle are ready to move forward. We have worked on this legislation for years. It is just not in the best interests of this country not to move forward. We have to move forward. This bill is truly a compromise. It is a consensus. I think its passage would indicate the true nature of this Senate. We are split 50-50, and this legislation, certainly with 66 cosponsors, indicates our ability to reach across the aisle both ways. When we entered into this historic power sharing agreement this year, we indicated that we had a thoughtful, bipartisan Senate. I think it indicates the bipartisan nature of this bill. There is no need to wait any longer. We have a half million contaminated abandoned sites in the United States that are waiting to be cleaned up to become thriving parts of our communities. Some of these sites would take only a few dollars to clean up.

For example, Mr. President, in Las Vegas, where we have the old National Guard armory, \$50,000 in brownfields money cleaned that up and produced a site that is now really a thriving economic entity within the State of Nevada. It is creating jobs. There is now a tax base that will help support the people of Las Vegas and the State of Nevada.

I do not want to be partisan today and I will not be partisan today, but as the days go on I am going to have to be more direct as to what the problem is in holding up this legislation. As I said, we are clear on this side. It is not right to hold up this bill. And I also say that this legislation has the support of the Senate. If we do not move this bill forward—and I think we could finish in just a few hours—in the regular course, I am going to be obligated to attach this bill to other legislation that moves through this body.

I repeat, with 600,000 jobs, 500,000 abandoned sites, increasing annual tax revenues up to \$2.4 billion, this is a bill that is good for the environment. It is good for jobs. We should not delay its consideration any longer. It is supported by the last administration, supposedly by this administration, and I hope the leadership in the Senate, the majority leader, will allow this matter to be brought before the Senate.

This legislation has been worked on very closely by Senators VOINOVICH, INHOFE, BOND, and CRAPO, as well as Senators CLINTON, BOXER, CORZINE, and GRAHAM to accommodate all their interests. Senator SMITH and I have worked hard to have this bill reported out of committee. I hope we can have action on the Senate floor at an early date—maybe this afternoon, maybe tomorrow. But I think we should move forward quickly.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE DUKE UNIVERSITY MEN'S NCAA CHAMPIONSHIP BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, pursuant to the permission given me by the majority leader, and with the agreement of the minority leader, it is my honor to have invited the Duke University basketball team, the NCAA champions of this year, along with the wives of those who have wives, and the coaches and their wives, to come to the Senate floor.

RECESS

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for no more than 12 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:04, recessed until 1:16 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

EDUCATION

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I wish to speak in morning business on the issue of education, which the Senate will take up over the next few weeks. There has been a considerable amount of discussion on this issue within the Senate membership but even more discussion within the populace in general. The President ran for election on the issue of education and how he intended to address that issue. In fact, he considered this to be the primary issue before us as a nation—the fact that he wants an educational system which leaves no child behind.

This is a goal that is laudable and which all of us should pursue. So the matter is now coming to the Senate. We have in the committee on which I serve—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—been able to produce a bill which came out of committee 20-0, a bipartisan bill, to try to move the issue of education along in a positive way—the Federal policy on education.

There is still much to do and, therefore, as we in this body take up the debate on the education policy during this week, there will be a considerable discussion of points that were left out of the bill as it came out of committee.

I think it is important to note, as we address the issue of education, that the Federal role in education is narrow. Most elementary and secondary education issues are addressed at the local level.

Madam President, the Duke University basketball team is a group of young men who reflect the type of athletes, sportsmen, and good citizens to which citizens of this Nation should strive. I congratulate the leadership of Duke University for producing a basketball program that excels not only in athletic ability but as a role model for our youth and our Nation.

It is very appropriate that before an education speech we should have the opportunity to meet these fine young men who set such a good example for kids across America.

The majority of funds that are spent on education are controlled at the local level. Approximately 93 percent of the funding for elementary and secondary school education comes from the local school districts or the States.

The Federal role in elementary and secondary school education is really quite narrow and is focused on two basic themes: One, making sure, for kids with special needs, special ed programs are funded; and two, making sure that children who come from low-income families have an equal opportunity to succeed as children who come from families who are better off.

For the last 25 years, we have pursued both these goals: special education and the education of low-income children. Unfortunately, both of these Federal programs have fairly significant flaws.

In the special education area, the Federal Government has failed to live up to the obligation of funding the full share of special education. Originally, the Federal Government said it would pick up 40 percent of the cost of special education. Unfortunately, as of 4 years ago, the Federal Government was only picking up 6 percent of the cost.

Due to a concerted effort by myself, quite honestly, and a number of others on our side of the aisle, the majority leader, chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee, Chairman SPECTER, and chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, Chairman JEFFORDS, we took on the issue of funding special education. We have dramatically increased funding—2½ times. We are now up to funding, if we accept the President's budget, almost 20 percent of the needs of special education. In fact, President Bush has proposed the single largest increase in special education funding ever proposed by a President in the history of this country. At least we are trying to address that issue.

The bill that will come to the floor later this week addresses the needs of kids from lower income families. In this area, regrettably, although the Federal Government has chosen to step on the ground in its responsibility, it has done a poor job of pursuing this responsibility.

This program was begun 35 years ago. It is called title I. It helps kids with lower incomes get the same education as their peers. We have spent \$120 billion on this program over its life. The vast majority of the spending has occurred since 1990. What have been the results? The results have been that the educational achievement of low-income kids has actually gone down or, at best, has remained stagnant. The average fourth grader today from a low-income family reads at two grade levels lower than his or her peers in that same classroom. The graduation rate, the dropout rate, and the level of academic ability of kids from low-income families in each grade level have been falling back. We have left a lot of children behind even though we spent \$120 billion.

We have proved unalterably that money cannot solve the problem. If it could solve the problem, it would have significantly improved or we could have at least seen a marginal improvement in academic achievement.

The President of the United States, President Bush, came into office saying he would change this. He has put forward a series of proposals, the purpose of which is to fundamentally adjust the Federal role as we pursue the improvement of education of low-income kids. It has four basic themes:

First, we will change the Federal role so we don't focus on the bureaucracy; we don't focus on the structure; we don't focus on the administration; rather, we focus on the child. That may seem logical. One may ask, aren't we already doing that? No, the money today does not flow to the child. The money flows to the school system and the bureaucracy. The President said let's look at the child and make our program child centered.

The second thing stressed by this administration and by those on this side of the aisle is, let's give the local school districts, the parents, the teachers, and the principals, flexibility when they get Federal funds.

Today and, unfortunately, for a number of years, the Federal Government, especially the Congress, has believed it knows best how to educate the child in Epping, NH, or Tuscaloosa, AL, or in Cheyenne, WY. Even though we have never met the children—at least I haven't met the ones in Cheyenne or Tuscaloosa—we know best how to educate them, so we have attached innumerable strings to the dollars we have sent out for the purpose of helping the low-income children get better educated. We have had program after program that has been categorical; it specifically says what the money should be spent for, who gets it, when they get it, and where they get it.

The amount of bureaucracy behind the Federal dollars is absolutely staggering. Some States spend almost two-thirds of their time complying with Federal regulations, which represents 7 percent of their actual spending. As a result, we have created a bureaucratic

maze of disproportionate complexity. We have strings running out from the desks that intertwine, and we are pulling the strings as they attach to the people who try to teach the kids in the local school districts. The President has said: Let's cut the strings. We have said on this side: Let's cut those strings. Send the money back to the local school districts. Acknowledge the fact that parents, teachers, and principals have as much or more knowledge of how to educate the local child in their school system than we do. Let's give them credibility for being concerned about their kids—something this Congress over the years has not been willing to acknowledge. The money will come back in a flexible form. That is a proposal the President has suggested.

The first proposal is that it be child centered. The second proposal is that the money be flexible.

The third proposal is, in exchange for this new flexibility, in exchange for getting the money with very few strings attached, we are going to ask for one thing. We are going to ask that the children learn, that they have academic achievement levels which reach and exceed, hopefully, their peers, that low-income kids are not left behind in the academic world. That is what we will ask. Instead of controlling all the input and instead of controlling the way the money goes in and how it is spent, we will say, you can take the money, but in exchange for taking the money, you have to make sure the children learn; you have to make them academically capable of competing in the world so they have a prosperous life. Academic achievement is what we are going to request.

The fourth item is an accountability system so we can be assured that there is academic achievement. We are no longer going to allow a system to take the low-income child, and especially the minority child, merge them with a peer group of children in the classroom, have the group achieve an average score that is acceptable, and say everybody in that classroom is learning. We know that by not doing it that way you end up with a lot of problems being masked by the majority. So we are going to require disaggregation. We are going to say for different ethnic groups, different racial groups, different income groups, explain whether or not those kids are learning, along with the whole group in the classroom.

We are going to put in place a testing regime developed at the local level, designed at the local level, which simply says, OK, local school system, decide what a third grader should know, what a fifth grader should know, what a sixth grader should know. Once you decide what that third, fifth, or sixth grader should know in math or English, then make sure the kids actually know that. We are not going to tell them what they should know; we are not going to tell them what the standard should be. We are going to

say, after you set the standards, we will expect all the kids in that classroom to achieve at the level that meets that standard.

That is the system being proposed—four new proposals, four new concepts which merge together to, hopefully, create a system where no child will be left behind: One, that it is child centered; two, that there is flexibility; three, that there is academic achievement; and four, that there is accountability.

As we move forward with the debate on this bill, there are going to be a lot of major issues as to how we accomplish those goals. The jury is still out. There are ways this bill could be amended on this floor which would make it hard for me to support, although it came out of the committee 20-0. But there is good intention, I believe. There is a desire to reach a bipartisan agreement and move it forward. That is reflected not only in the committee bill but in the fact that over the last month we have been negotiating, in a very conscientious effort, to reach agreement on some of the more difficult issues of policy and the most difficult issue of money.

As we go forward in this debate, I hope we understand that we are not going to be able to change the educational system for everyone in this country. That is not our role. It is the local school district and the States that control local education, primarily. We do have an obligation to do a much better job for low-income kids. We have extended into this issue. We have spent \$120 billion of American taxpayers' hard-earned income, and we have produced very weak results.

It is time for a change. It is time to recognize that we need to take a different approach to help ensure that the low-income child is not left behind. So we have come up with some creative ideas, and we are going to try to pass them. We are going to try to pass them in a bipartisan way. Then we are going to hope they will be used in the system to produce a much better result for a large percentage of our students who, up until now, have been left behind.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition? The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from New Hampshire. Certainly no one in the Senate is more knowledgeable than he about the bill, about the funding, and about the opportunities we have to strengthen education in this country.

This week, as was mentioned, we are going to take up, hopefully, common-sense reform. It means increasing accountability for student performance. It means supporting programs that work, reducing bureaucracy, increasing flexibility, and empowering parents. I think these are the goals we seek to attain. Certainly all of us have to establish goals, to establish where we want

to be, and then, as the details come forth, see if indeed what we are proposing to do leads us towards the accomplishment of those goals. I think that is where we are.

When we talk to people about the issues in Washington, certainly education is always at the top of the list. In general terms, I want to share a little bit of my view of what we ought to be talking about. It seems to me that America stands at the dawn of a new century, a shining moment of opportunity certainly for all of us, a moment of hope that our families can, more fully than in the past, achieve the American dream. We dream of peace and continued prosperity in a world where every nation looks to America for leadership. We are challenged to develop new technologies that will improve our lives and find medical breakthroughs to cure cancer and AIDS and Alzheimer's.

If America is to fulfill its dreams in a new century, we cannot forget that tomorrow's leaders, tomorrow's Nobel prize winners, are sitting in the classroom today. We must ask ourselves, do we have a first-class public education system that teaches our children how to think and how to succeed in this century?

Average is not good enough. That is why I am committed to helping parents, teachers, and local leaders build a foundation of excellence and opportunity for every child. That means making sure all children have the best teachers, can learn in safe schools, and they can learn right from wrong in addition to the ABCs.

Fifty years ago, the principal obstacles to learning in schools were talking out of turn or chewing gum in class. Today—just turn on the news—it is violence; it is drug abuse; it is teenage pregnancy. Our test scores, as compared to those of children in other countries, are still too low. The achievement gap between poor and middle-income students is still too wide. Too many students do not read at their own grade level or meet minimum standards in math or science. Too many are unfairly promoted and fall further and further behind. Too many enter college unprepared and have to take remedial courses to improve their basic skills. That is wrong.

It does not have to be that way. Republicans at every level—Congress, governors, local officials—are committed to help children learn and to build better, safer schools for a new century.

Education is first, last, and always, of course, about children. Success is defined by how much our children learn. We must make sure parents, teachers, and local leaders have the power to use Federal dollars as they are needed to meet our children's most important needs. Those closest to the classroom, of course, know better than bureaucrats in Washington what the students need, be it more teachers, math and reading tutors, better textbooks, or new classrooms and computers.

I just returned from Wyoming and have been again reminded of the difference in the needs from Sundance, WY, to Pittsburgh, PA. We ought to have the flexibility to do what needs to be done in that community to make education the most effective. Who cares more about children's future, parents or bureaucrats? Our children's future should not be limited by what seems right in Washington, DC but what is wrong with the schools they attend.

We are spending more money. Republicans are for spending more money on education than the President has requested. The issue, as pointed out by my friend from New Hampshire, is who sets the priorities. We are for more construction, putting more teachers in schools, putting more computers into schools, but we believe State and local administrators, working with parents, ought to decide on how to prioritize those issues based on their needs.

The Senate will begin debate, probably tomorrow, on the Education Opportunities Act, a bill which returns more money, more power, and more flexibility to States and local officials so they can set the educational priorities that are right for their students.

As you know, the vast majority of money for our schools comes from the State and local governments. The Federal Government provides only about 6 percent of all elementary and secondary education funds. Yet these Federal dollars require more paperwork and carry the most red tape.

I hear about this often. My wife is a special education teacher in a public high school. Special ed teachers spend more time on forms than they really should have to, almost as much as they do dealing with kids. That is wrong. That ought to be changed.

Washington has created a system that wastes about 35 cents out of every dollar in bureaucracy. That is money that never reaches the classroom. Recently in the newspapers we read about hundreds of millions of dollars that were unaccounted for, that didn't reach the classroom to help kids. Congress needs to work to make sure the Federal dollars actually get where they can be spent and where they can be effective, with the fewest possible strings attached.

We need more innovators and fewer bureaucrats. Stop and think back to your own education. Each of us can remember at least one teacher who made a positive difference in our lives, a positive impact. Why should such great teachers be rare?

Our children deserve the best teachers, teachers who are qualified, teachers who are experts in the subjects they teach. Local officials should be able to set high teacher standards and reward the best teachers with more pay.

I want not only the best teachers but also the best schools. I am sure you do as well. To achieve that goal we must hold schools and school districts ac-

countable. Unfortunately, reports show the schools in the District are not what we would like them to be. Madam President, 75 percent of fourth graders can barely read. Only 5 percent of eighth graders do eighth grade work in math and science. Forty percent of all high school students drop out before they graduate. That is not good. That is not good at all.

Just this year, the superintendent announced there were 70,762 students in the District—the first time, apparently, they have known the total. We need to change that.

No child should be trapped in an education system that is unworkable. Parents have the right to choose the best public school for their child. Students should have the opportunity for scholarships that allow them to escape failing schools. Schools that fail year after year and refuse to change must be overhauled from top to bottom. Administrators should be changed and new teachers should be hired. It is wrong to do anything less.

We must, of course, do more to make sure our schools do not fail a different kind of test—providing for a safe learning environment. We should empower teachers and principals to remove dangerous students from the classroom. They cannot be allowed to keep other children from learning. Local officials must have the power to put troubled students in special classrooms where they can get the attention they need when they need it. None of us want any child to fall through the cracks.

We must demand that our schools be safe and drug free. For those young people who refuse to change or endanger the lives of their classmates or teachers, we need to get tough. If they refuse to change, they must be punished. If they can only learn one lesson, it must be that society's laws mean something.

It is a Federal crime to bring a gun to school. In 1998, more than 6,000 students were expelled for bringing firearms to school, but the Clinton-Gore administration only prosecuted 8 students—8. What kind of signal does that send?

We should not tolerate one more school shooting. When our society gets used to it, our society is finished. We all had an exposure to this just last week with the anniversary of Columbine, and it affected all our schools and affected the kids who were there.

Certainly there is one more thing that ought to be mentioned—it is probably the most important factor in determining a child's success in school—and that is parents. We are the child's first and most important teachers. The most difficult truth is that the reason our schools are failing, sometimes, is because a lot of families are failing to do their part. Teachers are there to teach. They are not there to raise our children. We cannot expect them to be the best teachers they can be unless they have the support of mom and dad.

Nothing is more important to us than education. It is hard to determine

sometimes—and we will argue about it at great length—the role of the Federal Government vis-a-vis State and local. We will talk about where money ought to go and what ought to be required in terms of accountability. Indeed, we should. But to really know, we should pause for a while and ask: What do we want the outcome to be? What is it that we visualize for ourselves and our family and our community? What do we think education ought to be?

We have a responsibility as parents particularly in terms of determining how that can be accomplished. The role I think for the Federal Government is to help provide some additional funding—be it a relatively small percentage. I think it is important we have some kind of testing that is common throughout the country as most of our kids move around when they graduate from college or high school. We need to ensure our schools in Casper, WY, are preparing students as well as they are in Denver or Los Angeles. That is part of today's world.

I think we have a great opportunity now for better education, and one of which I hope we will certainly take full advantage. As I mentioned before, the Republican plan puts more money in education than the President asked for. But money alone does not provide a good education. I don't think you can have good education without it, but there are other requirements as well.

You have to have some accountability and much more.

I am delighted and excited about the opportunity to deal with this bill, S. 1. Why? Because it was considered to be the most important issue before the Congress. This was the issue that the President talked more about than any other and it is the issue that has more to do with the future of this country. The people run the Government. The people must be prepared to do that as well as being successful in a free country and a free market.

Thank you, Madam President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is good to be back in the Chamber. I don't think we are going to take all of the 4 hours, from what I understand, unless somebody wants to join us. I have two unanimous consent requests, both of which the Senator from North Dakota is aware, and then I will proceed with a few remarks. It won't be much. Then I will yield, unless he prompts me to give a 2-hour speech, and we will be out.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2001—2011—Resumed

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of April 6 with respect to conferees to the budget resolution be modified to add Senator BOND and Senator MURRAY.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, pursuant to the agreement of April 6, I now move that with respect to H. Con. Res. 83, the budget resolution, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 4 hours of debate on that motion.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I don't know why we need 4 hours. If any Senator wants to speak to the issue, the appointment of conferees and sending the completed package which we voted on, 65 Senators voted aye on, to the House and seeking a conference agreement with them, that is why we are here.

I understand that under the previous order, we are going to take up H. Con. Res. 83 and that either this Senator or the majority leader will be recognized to make a motion that we insist on an amendment—we have just done that—request a conference, which we have done, on the disagreeing votes and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate. We have done that.

We now have 4 hours, which have been agreed to, to debate this issue. I don't intend to even come close to spending 2 hours on this matter. To anyone on my side of the aisle, if they want to speak, I will be here for a while, as long as my ranking member wants me to be here by virtue of his speaking. If any Republican wants time, I will give it to them. If we run out of time, I will give some of his people some of my time.

Anytime I may have, I will reserve at this time. Essentially, I don't need very much of it.

Now we are in the process of proceeding to conference on two budget resolutions. We begin that process with the appointment of conferees in the Senate. The House has not done that yet. They will appoint their conferees tomorrow. It is my hope that the conference can meet as soon as the House has appointed its conferees, maybe as early as Wednesday.

Over the recess the two staffs of the Budget Committee on the majority side have been meeting to organize the materials for conference, to lay out any technical differences that can be resolved quickly by the conferees, and to highlight the major differences between the two resolutions. I am sure that information will be shared, and wherever the minority thinks there

should be matters changed, added to, or in any way described differently, obviously, we will take that into consideration.

I don't think there are very many big secrets about the differences in the two resolutions. The House budget resolution sticks fairly closely to President Bush's budget submission that was submitted in some detail over the recess period. Everyone knows that over the recess, April 15 came and went, with the American public paying their taxes, with the few exceptions being those who get extensions. Taxes are at an all-time high in terms of the totality of collections by the U.S. Government. The House budget resolution assumes a tax cut over the next 11 years of over \$1.6 trillion.

The Senate-passed budget resolution assumes a tax cut of nearly \$1.3 trillion over the next 11 years, including this year's \$85 billion surplus rebate, or, in some way, a refunding of 85.2, which should be implemented quickly to provide both a stimulus to the economy as well as longer term marginal tax rate reductions and whatever else can be accomplished by the Finance Committee within the agreed-upon tax number.

It is fair to say that the Senate-passed budget resolution provided for more spending than the House-passed resolution, both in the annually appropriated and in the accounts sometimes referred to as mandatory spending, or sometimes referred to as entitlement spending.

In the area of appropriated accounts, the Senate-passed budget resolution provided nearly \$688 billion in budget authority, or an 8.3-percent increase over current year funding. The House-passed budget resolution was at the President's request of about \$661 billion.

When I use these two numbers, 688 and 661, the 661 is the President's 4-percent increase. That increase is in the totality of Defense appropriations and nondefense appropriations. And so is the \$688 billion, in which the Senate approved the 8.3 percent. That includes Defense and nondefense.

While the increase or changes in the annually appropriated accounts have received the bulk of the attention in this debate so far, I need to highlight the fact that the Senate-passed budget resolution significantly increased spending for programs we refer to as mandatory spending, compared to the resolution which I introduced and upon which we commenced our debate, and that is before it was amended. We have added nearly \$400 billion in so-called mandatory spending, almost all of this in the area of some kind of educational funding, principally funding for special education.

Again, almost every dollar we added back for mandatory spending we took away from the President's proposed tax cuts. It should be obvious that the major challenge before the conference will be to find a compromise in both the areas of tax cuts and spending.

I don't think it requires a great deal of budget or political skill to figure out that an obvious compromise for the House is to reduce its tax cuts and increase its spending assumptions, and the Senate to increase its tax cuts and reduce its spending assumptions.

Finding that balance will indeed be a challenge, but I am confident that within a week or so we will reach an agreement that meets the challenges of drafting a budget blueprint that will allow us to get on with putting together and implementing legislation to provide a tax cut. There will be plenty of time to argue and debate what kind of tax cut and what will be affected and how soon.

Obviously, we need to consider the reduction of debt held by the public and fund national priorities such as health care, Medicare prescription drugs, energy security needs, defense, and environmental programs.

Mr. President, at the appropriate time, as I said before, I will yield back the remainder of my time. I yield the floor at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. I think neither of us believes we need 4 hours for this discussion. In fact, we need a relatively brief period of time on our side. I just want to go through the decisions that were made in the Senate in contrast to what President Bush proposed and in contrast to what we proposed on our side, just to put in some perspective where we are going as we go into the conference.

I have prepared this chart in order to help me do that in as efficient a way as I can. In this column, we have what President Bush proposed. The second column is what we proposed in the Democratic alternative. The third column is what the Senate passed.

If we look at the top, this is the projected surplus over the next 10 years, and we are all in agreement. The agencies that make these forecasts have told us we can anticipate \$5.6 trillion over the next 10 years. I am quick to point out that I would not bet the farm on any 10-year forecast or any 10-year projection. The agency that made this forecast themselves warned us of its uncertainty. They have said very clearly there is only a 10-percent chance that number is going to come true. There is a 45-percent chance that there will be more money, according to them. There is a 45-percent chance there will be less money.

After the performance of the economy over the last 8 weeks, since the forecast has been made, I would be willing to bet a lot more money that there is going to be less than what is forecast. With that said, that is the official forecast. Then we go to the various elements of the proposals by the President, and by us on our side, and what passed the Senate.

The next major item is the Social Security trust fund. The President fore-

casts \$2.6 trillion of Social Security surplus over this next 10 years. He allocates \$2 trillion of it to paying down national debt. We allocated \$2.5 trillion to paying down the debt.

By the way, we had a somewhat different estimate by the Congressional Budget Office as to the amount of the Social Security trust fund surplus. The President's people said \$2.6 trillion. The Congressional Budget Office said \$2.5 trillion. We are compelled to use the Congressional Budget Office numbers. So we have reserved all of the Social Security trust fund money for the Social Security trust fund because those moneys are not needed immediately. They go to pay down debt. The Senate passed \$2.5 trillion.

In the Medicare trust fund, the President reserved none of it for the purpose of paying down the debt. In fact, he moved all of it—in his forecast, it is \$526 billion. He moved it to an unallocated category. That is something with which we strenuously disagree. We don't believe that money is unallocated, uncommitted. We believe it is fully committed to the Medicare trust fund. Unless you use it for that purpose, you hasten the insolvency of the Medicare trust fund. So we don't believe it is available for other spending. We don't believe it can be used for any other purpose, nor should it be.

So in our alternative—again, there is somewhat of a different estimate from the President's, who estimates there is over \$500 billion in that category, and the CBO estimates \$400 billion—we reserve it all for the Medicare trust fund. That is what the final Senate result did as well.

I should make very clear that while, in total, they reserve the full amount for the Medicare trust fund, in 4 of the years they have raided the Medicare trust fund. In 2002, 2005, 2006, and 2007, they go into the Medicare trust fund to fund other priorities. We don't support that; we don't believe in it. We don't believe any private sector company could do such a thing. We don't believe we should be doing it either. That left, under the President's proposal \$3.6 trillion and under both the Democratic alternative and what passed the Senate, \$2.7 trillion available for other uses.

The President proposed, of the \$3.6 trillion in his plan that was available, using \$1.6 trillion for a tax cut. We proposed \$745 billion. The Senate passed \$1.2 trillion—roughly halfway in between the two proposals.

Then we go to the question of high-priority domestic needs. The President proposed \$212 billion of spending for high-priority areas. We proposed on our side \$744 billion. The Senate actually passed \$849 billion. The Senate actually passed spending of \$105 billion over and above what we on the Democratic side proposed. If you look at the constituent elements, you can see the President proposed on education over the next 10 years \$13 billion—a very modest sum of new money in the President's plan. We don't believe that is

sufficient. We proposed \$139 billion to strengthen education in the country. The Senate actually passed \$308 billion, which is far more than we proposed and obviously dramatically more than the President proposed.

On prescription drugs, the President proposed \$153 billion over 10 years. We proposed \$311 billion, and the Senate actually passed \$300 billion, very close to what we suggested.

On defense, the President proposed \$62 billion above the baseline. We proposed \$100 billion above the baseline. The Senate actually passed \$69 billion more than is in the baseline assumption.

On agriculture, the President actually proposed a cut of \$1 billion. We proposed in our Democratic alternative some \$88 billion to match what our major competitors are doing for their producers or match it as closely as we can under current trade law. One can see the Senate actually passed an increase of \$58 billion, again somewhere in between our proposal and the President's proposal.

On health care coverage, the President proposed no new money. We proposed \$80 billion to expand health care coverage, to begin to cover additional people who now do not have the benefit of health care coverage. The Senate actually passed \$36 billion, again somewhere in between.

On environment, the President proposed very substantial cuts, \$48 billion in cuts on environmental protection. We proposed an \$18 billion increase. The Senate actually passed cuts of \$41 billion. We believe that goes too far. We believe that is not wise given the environmental threats we face—clean air, clean water—and this is an area that should be addressed in the conference.

In a category we call "other," the President proposed some \$33 billion in spending priorities. We proposed \$8 billion. The Senate actually passed \$119 billion, most of that for our Nation's veterans. Some \$68 billion of what passed in the Senate was for our Nation's veterans, \$14 billion in home health care, and the rest in other items.

Next is the category of strengthening Social Security. This is where we have a very significant difference. The President proposed using \$600 billion from the Social Security trust fund itself to strengthen Social Security for the long term. We believe that is double counting. We do not believe we can take money from the trust fund itself and use it to fund private accounts or anything else. We believe that is double counting, that it hastens the insolvency of the Social Security trust fund itself, and that we ought to reserve every penny of the Social Security trust fund for Social Security, and any additional money to strengthen Social Security should come from outside the trust fund itself.

That to us is the more conservative approach and one that has more prospect of working given the demographic

tidal wave we face when the baby boomers start to retire. One can see under our alternative and what passed the Senate, neither of us agreed to take money from the Social Security trust fund for that purpose.

We proposed using non-Social Security, non-Medicare trust fund money to strengthen Social Security in the amount of \$750 billion. This is the area in which what finally passed is, frankly, most deficient. There is not a dime in what passed in the Senate to strengthen Social Security for the long term other than reserving the Social Security trust fund surpluses for Social Security. That is important. It is necessary. It is not sufficient. We simply must do more.

All of the testimony before the Senate Budget Committee made very clear that we face a demographic tidal wave just beyond the 10-year window of this budget resolution. That is when the chickens are going to come home to roost. That is when we see these massive surpluses now turning to dramatic deficits. That is why we believe not only should we reserve every penny of the Social Security surplus for Social Security, but in addition to that, we ought to take money out of this general fund surplus to strengthen Social Security for the long term as well. We believe that is just common sense.

We hope very much before this conference is done that not only will we reserve the trust fund moneys for the trust funds but that we will make an additional commitment in a contribution from general fund surpluses that are projected.

Remember, these are projections. This is not money in the bank. This \$5.6 trillion is not money in the bank. This is money that is forecast. That is why we think the President's proposal is especially unwise because he is taking virtually all of the non-trust-fund money and committing it to a tax cut. We just do not think that is wise. We do not think that is prudent.

We do not think any institution, if they were faced with a similar set of facts, would make this kind of decision. We do not think they would say we are going to take virtually all of our non-trust-fund money and put it out in a tax cut or, if you were a private sector enterprise, if you were a company promising a shareholder dividend, lock it in now for the next 10 years, virtually every penny outside the trust funds for the retirement funds of your employees and the health care trust funds of your employees. That is what the President has proposed.

Is that really what people would do if they were running a company? Is that what they would do? I do not think so. I believe they would pay down their debts to the full extent possible. They would invest in the future. Yes, they would have a dividend for the shareholders, but they certainly would not commit all of their non-trust-fund money for that purpose based on a 10-

year forecast that the people who made the forecast themselves say is highly uncertain.

Then we have the final differences in the interest costs. The President's interest cost is \$461 billion. Ours is \$490 billion. The Senate-passed package will cost \$572 billion.

People say to me: Gee, what are you talking about, interest cost? What is that about?

Simply, to the extent we provide a tax cut or we spend money, that requires additional interest costs because to the extent we have a tax cut, to the extent we have additional spending, that reduces the amount that is going to pay down the debt. That means we have more debt than we would otherwise have. That means higher interest costs.

Most of the President's additional interest cost is generated by his tax cut. In fact, his tax cut that is advertised to cost \$1.6 trillion does not cost \$1.6 trillion. It costs, just with the interest cost associated with it, at least \$2 trillion.

Then, of course, there are other things that have not been factored into the President's proposal because we now know that because of his proposal we are going to have to reform the alternative minimum tax.

The alternative minimum tax currently affects 2 million American taxpayers. Under the President's proposal, 35 million people are going to be affected, and it costs over \$300 billion to fix it. It is nowhere in the President's budget, but we know that cost is there. We know this Congress is never going to allow one in every four taxpayers in America to be caught up in the alternative minimum tax. It makes no sense. It will not happen, and it should not happen. It costs money to fix it. It is not in the President's budget, but it should be because it is a hidden cost.

In addition to that, there are a whole series of other things the President has not included that also cost money. We know that certain tax breaks currently provided in law are going to be extended. Research and development is going to be extended. We certainly are not going to change the energy tax credits that are in current law in the middle of an energy crisis, and we should not.

That costs money, but it is not in the President's proposal. Oh, it is there, it is just not funded, and that is another part of the problem of the President's plan.

He imposes a lot of costs, but he doesn't fund them. You can stick your head in the sand and say we will not fund them, but we know the reality is different.

Finally, on the unallocated category, the President has \$845 billion; we propose nothing in the unallocated category. What actually passed the Senate was \$129 billion. On the President's side of his \$845 billion, I hasten to point out that \$526 billion of that is from the Medicare trust fund. His unallocated

category is really much less than is advertised. About two-thirds of that money is Medicare trust fund money. All of a sudden he uncommits that money. I don't know from where that idea came. You cannot unallocate it. You cannot uncommit it. It is fully committed. Doing such a thing as the President proposes moves up the insolvency of the Medicare trust fund by 16 years. By 16 years sooner the Medicare trust fund goes broke—sooner than if the money is left where it is supposed to be in the Medicare trust fund.

These are the fundamental differences between what President Bush proposed, what we proposed on our side, the Democratic alternative, and what actually passed the Senate. The major differences are in the areas where the President proposed a tax cut, twice as big as what we proposed. On the other hand, we proposed \$900 billion more in debt reduction than the President proposed. That is the biggest set of differences between the President and the Democrats. He has a tax cut that is about \$800 billion more than ours. We have about \$900 billion more in debt reduction than the President. There is the fundamental difference between the two sides.

In addition to that, there are also differences in high-priority areas. Let's review them. In education, we propose far more in new resources for education than does the President. The Senate agreed with us. In fact, it went well beyond our proposal.

On prescription drugs, we proposed twice as much as the President. And the Senate adopted a number very close to what we proposed. There is no magic to this. There is no secret in it. What the President proposed is totally inadequate. Only 25 percent of people who are Medicare eligible get any help under the President's plan; 25 percent of the people would be helped and 75 percent would not be helped. It is no wonder the Senate adopted a number very close to what the Democrats proposed. Most objective observers say that is what is necessary to provide a meaningful prescription drug benefit.

On defense, we proposed more than the President and more than what passed the Senate.

On agriculture, the final result was somewhere in between. The President proposed a cut—a cut when we are in the midst of an agricultural crisis. It is the worst we have seen in 50 years. The President is proposing less resources. He is proposing the Congress not be able to respond as we have in each of the last 3 years to pass an economic disaster bill for our Nation's farmers. It makes no sense. We propose to be able to fund what we have been doing the last 3 years, and the Senate came somewhere in between.

On health coverage, another major difference, the President proposed no new resources. We proposed \$80 billion. The Senate, again, was somewhere in between.

As I see it, those are major differences. Those are the issues that will

have to be resolved in a conference committee. The House plan is close to what the President proposed.

I say to the conferees, you will have to come pretty close to what the Senate passed or the conference report simply will not pass in this body. That tells me we will have to make adjustments. The President's tax cut plan will have to be reduced. There will have to be more resources for education, prescription drug benefits, our Nation's defense, and agriculture than what the President has proposed and what the House has adopted.

Also, I hope we come out with a result that is better than what passed the Senate or the House with respect to strengthening Social Security for the long term. Nothing has been done—nothing in the House or Senate versions—to strengthen Social Security for the long term. It has gotten almost no attention. It is going to receive attention. It will receive attention at the end of this 10-year period when the baby boomers start to retire and the surpluses today turn into massive deficits. That is why we ought to take this opportunity with our surpluses to strengthen Social Security for the future. That is our responsibility. That is our obligation. We ought to take it seriously. I hope the conferees will.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, obviously I have on numerous occasions in the Senate Chamber discussed these issues, and on many of them I disagree with my friend. On some I agree. I certainly appreciate his thoughts as to what kind of conference report we will have to have in order for it to pass. He suggests it will have to be close to the Senate version. I don't know how anyone expects the House to accept something like the version passed in the Senate. Nonetheless, we will proceed. We will work carefully to make sure we have enough people in the Senate willing to vote on final passage.

I certainly don't go there operating on the premise discussed with the ranking member on how to get that done. We have to be careful and accept some of the Senate wishes. We certainly don't have to accept them all.

I will go back in history for a moment. The Presiding Officer is a member of the committee and will probably recall on January 23 Dr. Alan Greenspan appeared before the committee. That was the first testimony before a committee by Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, during this post-December era, where some serious changes in the American economy became very public and notorious. I have confidence that Alan Greenspan is correct in suggesting the "new" economy is here to stay and the comeback will be in the new economy along with the old economy. The future is built on the new economy which took us through these years of prosperity

and which he assumes will come back in due course and lead us to prosperity for a very significant period to come.

In this budget, we have to decide how we can be helpful. The Federal Reserve Board seems, to this Senator, to be doing everything it can to reduce short-term high interest rates. That is very important. It is important because it is also affecting long-term rates. Money is being made available. What is thought to be the biggest problem is investment, capital investments by business—both the new economy businesses and the old economy businesses. It is thought by some that perhaps the new economy has too much inventory around to invest in new capital and new production. We will see. We keep abreast of it as best we can.

Now, what should we do? The Senate had a vote on a Hollings amendment. I am not sure we can come out of the House with \$85 billion from this year's surplus because I am not sure they can figure out a way to get that to the people. I submit we ought to get this conference completed; we ought to direct the Finance Committee to start with a tax cut plan. Obviously, I don't know from where that will come.

We are, under our numbers, the way we figure it, at a tax level of 1.28. I round that to say 1.3. Every time I say 1.3, I hope everyone knows the exact number is 1.28.

The House is a little higher than 1.6 in total taxes for a 10-year period. They don't have very much allowed for this year, the year we are in, in which we have a very large surplus for the rest of Government. It does not take anything out of Social Security or Medicare.

What ought to happen is we ought to get out of this conference quickly, resolve that tax issue, resolve some of the other issues where clearly we disagree, and then we ought to prove to the American people that we can get something done. I think getting something done means a tax bill that will come out of the Finance Committee under our reconciliation instructions, which we debated thoroughly and the Senate decided to do that by a 51-49 vote. We decided our committee would work under the expedited process and get us a tax bill.

I am very hopeful they will find a way to allocate back to the American people as much of the surplus that exists for the year 2001—which we said in our Senate resolution was up to \$85 billion, which actually in the resolution I introduced we said up to \$60 billion—but somewhere in that area. I hope they will find a way. I hope they will apply their wills to finding a way to get back in circulation somewhere between \$60 billion and \$85 billion, meaning this year Americans will get some tax money back in their hands.

I do not hear anybody who thinks that is anything but the right thing to do. We ought to show the American people we are working in harmony with the Federal Reserve Board to affect the

current short-term problems in the economy, hoping if we right them, and if there is a way, that will bring into play a long-term growth all of us very much desire for our people.

In addition, with that same bill under the expedited process—kind of the hurry-up-and-get-it-done process to show Americans you can do it in a timely manner, the part which is called reconciliation—I hope we will produce a tax bill for the remainder of whatever we agree upon.

In the House they say \$1.6 trillion over 11 years. We say \$1.3 trillion over 11 years. Whatever the number, I hope they do the early stimulus as I have described and then proceed to give us some marginal rate reductions.

Why did I start with Dr. Alan Greenspan? Because I want to close with him. This year, on January 23, and previously to this on two occasions, addressing the issue of surplus and what we should do with it, he said: You should pay the debt down as much as possible. No. 1; No. 2, he did not just say cut taxes, he said reduce or cut marginal tax rates. We asked him, How do we help the economy? That was the precursor question to the answer I just gave. First, pay down the debt as much as possible. Second, reduce or cut marginal tax rates.

I know a lot of people say: Let's help the economy. But then they say: I don't know about this marginal rate business. We would like to do other things.

It would be nice to do other things, but the truth of the matter is we are hearing from the very best that if you do have a surplus that you are going to give back to the people, and you are not in a mode of doing right-now stimulus because we already addressed that issue, do that as much as you can, the answer has been: To help the economy, reduce marginal rates.

I regret to say what was not said was reduce marginal rates for halfway up the tax structure and not the other half. What has been said is reduce the marginal rates. We hope when we are finished under this expedited feature we will get an early stimulus and we will get a bill that helps with the long-term economy in the mode and manner discussed by Dr. Greenspan every year for the last three when we addressed surpluses.

I do not choose today to get into an argument about how much debt reduction is the right amount. My good friend thinks we should have more than we voted in in the Senate, we should have more than I provided in the underlying proposal, and more than the President suggested. But we think we have a very good debt reduction proposal and still can have a good number for tax cuts. We believe when you start with debts—the U.S. Government has debts taking about 17 percent of the budget—and we can say to the public at the end of this time it will be down to between 5 percent and 7 percent, we think we are making a giant stride in reducing the public debt.

I have in my mind showing a pie graph of where the Government money goes. People always say: Why so much to the debt? Because we have a lot of debt. How much are you going to reduce it? We are going to reduce it down to where that sliver, that piece, is going to be between 5 percent and 7 percent; that is going to be the cost remaining. In my opinion that is exactly what we ought to do.

I want to close with one thought. Frankly, I hear the ranking member from the other side, whom I admire and respect, I hear him talking about whether we want to agree and believe that we have the surplus of \$5.6 trillion over a decade. I want to remind everybody, when the chips are down and you have sitting before you in the committee those who have figured the numbers and the variables on what might be the case, when you finally ask them which is it going to be, the \$11 trillion that it might be or the \$1.6 trillion that it might be or the \$5.6 trillion—that 50 percent or 75 percent, I think, where the lines end up when you do a model and ask them—if you have to decide which one is right the answer is, use \$5.6 trillion.

We can do anything we would like. We could use \$2 trillion as the starting point and say that is all we can expect. Some might say, instead of \$5.6 trillion, you ought to use \$7.5 trillion or \$8 trillion because it could be much higher. I think the number that has been chosen, \$5.6 trillion, from which you will pay Medicare for sure, from which you will pay for all the Social Security indebtedness that we have—every penny that belongs in that trust fund is used to pay that debt down—when you end up doing that, I think you have a very balanced package and that leaves open the issue of how much do we spend.

Those who are interested have seen the divergence of how we spend, how we spend under what I will call the Democratic proposal, how we would do it under the Domenici proposal, and how we would do that under the proposal that passed the Senate. Clearly, in the Senate, many amendments were accepted on the side of either entitlements or appropriation expectations—the amount we can use in appropriations. Many were accepted on the floor and nobody should believe we are going to take all of those and accept them all in a conference with the House which has started with the President's number. There has to be some give and some take. I think that will happen.

I look forward to chairing the conference in a spirit of getting it done as quickly as we can so we can get on with passing the bills that will carry it out and stopping as quickly as we can the debate of what we ought to do and get into a mode of what we are going to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, there is clearly an area of major agreement be-

tween the two sides. That is the need for fiscal stimulus now. We had in our budget resolution \$60 billion in budget stimulus this year, in the year 2001. Maybe it will be helpful for people to understand the differences between what I was talking about and the budget for the years 2002 through 2011. But we are in the year 2001 right now. So when we compare the tax cut under the Bush budget and our proposal and what passed the Senate, we are talking about the 10 years from 2002 through 2011. The President proposed \$1.6 trillion. For that period we proposed \$745 billion. The Senate passed something roughly in between. But this does not cover the year 2001, the year we are in right now.

Both Senator DOMENICI in his budget proposal, and me in ours, proposed \$60 billion of budget stimulus this year, financial stimulus this year, fiscal stimulus now to give a lift to this economy. What actually passed the Senate was even more generous, \$85 billion of fiscal stimulus for the year 2001.

What Senator DOMENICI is saying is perhaps we cannot do quite that much in conference, and perhaps we cannot. But we do have \$96 billion available outside of the trust funds of Medicare and Social Security, so we know we have budgeted already enough money to accommodate a fiscal stimulus of up to \$85 billion without invading the trust funds of Medicare and Social Security, and we are obviously in very close agreement on this question. I think the American people should take heart from that, that we are going to be working together, fighting together, trying to put together a fiscal stimulus package for this year, the year we are in right now, 2001, to get out to the American people to give some lift to this economy. And that would be a good thing to do.

The chairman made mention of a number of other issues that we have talked about in the past—how much debt reduction can you do? We have a disagreement on this question. We believe we can do more debt reduction than they have proposed, certainly than the President has proposed.

I note that the Senate agreed with our position. The Senate provided a good deal more debt reduction than the President has said that he believes is possible. That was a good outcome. I hope we do not shrink from that.

But the place we really did not do as well is in strengthening Social Security for the long term above and beyond the trust funds themselves. All of us know just saving the trust fund money for the purposes intended is important, but it is not enough.

That is why on our side we believe not only should we reserve all of the trust fund money for the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, but then, in addition to that, we ought to take some of the general fund money and use that to strengthen Social Security for the long term because that is what it is going to take to do the job

and to prevent a massive buildup of debt from occurring.

I think one thing that often gets lost in the debate is the current indebtedness of our country. The gross debt is \$5.6 trillion. Under the President's plan, the gross debt of the United States is going to grow to \$7.1 trillion. The gross debt, under his plan, is not going to be reduced; it is going to grow. Under our plan, we are able to keep it about where it is because we are putting more money into debt reduction—both short-term and long-term—than is in the President's plan. We believe that is a wiser course.

We are reserving about 70 percent of this projected surplus for debt reduction. He reserves about 35 percent of the projected surplus for debt reduction. So that is the major difference. That is where we really have a difference of opinion.

We think we ought to put more emphasis on debt reduction because, frankly, given the uncertainty of the forecast—and that is another area where we have a disagreement. Senator DOMENICI says \$5.6 trillion is the number. Well, he is right in the sense that is the number that has been given to us by the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget. That is a very professional forecast. I will not argue with that for a minute. It is well done. But it is a 10-year projection—10 years. The people who made the forecast said there is only a 10-percent chance that number is going to come true.

Let's not cast that in concrete. Goodness, that should inform us; it should not lock us into decisions to use every penny of that money. I think what it should tell us is that we should be cautious. That is why we put a greater emphasis on debt reduction because, then, if the forecast does not come true, the worst that has happened is you have reduced the debt less than you anticipated. That is the worst that happens.

Under their plan—because they are using all the money, between their tax cut and other priorities—what happens if that isn't true? It risks putting us back into deficit. It risks us raiding the trust funds of Social Security and Medicare all over again. Goodness knows, we have been down that road. Do we have to repeat the 1980s all over again? I hope not. Can't we learn from the 1980s—the time we had a rosy forecast like this one, had a big tax cut, big defense buildup, and wondered why the deficits and debts of the country multiplied geometrically? I do not want to repeat that exercise. That put our country in a deep hole. It took us 15 years to dig out. I do not want to be digging out for the next 15 years.

The difference between the 1980s and now is that in the 1980s you had time to dig out. If we make a mistake now, there is no time to dig out because in 11 years the baby boom generation starts to retire, and then these surpluses turn into big deficits as the number of people eligible for Medicare

and Social Security double. That is what is going to happen. We know it. It is not a projection. The people are alive. They have been born. They are living today. They are going to retire, and they are going to be eligible. And it is going to cost the Government a lot of money, much more than we are currently having to pay out.

So let's be cautious. Yes, let's be conservative. The conservative thing to do is emphasize more debt reduction and to curtail our appetite to spend and curtail our appetite to have tax cuts, which are both living for the moment. It is fun to live for the moment; especially if you are a politician, there is nothing better than to have tax cuts and spending. That is the best of all worlds. The problem with that is that we have a need to be responsible to future generations. Our generation ran up this debt. We have the obligation to pay it down and to do it before we start to retire. Goodness, the last thing we ought to be doing is shoving this debt on to our kids. We ran it up. We ought to retire it.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have nothing further to say. I do not think there is anyone on our side who wishes to speak. If the Senator is ready, we can yield back our time.

Mr. CONRAD. Yes. We are prepared to yield back our time on our side.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back any time we have reserved under the previous order.

Mr. CONRAD. I do as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions are agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida) appointed Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BOND, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. MURRAY conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

APPRECIATION OF SERVICE BY THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION, UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, I rise to highlight some of the recent interdiction and investigative successes by the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA, the United States Customs Service, the United States Coast Guard, and the National Guard.

These men and women, and their agencies, are dedicated professionals committed to protecting our great nation from the devastating affects of the illegal drug trade. They are frequently called to place their lives in harm's way in an effort to keep our national secure.

As announced by the Attorney General in January 2001, DEA successfully concluded a 10-month narcotics trafficking investigation named Operation White Horse, that involved the movement of heroin by "swallowers" from Colombia to the United States via the cities of Philadelphia and New York. Sixty-five members of the organization, from the Colombia headquarters of the street-level dealers, were arrested in what was described as a "wholesale dismantling" of the smuggling organization.

The United States Customs Service also had an impressive spring 2001, including a recent week on the Southwest border that netted 61 drug seizures, yielding 5,449 pounds of marijuana and 82 pounds of cocaine, as well as 16 export violations, 6 seizures of prohibited medications, and additional seizures of undeclared merchandise, stolen vehicles, counterfeit credit cards, and illegal fireworks. The Customs Service is rapidly distinguishing itself with the front-line use of X-ray, Gamma-ray, and other non-intrusive technologies at their inspection stations and ports of entry. Customs also completed major domestic and international child pornography cases involving Germany and Russia, as well as continued interdiction of large amounts of the drug Ecstasy.

Coast Guard successes, supported by the Department of Defense, include a 6-day period in February 2001 when it seized 28,845 pounds of cocaine and arrested 24 smugglers, on numerous vessels in both the Caribbean and Eastern Pacific. To date, the Coast Guard has seized 60,636 pounds of cocaine, 20,194 pounds of marijuana, as well as interdicted 1,681 illegal migrants at sea, all in a period of 10-percent operational reductions due to budget constraints.

Finally, I appreciate the superb job the National Guard does in operating the four domestic counterdrug training schools, and hopefully soon a fifth one in Iowa, throughout the country that provide much needed training of Federal, State, local, and community personnel in various counterdrug topics.

I am extremely proud of these successes and the personnel involved. As we consider the budgets for these agencies in the weeks ahead, we need to remind ourselves from time to time that it is real, flesh-and-blood individuals out there on the front lines and not bland numbers on spreadsheets and in our briefing books. Their commitment does us all proud.

NURSING SERVICES QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, on April 6 my colleagues and I introduced the Medicare and Medicaid Nursing Services Quality Improvement Act of 2001. This legislation is intended to help address a problem currently facing nursing homes in North Dakota and Wisconsin and potentially other nursing homes across the country.

We all know that nursing homes nationwide are facing a looming staffing crisis that is expected to worsen as the baby boomers reach retirement. An American Health Care Association report, entitled "Staffing of Nursing Services in Long Term Care," estimates that the need for registered nurses will grow 66 percent between 1991 and 2020 and the number of licensed practical nurses needed will grow by nearly 72 percent over the same time. Likewise, the number of nurse aides who will be necessary is projected to grow by 69 percent.

In my State, nursing home administrators have a thousand open nurse aide positions that they have been unable to fill. A number of nursing home administrators in North Dakota have told me that they have had to refuse patients because they do not have adequate staff to care for them.

Unfortunately, a problem has arisen in my State that will exacerbate this staffing shortage. By way of background, North Dakota nursing homes have been using trained resident assistants—called feeding assistants in North Dakota,—to help feed nursing home patients. This has been the practice for the last decade with positive results. The data in North Dakota indicates that our nursing home patients experience less weight loss and dehydration than patients nationally, and nursing home officials in North Dakota attribute this to the use of resident assistants.

The problem, however, is that the Health Care Financing Administration has told North Dakota and other nursing homes that they can no longer continue to use these trained resident assistants because they lack certification. In North Dakota, this means that hundreds of resident assistants may need to be laid off later this year, even while my State's nursing homes are experiencing difficulty finding certified staff.

The bill that I introduced along with Senators KOHL and CONRAD would allow

North Dakota and Wisconsin to continue using resident assistants for feeding and hydration, while a demonstration project is conducted in our states and others to evaluate what kind of impact the use of these staff has on the quality of feeding and hydration services provided to nursing home patients and on the recruitment and retention of nursing staff. If after the three-year demonstration project, the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that the use of resident assistants does not result in a reduction in the quality of feeding and hydrating of nursing home residents or in a decrease in the recruitment and retention of nursing staff, other nursing homes around the country would be allowed to use resident assistants to help with feeding and hydration tasks.

This legislation includes a number of safeguards designed to protect nursing home patients. For instance, nursing homes are prohibited from using resident assistants to replace existing nursing staff or to count these assistants toward minimum nursing staffing requirements. In addition, resident assistants would have to complete a state-approved training program related to the feeding and hydration tasks they would be performing. Of course, nursing homes would not be able to use resident assistants to administer medication, provide direct medical care, or perform other nursing tasks.

I recognize that this bill is not the only answer or the whole answer for addressing the staffing crisis in nursing homes. I want to work with my colleagues in Congress, nursing homes, and advocates for nursing home residents to address this larger issue of the staffing shortage.

The staffing shortage in nursing homes is not the only reason for malnutrition and dehydration of patients, but it certainly contributes to the problem. A June, 2000 Commonwealth Fund study estimated that 35 to 85 percent of nursing home patients are malnourished, in part because they do not receive enough assistance from aides while eating because the aides must assist as many as 15 to 20 patients at mealtime. According to a Los Angeles Times article earlier this week, a University of California-San Francisco professor who observed 100 nursing home residents with eating problems found that nursing home workers were often so rushed that they "shoveled" food into their patients' mouths, causing choking and coughing.

The resident assistants in North Dakota provide compassionate care and often have more time to coax their patients into eating, something that overworked certified nurse aides generally don't have time for. I am convinced that if we reduce the number of staff in North Dakota nursing homes, which is what will happen if long-term care facilities can no longer use resident assistants, then patients in North Dakota will suffer.

One resident assistant in North Dakota told me about a patient she feeds who has difficulty holding her head up when she eats. The resident assistant said that when she was on vacation, her patient lost seven pounds. Fortunately, after a few weeks back on the job, the resident assistant got her patient's weight back up to where it needed to be. However, if this resident assistant was forced to leave her post permanently, that weight loss may have been long-term and ultimately life-threatening.

I believe the Medicare and Medicaid Nursing Services Quality Improvement Act is a step that Congress can take to address both the staffing shortage and the malnutrition of patients. This is not the only solution and it may not be the best solution, but I hope my colleagues will work with Senator KOHL, Senator CONRAD and me to tackle these serious issues confronting long-term care facilities and their patients.

MILITARY PERSONNEL DETAINED BY THE PRC

Mr. THOMAS. Mr President, I rise today as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to speak to S. Res. 66.

As we are all now aware, at 9:15 a.m. local time on April 1, 2001, a collision occurred between a United States military EP-3E Aries II reconnaissance aircraft flying off the coast of the People's Republic of China, PRC and one of two F-8 jet fighters from the People's Liberation Army-Air Force sent to intercept it. Both countries agree that the collision occurred in international airspace over the South China Sea near the Chinese island province of Hainan. Due to the damage incurred in the accidental collision, the F-8 and its pilot were lost at sea and the EP-3E was required to make a "Mayday" distress call on the internationally recognized emergency radio frequency.

In fact, the damage to our plane was so bad that it effectuated an emergency landing at a military airbase at Lingshui, Hainan. Upon landing, the twenty-four United States military personnel aboard the EP-3E were removed from the aircraft by Chinese military personnel and detained in an undisclosed location, notwithstanding the fact that the crew of an aircraft forced to land on foreign soil in an emergency is considered under international norms to have sovereign immunity.

Chinese authorities then unnecessarily prevented United States military and consular officials from meeting with the crew members until April 3, 2001, and even then permitted only a short, supervised visit. There is absolutely no reason why we should not have been allowed at the very least telephone access to our military people. China is not a technologically backward country without phone service; our people are not being held in

some isolated mountain village in the middle of a jungle. China's behavior in this case in purposefully keeping us from contacting the aircrew is, to me, disturbing.

In addition, I am also concerned that in contravention of international norms, Chinese officials have boarded the aircraft and have apparently removed portions of the equipment from it. International law recognizes both the right of the crew of an aircraft in distress to land safely on foreign soil and the inviolable sovereignty of an aircraft in distress that has landed on foreign soil; it also recognizes the right of a nation which has had an aircraft land in distress on foreign soil to have its citizens and aircraft returned safely and without undue delay.

China's flaunting of these conventions disturbs me not just because of the ramifications in this particular case, but also because it has the capability of wrecking greater havoc on the overall bilateral US-PRC relationship, a relationship I believe to be our most important in Asia along with Japan and South Korea. The Chinese government needs to realize that this issue is bigger than just this crew and this plane. This is about trust, about whether the PRC can be trusted to live up to its word, to live up to international agreements which it has signed, and to be a part of the world community of nations. So far, they have turned their backs on those agreements, and on their obligations. They have shown me, and other Members of Congress, that whether they can be trusted is presently open to question.

If this matter is not resolved immediately and satisfactorily, then the Congress needs to rethink whether Beijing can be trusted to fulfill its obligations as a member of the WTO. And while I have previously stated that I believe it would be a mistake to include such materiel as Aegis-equipped destroyers in this year's weapons sales to Taiwan, if Beijing remains intransigent and continues to violate norms of decent international behavior in this case, then I—for one—will begin to reassess whether Taiwan is not justified in its mistrust of the PRC and whether such sales might not now be justified. It would truly be a shame if, at the beginning of a new Administration, an Administration that has not even had a chance yet to formulate or articulate its China policy, this situation poisoned the well.

The resolution is simple. It expresses our regret over the damage to the aircraft and the loss of life resulting from the collision. It calls on the Chinese government to release the crew, who are, of course, utmost in our thoughts and concern; the aircraft, and the equipment from the aircraft. Finally, it supports President Bush in his efforts. I am pleased that the resolution has a bipartisan list of seventy-five cosponsors, including the ranking member of the East Asia Subcommittee [Mr. KERRY]; the very distinguished

President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND]; the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. WARNER]; the Chairman of the Energy Committee [Mr. MURKOWSKI]; three members and the ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], Mr. SMITH of Oregon and Mr. BROWNBACK, and Senator BIDEN; two Senators who I consider among the most knowledgeable on China in the Senate, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BAUCUS; and one of our newest members, Senator CLINTON.

I hope that we will act to put the Senate on record on this issue.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, April 20, 2001, the Federal debt stood at \$5,713,631,148,647.61. Five trillion, seven hundred thirteen billion, six hundred thirty-one million, one hundred forty-eight thousand, six hundred forty-seven dollars and sixty-one cents.

One year ago, April 20, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,707,061,000,000 Five trillion, seven hundred seven billion, sixty-one million.

Fifteen years ago, April 20, 1986, the Federal debt stood at \$1,962,745,000,000, One trillion, nine hundred sixty-two billion, seven hundred forty-five million.

Twenty-five years ago, April 20, 1976, the Federal debt stood at \$604,399,000,000, Six hundred four billion, three hundred ninety-nine million, which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion, \$5,109,232,148,647.61. Five trillion, one hundred nine billion, two hundred thirty-two million, one hundred forty-eight thousand, six hundred forty-seven dollars and sixty-one cents during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MOREHOUSE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

• Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, 25 years ago the National Medical Association and other prominent organizations endorsed the development of the Medical School at Morehouse College in Atlanta, GA. This came in light of studies that revealed first, a severe shortage of African American and other minority physicians in the United States, particularly in Georgia and second, that African Americans suffered disproportionately from major diseases. Since its inception, Morehouse School of Medicine has worked to help solve our nation's health care crisis by graduating top-quality physicians who dedicate themselves to serving the more than 32 million people in this country who live in medically neglected communities. More than 80 percent of Morehouse School of Medicine graduates practice in underserved com-

munities. Each year, the School graduates five times the national average of African Americans completing their studies at accredited medical schools in this country.

Since 1975, Morehouse School of Medicine has grown from an entry class of 25 students to a current 40 students per class. Each year, over 20,000 Georgians who are disadvantaged are served by approximately 50 community health promotion projects sponsored by Morehouse School of Medicine. These projects include prevention initiatives associated with substance abuse, teen pregnancy, geriatric services, cancer, lead poisoning and violence prevention. In addition to the Medical School's activities in community health promotion, Morehouse School of Medicine provides about 25,000 patient encounters for approximately 10,000 people per year in community clinics throughout metropolitan Atlanta area. The student body of Morehouse School of Medicine continues to excel and 100 percent of the institution's family medicine and surgery residents passed their board exams in their first sitting for 2 years in a row.

These accomplishments stem in part from the strong leadership of Morehouse School of Medicine's founding dean and president, Louis W. Sullivan, M.D., who has been with the Medical School since its inception. Aside from his years in Washington as U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Sullivan has dedicated his life's work to producing top-quality physicians. During his tenure, Morehouse School of Medicine established several programs. These include a 4-year undergraduate medical education program, seven residency programs and several centers of excellence including the National Center for Primary Care, the Neuroscience Institute, the Cardiovascular Institute and the NASA/Space Medicine and Life Science Research Center, the first of its kind at a minority medical institution.

Dr. Sullivan has worked tirelessly to provide vision and direction for the institution's future, while continuing to preserve the very best traditions of its past. Morehouse School of Medicine, the State of Georgia and our Nation are truly blessed to have his leadership.●

TRIBUTE TO THE POSTAL EMPLOYEES OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PERFORMANCE CLUSTER

• Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the Postal Employees of the New Hampshire Performance Cluster, a group of dedicated public servants who have been recognized for exemplary performance of service duties. On April 3rd of this year, The Postal Employees of the New Hampshire Performance Cluster were recognized with the Postal Service's highest award, the Chief Operating Officer Award for overall excellence in the area of customer satisfaction.

New Hampshire Postal Employees have been honored along with four other districts in the nation receiving the Order of the Yellow Jersey Award for Excellence in customer service. This prestigious award is based on the percentage of residential customers who rated the postal service employees as excellent in four areas: overall performance, courteous and friendly clerks, consistency of mail delivery and accuracy of mail delivery.

The Postal Employees of the New Hampshire Performance Cluster have provided dedicated service to the citizens of our state. The people of our state look upon them with tremendous gratitude for all that they have done.

It is an honor and a privilege to serve the Postal Employees of the New Hampshire Performance Center in the United States.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1365. A communication from the General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General and the designation of an Acting Inspector General; to the Committee on Intelligence.

EC-1366. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certification of Evidence for Proof of Service" (RIN2900-AJ55) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1367. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering those cases in which equitable relief was granted in calendar year 2000; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1368. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General Strategic Plan for 2001 through 2006; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1369. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule

entitled "Qualified Lessee Construction Allowances For Short-Term Leases" (Rev. Rul. 2001-20) received on April 11, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1370. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to Monitoring the Impact of Medicare Physician Payment Reform on Utilization and Access for 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1371. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report relating to management performance for 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1372. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "List of Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance" (Doc. No. FEMA-7750) received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1373. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the discontinuation of service in acting role of Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1374. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the return of the nomination for the position of Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1375. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the annual performance evaluation for fiscal year 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1376. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Exports to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; Revision of Foreign Policy Controls" (RIN0694-AC39) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1377. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of the Wassenaar Arrangement List of Dual-Use Items: Revisions to Microprocessors, Graphic Accelerators, and External Interconnects Equipment" (RIN0694-AC39) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1378. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Entity List: Revisions and Additions" (RIN0694-AB60) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1379. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the EAR as a result of the addition of Brazil, Latvia and Ukraine to the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), and Other Revisions" (RIN0694-AB50) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1380. A communication from the Under Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, a re-

port relating to the Imposition of Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls for Exports to Persons in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Inductees of the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1381. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Food Starch-Modified by Amylolytic Enzymes" (Doc. No. 99F-2082) received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1382. A communication from the President of the United States Institute of Peace, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the audit of the Institute's accounts for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1383. A communication from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1384. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Recreational Programs" (RIN1820-ZA12) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1385. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Devices; Reclassification of Six Cardiovascular Preamendments Class III Devices into Class II" (Doc. No. 99N-0035) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1386. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irradiation in the Production, Processing and Handling of Food" (Doc. No. 94F-0008) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1387. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Animal Feed and Pet Food; Irradiation" (Doc. No. 99F-2799) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1388. A communication from the Administrator of the Office of Workforce Development, Office of Workforce Security, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Unemployment Insurance Program Letter (UIPL) 14-01—Treatment of Indian Tribes Under Federal Unemployment Compensation Law; UIPL 14-01, Change 1—Questions and Answers" received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1389. A communication from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates for Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1390. A communication from the Chairman of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the annual financial reports for 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1391. A communication from the Director of the Federal Judicial Center, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual performance evaluation report for calendar year 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1392. A communication from the Director of the Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adding Colombia to the List of Countries Whose Citizens or Nationals are Ineligible for Transit Without Visa (TWOV) Privileges to the United States Under the TWOV Program" (RIN1115-AG16) received on April 3, 2001; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1393. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "United States Attorneys' Office, Giglio Information Files" received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1394. A communication from the Secretary of the Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report relating to the Biennial Survey of Article III Judgeship Needs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1395. A communication from the Acting Deputy Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Freedom of Information Act for 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1396. A communication from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition and Technology, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the intent to obligate funds for out-of-cycle Fiscal Year 2001 Foreign Comparative Testing Projects; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1397. A communication from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition and Technology, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to identifying, for each agency, the percentage of funds that are projected to be expanded during each of the next five fiscal years for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1398. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the withdrawal of the statutory report concerning UN peacekeeping operations in East Timor, Sierra Leone; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1399. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning activities relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1400. A communication from the Chief of the Programs and Legislation Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning a multi-function cost comparison of the Base Operating Support functions at March Air Reserve Base, California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1401. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Force Management Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, a report relating to the results of the Military Exit Survey; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1402. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, the report of a retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1403. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the annual report required by the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991 for the period February 1, 2000 through January 31, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1404. A communication from the Acting Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of an acting officer for the position of Assistant Administrator of the Bureau for Europe and Eurasia, Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1405. A communication from the Acting Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the discontinuation of service in an acting role as Assistant Administrator of the Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1406. A communication from the Acting Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, a report relative to the nomination for the position of Administrator of the Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1407. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1408. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1409. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles and defense services in the amount of \$50,000,000 to Norway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1410. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or services under a contract in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more to Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1411. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or services under a contract in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more to the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1412. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1413. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with France; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1414. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of

defense articles or services under a contract in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more to Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1415. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report mandated by the PLO Commitments Compliance Act from June 16 to December 15, 2000; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1416. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-9. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Kansas relative to the assistance with Gulf War illness; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 6008

Whereas, Nearly 700,000 members of the United States armed forces, including 7,500 Kansans, deployed to the Persian Gulf region during 1990 and 1991 to participate in Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm to liberate Kuwait; and

Whereas, These Gulf War veterans have been, and continue to be, afflicted by an abnormally high rate of unexplained health problems. To date federal research efforts have not identified the prevalence, patterns, causes or treatments for illnesses suffered by Gulf War veterans. Yet thousands of our veterans continue to suffer from a variety of chronic symptoms; and

Whereas, The Kansas Persian Gulf War Veterans Health Initiative, a project of the Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs, primarily through the efforts of Dr. Lea Stelle, has completed a scientific study of 2,000 Kansas Gulf War veterans with the results being published in the American Journal of Epidemiology. Major findings of this study include:

Kansas Gulf War veterans have significantly more health problems than veterans who served in other areas. The study results indicate these conditions may have been caused by multiple factors.

A pattern of chronic symptoms, Gulf War illness, was identified. Thirty-four percent of Kansas Gulf War veterans report a pattern of chronic symptoms that include joint pain, respiratory problems, neuropsychologic difficulties, diarrhea, skin rashes, and fatigue. Veterans with Gulf War illness experience a pattern of multiple types of symptoms that can persist for years, problems that can be severe and disabling for some veterans.

The rates of Gulf War illness can be linked to where and when veterans served in the Persian Gulf region. Veterans who served on board ship had the lowest rates (21%), with higher rates in veterans who had been stationed in support areas of Saudi Arabia (31%), and highest rates in veterans who were in Iraq or Kuwait (42%). In addition, veterans who served only during Desert Shield have a low rate of illness (9%), while those who were in the Persian Gulf region several months after the war ended have higher rates (36-43%).

Veterans who did not deploy to the Persian Gulf, but reported getting vaccines during the war, may have some of the same health problems as Gulf War veterans; and

Whereas, While it has been established that Gulf War veterans suffer from an abnor-

mally high rate of unexplained health problems, the cause, or causes of these varied conditions have not been determined, and the system for providing care and treatment of these veterans has been inadequate or nonresponsive to the conditions presented; and

Whereas, Gulf War illness has had a severe negative impact on the physical and emotional well-being of Gulf War veterans, and has affected their ability to work, yet adequate compensation for these conditions has not been received by these veterans; and

Whereas, Service connected illnesses have not been addressed adequately for veterans of past wars and conflicts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, That we memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to provide funding for Gulf War illness research independent of that administered by the United States Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs; and to establish a process of independent review of federal policies and programs associated with Gulf War illness research, benefits, and health care; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge further assistance to veterans afflicted with Gulf War illness, whether by the Department of Defense, Department of Veterans Affairs or another designated organization, to provide badly needed health care, vocational assistance and disability compensation; and that there be public service announcements informing veterans across the nation of the findings of this research and informing the veterans of the programs that are available to help them; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed to provide an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice-President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and to each member of the Kansas Congressional delegation; to the Governor of the State of Kansas, the Secretary of Health and Environment, the Secretary of Human Resources, and the Chairman of the Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs; and to the National and State Commanders of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans, National Retired Officers Association, National Retired Enlisted Association and the National Order of the Purple Heart.

POM-10. A resolution adopted by the Brook Park City Council in the State of Ohio relative to the steel industry; to the Committee on Finance.

POM-11. A petition from a citizen from the State of Georgia relative to Senator Max Cleland; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

POM-12. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas relative to the establishment of a federal energy policy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 1607

Whereas, The nation faces a growing shortage of domestic oil and the world may face petroleum shortages in the next fifty years; and

Whereas, Natural gas has risen dramatically in price because demand has increased faster than supplies are discovered; and

Whereas, Domestic consumers are faced with ever-increasing price spikes and lowered expectations of the market meeting the demand for energy; and

Whereas, The American association of petroleum geologists, in concert with other scientific professional learned societies, is convening in Washington, D.C., on April 23, 2001,

to address the need for a national energy supply and to look for new sources of energy; and

Whereas, The United States does not have a public policy on energy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, the House of Representatives concurring therein, That the legislature of the state of Kansas encourages the development of a federal energy policy that considers all possible future sources of energy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to send enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States; the Vice-President of the United States; Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the United States Senate; the Speaker, Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives; the Secretary of the United States Department of Energy; to each member of the Kansas Congressional Delegation; and to the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, P.O. Box 979, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101-0979.

POM-13. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas relative to life time health care benefits for military retirees and their families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 5011

Whereas, Inasmuch as many of our citizens have risen to the defense and safeguard of our state and nation, this Concurrent Resolution of support and honor recognizes those individuals who unselfishly served our state and nation as they defended our democratic way of life and the freedoms set down by the founding fathers of this nation; and

Whereas, The state of Kansas through its Legislature acknowledges and recognizes the contribution these veterans of military service have made to the estate of all our citizens, and we ask the Congress of the United States to acknowledge these retired veterans by continuing to support and improve their quality of life through extended health care; and

Whereas, This population of retired veterans served during foreign and domestic crises of the 20th century, where their involvement with names such as Ardennes, Wake, Guadalcanal, Normandy, Bastogne and Iwo Jima earned our nation's highest respect and accolades; while other names not so common to America were added during the Korean conflict, like Inchon and Choson; later came other Asian names like DaNang, Khe Sanh, Hue and Quang Tri; places these retired veterans know all too well as a battleground which tested their will to survive and return; and

Whereas, These retired veterans now constitute a significant portion of the aging population in this country and, in particular, our state; and

Whereas, These retired veterans were guaranteed through contract, both stated and implied, lifetime access to medical benefits for themselves and their immediate family members upon retirement for serving their nation unselfishly and honorably for 20 years or more; and

Whereas, Prior to retirement at age 65 years, this population of our citizenry were provided health care service through the military health care system or through other U.S. Department of Defense programs; however, upon reaching the age of 65 years and through recent Federal regulatory changes in entitlements for military health care benefits, these individuals that served and their family members, lost significant portions of their health care support system; and

Whereas, The medical benefits which were lost through changes to Federal legislation

forced these retired veterans to pay out-of-pocket for medical coverage from alternative sources; and those changes forced these citizens into omnibus national health care programs, such as Medicare; and

Whereas, Many retired veterans and their immediate family members live on fixed incomes where the loss of medical benefits significantly impacts their quality of life, disrupts their needed levels of care and puts out of reach certain health care capabilities and pharmaceutical support to which they had been previously entitled; and

Whereas, Many of these retired veterans suffering from service connected injuries, serious illnesses, or medically-related quality of life developments have found that their access to medical treatment facilities is now limited due to significant downsizing or in many rural areas has become nonexistent; and

Whereas, These honorable men and women of Kansas and of this nation who have sacrificed in the uniformed service of our country are deserving of the health care programs to sustain their quality of life that they were guaranteed for 20 or more years of unselfish service; and

Whereas, The Legislature of the state of Kansas has a special charge to safeguard and maintain the quality of life for its citizens that have served and earned a retirement from military service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein, That the Kansas Legislature respectfully requests and petitions its Congressional representatives of the United States to address, for rectification, the aforementioned concerns regarding the health care coverage of our retired military veterans and their immediate families; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to send enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the president pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each member of the Kansas Congressional Delegation.

POM-14. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming relative to using Wyoming Powder River Basin super compliant coal, to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the United States, generally and the western states specially are experiencing severe energy shortages, particularly a shortage of electrical energy; and

Whereas, new energy generation facilities are urgently needed to prevent these shortages and the damaging consequence of these shortages as they permeate the economy; and

Whereas, in recent years the timely construction of these necessary facilities has been obstructed through endless litigation and other delaying tactics; and

Whereas, the majority of people of the State of Wyoming desire to pursue sound energy and economic development; and

Whereas, Wyoming is richly endowed with natural resources, including Powder River Basin super compliant coal and Wyoming gas and oil that could solve the pending electrical energy supply crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved By The Members of the legislature of the State of Wyoming:

1. That the President, the Vice-President, the Congress and the Executive Branch of the federal government are urged to immediately secure the construction of critically needed new electric generation facilities, oil, and gas pipeline and transmission facilities using Wyoming Powder River Basin super

compliant coal, Wyoming gas and other available Wyoming natural resources.

2. That the United States Congress is urged to enact any legislation that will support the construction of energy and electric generation facilities, transmission facilities and gas pipelines.

3. That the Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice-President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the United States Secretary of Energy and the Wyoming Congressional Delegation.

POM-15. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relative to Medicaid; to the Committee on Finance.

POM-16. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relative to the metal industry; to the Committee on Finance.

A RESOLUTION

Whereas, Metal manufacturing is integral to the economy of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, employing over 72,900 workers in the primary metal industry and 86,200 workers in the fabricated metal products industry; and

Whereas, The American steel industry holds an important place in the history of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for its contribution to business and industry; and

Whereas, The American steel industry plays a vital role in our national security, which depends on a strong domestic steel economy, and in our national defense, which relies on a strong steel manufacturing base, and is of paramount concern for America and our allies; and

Whereas, The specialty steel industry, which includes stainless steel, tool steel and other alloyed metal steel, holds an important position in the economic and industrial history of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the United States and has made significant improvements to restructure, modernize and become a world leader in productivity and competitiveness; and

Whereas, The current economic and financial crises in Russia, Asia and other foreign nations have involved severe devaluation of the currencies of several primary steel-producing and steel-consuming countries along with a collapse in the domestic demand for steel and specialty steel in these countries; and

Whereas, The crises have generated and will continue to generate surges of steel imports into the United States, flooding the American market with foreign steel and foreign steel products at prices severely below production cost, thereby disadvantaging the American steel industry and its workers and families in the marketplace while the United States, through the International Monetary Fund, continues to participate in a massive financial bailout of these countries in a manner that encourages exports; and

Whereas, Imports of specialty steel from foreign producers are being dumped into this country in large quantities at unfair, below-market prices, contributing significantly to reduced earnings and reductions in employment for American workers; and

Whereas, The dumping of stainless steel plate in coils and other specialty steel products is prevalent in the United States market, causing an adverse impact on domestic steel production and the thousands of jobs in this Commonwealth and the United States associated with the regular and specialty steel industry; and

Whereas, Recent reports confirm that this country is headed for a downturn in the

economy, thereby requiring prompt Federal action and initiatives; and

Whereas, Recent reports confirm that 14 steel companies have filed for bankruptcy protection, and the impact of this problem goes well beyond one industry; and

Whereas, Statistics over the last three years have proven that the dumping of foreign steel into the American marketplace has had a devastating economic effect on American jobs; and

Whereas, There is a serious need for improvements in the enforcement of United States trade laws to provide an effective response to this situation; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania call on the President of the United States and the Federal Government to take all necessary action to:

(1) pursue enhanced enforcement of United States trade laws with respect to the surge of steel imports into the United States, using all remedies available under those laws, including duties relating to stainless steel plate in coils;

(2) continue to impose antidumping duties on imports of specialty steel from these foreign nations;

(3) work to establish a more equitable distribution of the burden of accepting imports of specialty steel from foreign nations;

(4) establish the appropriate forum or mechanism for executive branch interagency cooperation to closely monitor imports of steel, including specialty and stainless steel plate in coils; and

(5) report to the Congress of the United States as soon as possible a comprehensive, workable plan for addressing the surge in all steel imports, including the negative effects on employment, prices and investments in the American specialty and regular steel industry; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the United States Trade Representative and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM-17. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia relative to Interstate Route 81 corridor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 423

Whereas, the Virginia portion of Interstate Route 81 is among the most heavily traveled highway corridors in the United States; and

Whereas, Interstate Route 81 was originally designed to accommodate ten percent truck traffic, but, over time, the percentage of truck traffic has continued to grow, until the highway's traffic today is composed of approximately forty percent trucks; and

Whereas, this large number of heavy vehicles not only contributes to traffic congestion and exacerbates the severity of highway crashes, but also increases the frequency and the cost of highway maintenance and reconstruction on Interstate Route 81 and other highways in the corridor; and

Whereas, transferring freight from highway trucks to rail saves fuel, reduces congestion, minimizes air and water pollution, reduces highway maintenance and construction costs, and promotes safety; and

Whereas, Interstate Route 81 is paralleled for its entire length through Virginia by a railroad, much of which was initially engineered and constructed more than 100 years ago, and which does not currently provide a competitive alternative to the use of Interstate Route 81 by heavy trucks; and

Whereas, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation has studied whether improvements to the parallel rail infrastructure are likely to result in the di-

version of some of the interstate heavy truck traffic from Interstate Route 81 to the railroad, and whether investing public funds in improving the railroad infrastructure would result in measurable benefit to the public; and

Whereas, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation study concluded that specified improvements to the rail infrastructure in the Interstate Route 81 corridor could divert to the railroad as much as 10 to 25 percent of the interstate truck traffic now moving and projected to move on Interstate 81, with a potential public benefit of as much as \$300 million to \$2 billion; and

Whereas, diversion to rail of such a substantial number of heavy trucks would reduce congestion, reduce maintenance and construction costs, reduce fuel consumption, reduce air and water pollution, reduce accidents, and is clearly in the public interest; and

Whereas, public funding of improvements to the railroad infrastructure, together with completion of the scheduled improvements to Interstate Route 81, would provide an example to the nation of the significant public benefits resulting from the use of public funds in providing a viable rail alternative for the transportation of interstate freight; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the United States Congress be urged to appropriate funds for improvement of rail infrastructure in the Interstate Route 81 corridor. Such improvement shall ensure that the railroad that parallels Interstate Route 81 in Virginia provides a viable alternative to the use of Interstate Route 81 for the movement of interstate freight traffic; and, be it

Resolved further, That the General Assembly of Virginia support the conclusions of the study conducted by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation and commend it to the United States Congress for consideration; and, be it

Resolved finally, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the Secretary of the United States Department of Transportation, and the members of the Virginia Congressional Delegation in order that they may be apprised of the Sense of the General Assembly in this matter.

POM-18. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington relative to the 1946 Rescission Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4002

Whereas, The Philippine Islands was a territory of the United States until July 4, 1946, and the United States had control over Philippine nationals and its internal affairs. The Philippines Commonwealth had no function in matters of foreign affairs and could not declare war nor surrender its forces; and

Whereas, On July 26, 1941, U.S. President Roosevelt issued a Military Order and invoked his powers under Section 2(a)(12) of the Philippine Independence Act (P.L. No. 77-127 Section 10(a)) to "call and order into the service of the Armed Forces of the United States . . . all of the organized military forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines"; and

Whereas, World War II is remembered as The Good War that President Roosevelt claimed to have defended the great human freedoms against the encroachment and attack of the dark forces of despotism; and

Whereas, Filipino soldiers fought during World War II under the American flag and under the direction and control of United

States military leaders pursuant to President Roosevelt's July 1941 Military Order; and

Whereas, Shortly after the war in 1946, the U.S. Congress passed the Rescission Act which specifically mandates that services rendered by Filipino World War II veterans ". . . shall not be deemed to have been active military, naval, or air service for the purposes of any law of the United States conferring rights, privileges or benefits . . ."; and

Whereas, The legislative rider appended to the 1946 Rescission Act denies U.S. military status and benefits to those veterans who fought under the command of officers of the U.S. Armed Forces in the Philippines; and

Whereas, The significant and adverse impact of the 1946 Rescission Act is its unjust discrimination against Filipino soldiers of World War II by denying them eligibility for equal benefits administered by the department of veterans affairs; and

Whereas, Filipinos are the only national group singled out for denial of full U.S. veterans status while the soldiers of more than sixty-six other U.S. allied countries, who were similarly inducted into the service of the armed forces of the United States during World War II, were granted full U.S. veterans status; and

Whereas, The United States government has yet to fully restore the rights, privileges, and benefits guaranteed, then taken away from Filipino soldiers of WWII; and

Whereas, The gallantry, loyalty, and sacrifices of Filipino veterans of WWII, who fought for freedom and democracy in the Armed Forces of the United States, deserve recognition and their honor and dignity restored; and

Whereas, There is no pending legislation in the U.S. Congress that will restore full United States veterans status to Filipino WWII veterans; Now, therefore

Your Memorialists respectfully pray that the President and Congress of the United States during the First Session of the 106th Congress take action necessary to amend the 1946 Rescission Act and honor our country's moral obligation to restore these Filipino veterans full United States veterans status with the military benefits that they deserve; be it

Resolved, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable George W. Bush, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 756. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the credit for electricity produced from biomass, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 757. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 504 West Hamilton Street in Allentown, Pennsylvania, as the "Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 99

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs.

LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 99, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for employers who provide child care assistance for dependents of their employees, and for other purposes.

S. 145

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 145, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase to parity with other surviving spouses the basic annuity that is provided under the uniformed services Survivor Benefit Plan for surviving spouses who are at least 62 years of age, and for other purposes.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability.

S. 198

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance through States to eligible weed management entities to control or eradicate harmful, non-native weeds on public and private land.

S. 258

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the medicare program of annual screening pap smear and screening pelvic exams.

S. 277

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 277, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 388

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to protect the energy and security of the United States and decrease America's dependency on foreign oil sources to 50% by the year 2011 by enhancing the use of renewable energy resources conserving energy resources, improving energy efficiencies, and increasing domestic energy supplies; improve environmental quality by reducing emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases; mitigate the effect of increases in energy prices on the American consumer, including the poor and the elderly; and for other purposes.

S. 452

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 452, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure that the Secretary of Health and Human Services provides appropriate guidance to physicians, providers of services, and ambulance providers that are attempting to properly submit claims under the medicare program to ensure that the Secretary does not target inadvertent billing errors.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 570, a bill to establish a permanent Violence Against Women Office at the Department of Justice.

S. 643

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 643, a bill to implement the agreement establishing a United States-Jordan free trade area.

S. 656

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 656, a bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain nationals of Liberia to that of lawful permanent residence.

S. 661

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 661, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent motor fuel exercise taxes on railroads and inland waterway transportation which remain in the general fund of the Treasury.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to modernize the financing of the railroad retirement system and to provide enhanced benefits to employees and beneficiaries.

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, supra.

S. CON. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 14, a concurrent resolution recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of it.

S. RES. 66

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the

Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 66, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the release of twenty-four United States military personnel currently being detained by the People's Republic of China.

AMENDMENT NO. 183

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 183 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 183 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 183 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 210

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 210 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent

resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 211

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 211 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 231

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 231 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 234

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 234 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 235

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 235 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 236

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) were added as

cosponsors of amendment No. 236 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 238

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 238 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 249

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 249 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 253

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 253 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 253 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 302

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 302 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, his name was added as a cosponsor of

amendment No. 302 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. CARNAHAN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), and the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 302 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 302 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 302 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 303

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 303 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 303 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

At the request of Mr. ENZI, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 303 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 303 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 303 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 303 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 303 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 312

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 312 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 313

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 313 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for

fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 316

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 316 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 316 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 316 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, *supra*.

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 316 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, *supra*.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 316 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, *supra*.

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 316 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 316 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, *supra*.

At the request of Mrs. CARNAHAN, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 316 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, *supra*.

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 316 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 317

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 317 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 325

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 325 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

At the request of Mr. INOUE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 325 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 325 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 334

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 334 proposed to H. Con. Res. 83, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 756. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the credit for electricity produced from biomass, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce important tax legislation to help address the current energy shortage in our country. The legislation, entitled the "Growing Renewable Energy for Emerging Needs [GREEN] Act," will extend and expand the tax credit for homegrown, clean-burning, renewable biomass.

As many of my colleagues know, I authorized the section 45 credit in the

Senate and it was included in the Energy Policy Act of 1992. However, the tax credit for the production of energy from biomass is set to expire on January 1, 2002. For this reason, I am introducing legislation to extend and expand the credit to help sustain the many benefits derived from biomass.

Last month, I introduced S. 530 to extend the wind energy portion of section 45, which has been extremely successful. The purpose of today's bill is to extend and expand the biomass portion of section 45 to include technologies such as biomass combustion and cofiring biomass with coal-fired facilities. Formerly, section 45 only allowed the use of closed-loop biomass.

The clean, controlled combustion of biomass, which consists of sawdust, tree trimmings, agricultural byproducts, and untreated construction debris, is another proven, effective technology that currently generates numerous pollution avoidance and waste management public benefits across the nation.

In addition, biomass energy displaces more polluting forms of energy generation while decreasing our dependence on foreign oil. Our national security is currently threatened by a heavy reliance on foreign oil.

Biomass can also produce enormous economic benefits for rural America. Rural economies will grow because of the development of a local industry to convert biomass to electricity. Moreover, studies show that biomass crops could produce between \$2 to \$5 billion in additional farm income.

In order to retain the environmental, waste management, and the rural employment benefits that we could receive from the existing "open-loop" biomass facilities, my bill rewrites section 45 to allow tax credits for clean combustion of wood waste and similar residues in these unique facilities.

Importantly, we have also ensured that the definition of qualifying biomass materials is limited to organic, nonhazardous materials that are clearly proven to burn cleanly without any pollution risk. Also, to allay any concern that biomass plants might burn paper and thus possibly jeopardize the amount of paper that is available to be recycled, I have specifically excluded paper that is commonly recycled from the list of materials that would qualify for the credit.

I believe this bill provides a common sense combination of current and new technologies to help maintain the economic, environmental and waste management benefits derived from biomass power. The current electricity shortage in California and the soaring prices of home heating fuel and natural gas this winter are reasons enough to support and accelerate this renewable energy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 756

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Growing Renewable Energy for Emerging Needs (GREEN) Act".

SEC. 2. CREDIT FOR ELECTRICITY PRODUCED FROM BIOMASS.

(a) **EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF PLACED-IN-SERVICE RULES.**—Paragraph (3) of section 45(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

"(B) **CLOSED-LOOP BIOMASS FACILITY.**—In the case of a facility using closed-loop biomass to produce electricity, the term 'qualified facility' means any facility—

"(i) owned by the taxpayer which is originally placed in service after December 31, 1992, and before January 1, 2007, or

"(ii) of the taxpayer which is originally placed in service before December 31, 1992, and modified to use closed-loop biomass to co-fire with coal before January 1, 2007.",

(2) by striking "2002" in subparagraph (C) and inserting "2007", and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(D) **BIOMASS FACILITIES.**—In the case of a facility using biomass (other than closed-loop biomass) to produce electricity, the term 'qualified facility' means any facility owned by the taxpayer which is originally placed in service before January 1, 2007.

"(E) **SPECIAL RULES.**—In the case of a qualified facility described in subparagraph (B)(i) or (D)—

"(i) the 10-year period referred to in subsection (a) shall be treated as beginning no earlier than the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and

"(ii) subsection (b)(3) shall not apply to any such facility originally placed in service before January 1, 1997."

(b) **BIOMASS FACILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 45(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining qualified energy resources) is amended—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (B),

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ", and", and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(D) biomass (other than closed-loop biomass)."

(2) **BIOMASS DEFINED.**—Section 45(c) of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) **BIOMASS.**—The term 'biomass' means any solid, nonhazardous, cellulosic waste material which is segregated from other waste materials and which is derived from—

"(A) any of the following forest-related resources: mill residues, precommercial thinnings, slash, and brush, but not including old-growth timber,

"(B) solid wood waste materials, including waste pallets, crates, dunnage, manufacturing and construction wood wastes (other than pressure-treated, chemically-treated, or painted wood wastes), and landscape or right-of-way tree trimmings, but not including municipal solid waste (garbage), gas derived from the biodegradation of solid waste, or paper that is commonly recycled, or

"(C) agriculture sources, including orchard tree crops, vineyard, grain, legumes, sugar, and other crop by-products or residues."

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to electricity produced after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 757. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 504 West Hamilton Street in Allentown, Pennsylvania, as the "Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to name the Federal building and courthouse in Allentown, Pennsylvania for retired Judge Edward N. Cahn. Judge Cahn, a native Pennsylvanian and resident of the Lehigh Valley, served with distinction on the Federal bench for 23 years, including 5 years as chief judge.

Judge Cahn attended school at Lehigh University and graduated magna cum laude in 1955. He went on to receive a law degree from Yale University in 1958 and began practicing law in Allentown in 1959. His accomplishments on the basketball court as a 1,000 point scorer for Lehigh University translated into his later success in another court, when President Ford nominated him to be a federal judge in 1974.

Judge Cahn was instrumental in helping build Allentown's new courthouse, which opened in 1995. This beautiful structure is a symbol for the resurgence of the Lehigh Valley, and it is only fitting that the courthouse should bear the name of an individual who did so much to help his community. His dedication to his work and fairness were well recognized throughout Pennsylvania and it is my hope that future jurists who serve in this courthouse will uphold those same ideals.

On February 28, 2001, the House unanimously passed an identical measure, H.R. 558, introduced by my colleagues, Congressmen PATRICK TOOMEY and TIM HOLDEN. I am hopeful that the Senate will also see fit to pass my bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Judge Edward N. Cahn.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 757

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF EDWARD N. CAHN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 504 West Hamilton Street in Allentown, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the "Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro

tempore, pursuant to Public Law 94-118, reappoints the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2001

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 24. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business, equally divided, with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. VOINOVICH. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. VOINOVICH. For the information of all Senators, it is hoped that the Senate can begin consideration of S. 1, the education bill, tomorrow morning. Negotiations have been ongoing during the recess and throughout the day today. It may be possible to begin consideration of the education legislation shortly after convening on Tuesday. Any Senator who desires to speak on the issue of education is encouraged to come to the floor tomorrow to participate in the debate. Votes are therefore possible during tomorrow afternoon's session.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VOINOVICH. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator NELSON of Florida.

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

Mr. VOINOVICH. 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. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

OIL DRILLING

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to discuss a matter of critical importance to the State of Florida; that is, the prospect that soon, under the new administration, we might have the sale-for-lease tracts for offshore oil drilling off the coast of the State of Florida.

There has been in place presently a moratorium in one form or another since 1989 regarding drilling off the coast of the State of Florida. And there is presently offered, through this new administration, through the Department of the Interior, a proposed lease sale called "lease sale 181," which comes within 30 miles of Perdido Key, which is in northwest Florida. It is explained by the new administration that most of the tract for lease is 100 miles off the coast. But there is indeed a part that comes to within a few miles of the coast of Alabama and close to the State of Florida-Alabama line. This lease tract would come within some 20 to 30 miles of the pristine white beaches of the State of Florida.

I can tell you that 16 million Americans residing in the State of Florida do not want drilling off the coast of our State and have spoken vigorously against it, which is why we have had a moratorium off the State of Florida. Yet the administration continues to persist.

Now let me read for you a statement that was made by candidate George W. Bush in the past campaign. He made this statement at West Port Richey, north of Tampa, FL. He said at the time in the campaign, when asked about offshore oil drilling in Florida:

I'm going to work with your Governor about offshore drilling here in Florida. We are both against it. We are both against it.

Twice he said he was against it. But it is now his position to offer it. Just last week the Tampa Tribune, a very conservative editorial newspaper—in an editorial last Thursday, said:

Had George W. Bush openly supported the sale of these leases before the election, he would have lost Florida and the Presidency.

Now that is the truth. And promises are being broken. The fact is that they don't need to be because we could address our energy problem if we would be wise by increasing our R&D on alternative fuels, on increased conservation. You don't have to produce your way out of the energy crisis. You can be a lot wiser with using alternative methods.

In the discussion of the budget, we saw some dramatic testimony showing that the consumption of energy in the United States, in large part, is allocated to transportation. Why should we not use research and development to build a new automobile that in fact can get 60 to 80 miles per gallon? That would cause a tremendous conservation of energy in this country. That is just one alternative, but it is an alternative we ought to explore and keep the promises that were made in the election.

This whole matter of offshore oil drilling suddenly caught my attention back in the early 1980s, when, as a junior Congressman representing a congressional district off the east coast of Florida, suddenly I was confronted with the Reagan administration, through the person of the former Secretary of the Interior, James Watt, offering leases for oil drilling off the east coast of the United States, from as far north as Cape Hatteras, all the way as far south as off Fort Pierce, FL. As a junior Congressman, I went to work with the Appropriations Committee in the House to get them to insert language that would say in the Department of the Interior appropriations bill: No money may be used under this appropriations act for the purpose of offering oil and gas leases in tracts such-and-such—and then we described all of the tracts that were being offered.

We won in that year in the Appropriations Committee because of bringing to that committee dramatic testimony from Florida about what would be the environmental and economic damage to our State if waves of oil were lapping up onto the beaches of Florida—not only environmental damage, but economic damage as well, particularly considering Florida's tremendous tourism industry.

Well, I thought my fight was over. But sure enough, after a year's lapse, the Reagan administration came back under a new Secretary of the Interior and proposed those oil leases again. So we had to go to work even harder. This time it escalated all the way up to not just the appropriations subcommittee on the Department of the Interior, but to the full Appropriations Committee, where we finally won the vote by pointing to NASA and the Department of Defense to the fact that you can't be dropping solid rocket boosters from the space shuttle and the first stages from expendable booster rockets being launched from the Kennedy Space Center and the Cape Canaveral Air Force Station if you have oil rigs down below. So we won that vote after a hard fight.

I thought our fight was over on being able to protect Florida's shores from the threat of environmental and economic damage as a result of oil drilling. But my hope back there in the early 1980s was for naught because in the year 2001, despite a promise that was made last fall, in the year 2000, by candidate for President George W. Bush, one of the first acts of the new Bush administration is to offer for sale lease tract 181 off the coast of the State of Florida for oil and gas drilling.

Well, 16 million Floridians will not stand for this. Senator BOB GRAHAM and I will not stand for this. Statewide elected officials expressed many times over, including this Senator who used to be an elected member of the State Cabinet of Florida, will not stand for it. The legislature of the State of Florida will not stand for it. Most of the

congressional delegation from the State of Florida will not stand for it. Yet the administration persists.

It looks as if we are in for a donnybrook where we will clash our swords and see if the will, the desire of 16 million Floridians will prevail.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3:20 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, April 24, 2001, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23, 2001:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

POWELL A. MOORE, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE JOHN K. VERONEAU.
WILLIAM J. HAYNES II, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE DOUGLAS A. DWORKIN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

ROBERT GLENN HUBBARD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, VICE MARTIN NEIL BAILY, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

ROGER WALTON FERGUSON, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2000. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

EDWARD C. ALDRIDGE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR ACQUISITION AND TECHNOLOGY, VICE JACQUES GANSLER.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

TIMOTHY J. MURIS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSIONER FOR THE TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM SEPTEMBER 26, 2001, VICE ROBERT PITOFKY, TERM EXPIRING.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

BRUCE MARSHALL CARNES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE MICHAEL TELSON, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A. ELIZABETH JONES, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EUROPEAN AFFAIRS), VICE JAMES F. DOBBINS.
PETER F. ALLGEIER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE RICHARD W. FISHER, RESIGNED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

LARON L. JENSEN, OF VIRGINIA

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

CARLOS F. POZA, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

DOROTHY L. LUTTER, OF MASSACHUSETTS

THOMAS E. MOORE, OF TEXAS

KAREN L. ZENS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE AGENCIES INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASS STATED, AND ALSO FOR THE OTHER APPOINTMENTS INDICATED HEREWITH:

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

RALPH K. BEAN, OF COLORADO
JAMES P. BUTTERWORTH, OF CALIFORNIA
SARAH D. HANSON, OF WYOMING
MARY ELLEN H. SMITH, OF CALIFORNIA

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:

THOMAS N. AMAN, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL JAMES ARD, OF VIRGINIA
ALLISON VAL AREIAS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JEFFREY A. ARNOLD, OF WASHINGTON
CRAIG M. ARTIGUES, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN M. ASHBY, OF FLORIDA
RAFFI V. BALIAN, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD R. BALLARD, OF FLORIDA
TIMOTHY D. BEARD IV, OF VIRGINIA
DEVIN L. BEAUREGARD, OF VIRGINIA
BRIGHAM B. BECHTEL, OF VIRGINIA
SHIRLEY J. BECHTEL, OF VIRGINIA
MARC P. BENNETT, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN O. BLAIR, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTINA N. BOILER, OF VIRGINIA
RAMON A. BOLANOS, OF VIRGINIA
VINCENT P. BONNER, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY J. BONVICIN, OF VIRGINIA
LAUREL A. BOTTS, OF VIRGINIA
BRETT J. BRENNKE, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT A. BRISKMAN, OF VIRGINIA
GLEN K. BUCHANAN, OF VIRGINIA
STEVEN C. BULL, OF VIRGINIA
PETER B. BURKE, OF VIRGINIA
TODD M. CARTER, OF VIRGINIA
GAIL CHUN FARAON, OF VIRGINIA
GEOFFREY M. CLEASBY, OF TEXAS
TAYLOR G. CRANWELL, OF VIRGINIA
SUSAN G. CZASKA, OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT DEANGELO, OF VIRGINIA
JERRY JOSEPH DREES, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW SCOTT DURBIN, OF MARYLAND
SARAH BERKEY FAHEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CONSTANTINOS DAVID FAIR, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
JOSEPH RODNEY FARAON, OF VIRGINIA
AMY S. FOX, OF VIRGINIA
QUENTIN L. GEHLE, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER F. GOETHERT, OF VIRGINIA
SILVIO I. GONZALEZ, OF FLORIDA
CHARLES EDWARD GOSLIN III, OF VIRGINIA
SHERMAN L. GRANDY, OF IDAHO
KAREN LOUISE GUSTAFSON DE ANDRADE, OF COLORADO
JANE M. HANNAN, OF VIRGINIA
KERRI STRENG HANNAN, OF FLORIDA
MICHAEL HARRIS, OF MARYLAND
CHRISTINE ELISE HART, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PENELOPE E. HAYS, OF VIRGINIA
IAN TAVISH HILLMAN, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW THORPE HINTZ, OF VIRGINIA
ELIZABETH K. HORST, OF MINNESOTA
BENJAMIN V. HOUSE III, OF MARYLAND
LAWRENCE CRAIG IMES, OF VIRGINIA
EDWARD S. JACKMAN, OF VIRGINIA
BERNT B. JOHNSON, OF FLORIDA
JENNIFER L. JOHNSON, OF NEW YORK
MAURA A. JOHNSON, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD H. JOHNSON, OF VIRGINIA
LOUIS THOMAS KAH, OF VIRGINIA
BRADFORD J. KARNY, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL A. KEPALAS, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN R. KELLER, OF VIRGINIA
AMBER LEIGH KEMP, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN T. KENNEDY, OF VIRGINIA
ANGELA M. KERWIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ALEXANDER B. KIRCHNER, OF VIRGINIA
DENNIS R. KIRKLAND, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN H. KLAS, OF VIRGINIA
DEBORAH K. KLOPP, OF MARYLAND
BROOKE ELIZABETH KNOBEL, OF ILLINOIS
ALEXANDER R. KOMONS, OF VIRGINIA
KEISHA KAMILLE LAFAYETTE, OF FLORIDA
KATHERINE E. LAWSON, OF MARYLAND
WILLIAM P. LINDER, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICIA I. MALDONADO, OF VIRGINIA
CLYDE V. MANNING, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN P. MARIETTI, OF MICHIGAN
DAMIEN E. MARQUEZ, OF VIRGINIA
GALEN W. MCBRIDE, OF VIRGINIA
NEIL MCCURTY, OF CALIFORNIA
SHELLAH MILLIKEN, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID MUNIZ, OF VIRGINIA
CARRIE L. MUNTEAN, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM G. MUNTEAN III, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM D. MURRAY, OF VIRGINIA
JUSTIN D. MYLROIE, OF VIRGINIA
JEREMEH M. NETTZKE, OF OHIO
SUSAN R. OLIVER, OF VIRGINIA
ROLF A. OLSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RICHARD ARTHUR FREDERICK OTTO, OF MARYLAND
MERODE S. PARK, OF VIRGINIA
PAULETTE F. PARKER, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL THOMAS PASCUAL, OF MARYLAND
THOMAS PECORA, OF VIRGINIA
CYNTHIA ANNE PENDLETON, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN J. POSIVAK JR., OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT D. POZIL, OF WASHINGTON
ROBYN ANISE PUCKETT, OF GEORGIA
CHRISTOPHER PATRICK QUADE, OF VIRGINIA
J. STEVEN RAMIREZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
VAN E. REIDHEAD, OF MISSOURI
WILLIAM E. RICHARDSON, OF VIRGINIA
TRACEY A. RINEHART, OF CALIFORNIA
DEBORAH ROBINSON, OF COLORADO

RUTH ANN ROUSH, OF VIRGINIA
PENNY CAROLYN SATCHES, OF VIRGINIA
KARL CHRISTIAN SCHWAB, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS K. SEEKER, OF VIRGINIA
SAMEER VIJAY SHETH, OF FLORIDA
ANNA SHIN, OF VIRGINIA
MARY K. SIEGEL, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC SILLA, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM P. SIMONSEN, OF VIRGINIA
MARSHA LYNNE SINGER, OF FLORIDA
JENNIFER M. SKOTZKO, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER B. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
KIRBY W. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
NICOLE D. SOBOTKA, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN K. STEIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
J. WARREN STEMBRIDGE, OF VIRGINIA
BARBARA P. SUDDATH, OF OREGON
NANCY SZALWINSKI, OF TEXAS
RICK TACY, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN L. TASCO, OF FLORIDA
BARBARA BOS TAYLOR, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN A. TAYLOR, OF VIRGINIA
DARREN DION TAYLOR, OF VIRGINIA
J. BRET TRAW, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARILYN J. TRESSLER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
BYRON F. TSAO, OF VIRGINIA
MARK EDWARD TURNER, OF VIRGINIA
SHARON UMBER, OF MINNESOTA
WILLIAM JAMES VARGO, OF MARYLAND
ENRICO VERDOLIN, OF FLORIDA
JEFFREY S. VRABEL, OF VIRGINIA
LORRAINE TECZA WAGER, OF MARYLAND
GLENN A. WEAVER, OF VIRGINIA
MARK A. WEBSTER, OF VIRGINIA
TODD W. WEGMAN, OF MARYLAND
MARK WEINBERG, OF ILLINOIS
MASON C. WHITE, OF VIRGINIA
RAYMOND M. WHITE, OF MARYLAND
SUSAN E. WOODS, OF VIRGINIA
WALLACE E. WYATT, OF VIRGINIA
ANTHONY J. YOWELL, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL ZIKES, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 14, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RICHARD OLIVER LANKFORD, OF LOUISIANA

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

ANGELA STYLES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR FOR FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY, VICE DEIDRE A. LEE, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

WILLIAM D. HANSEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, VICE FRANK S. HOLLEMAN III, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

VIET D. DINH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE ELEANOR ACHESON, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

MAUREN PATRICIA CRAGIN, OF MAINE, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (PUBLIC AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS), VICE JOHN T. HANSON, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. DAVID C. HARRIS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. LAWRENCE J. JOHNSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES L. PRUITT, 0000

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY C. BARRICK, 0000
COL. CLAUDE A. WILLIAMS, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. CRAIG T. BODDINGTON, 0000
COL. SCOTT ROBERTSON, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED

WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. ALFRED G. HARMS JR., 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KATHLEEN L. MARTIN, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES A. JOHNSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CHRISTOPHER C. AMES, 0000
CAPT. MICHAEL C. BACHMANN, 0000
CAPT. REUBIN B. BOOKERT, 0000
CAPT. STANLEY D. BOZIN, 0000
CAPT. JEFFREY A. BROOKS, 0000
CAPT. CHARLES T. BUSH, 0000
CAPT. JOHN D. BUTLER, 0000
CAPT. JEFFREY B. CASSIAS, 0000
CAPT. BRUCE W. CLINGAN, 0000
CAPT. DONNA L. CRISP, 0000
CAPT. WILLIAM D. CROWDER, 0000
CAPT. PATRICK W. DUNN, 0000
CAPT. DAVID A. GOVE, 0000
CAPT. RICHARD D. JASKOT, 0000
CAPT. ROBERT D. JENKINS III, 0000
CAPT. STEPHEN E. JOHNSON, 0000
CAPT. GARY R. JONES, 0000
CAPT. JAMES D. KELLY, 0000
CAPT. DONALD F. LOREN, 0000
COL. JOSEPH MAGUIRE, 0000
CAPT. ROBERT T. MOELLER, 0000
CAPT. ROBERT B. MURRETT, 0000
CAPT. ROBERT R. REILLY JR., 0000
CAPT. JACOB L. SHURD, 0000
CAPT. PAUL S. STANLEY, 0000
CAPT. PATRICK M. WALSH, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

LARRY J. CIANCIO, 0000
GERALD G. LUCE, 0000
FREDRIC D. SHEPPARD, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS, TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

CARLTON JACKSON, 0000 JA
RICHARD D. MILLER, 0000 JA

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DALE J. DANKO, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DELBERT G. YORDY, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ALEXANDER L. KRONGARD, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHAEL G. AHERN, 0000
DANIEL ALBRECHT, 0000
DIANNE J. ALDRICH, 0000
MARGARET D. ALEXANDER, 0000
HOWARD H. ANDERSON JR., 0000
LARRY H. AMENT JR., 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. ARMSTRONG, 0000
OLPH W. ARNOLD JR., 0000
MICHAEL J. ASHE, 0000
FERNAND F. AUCREMANNE, 0000
RANDALL J. AVRAM, 0000
GEORGE P. AYRAM, 0000
MARY P. BACKMAN, 0000
JOHN C. BALEIX, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. BARBER, 0000
RICHARD S. BARR, 0000
WILLIAM J. BARTZ, 0000
ANDREW L. BENSON, 0000
ZACHARY J. BERRY, 0000
ROBERT J. BIANCHI, 0000
ROBERT E. BJELLAND, 0000
TERESA A. BOHUSZ, 0000
MARK O. BOMAN, 0000

STEVEN E BRAATZ, 0000
 MORRIS A BRANCH, 0000
 HANS A BRINGS, 0000
 MARK A BROWN, 0000
 PAULETTE C BRYANT, 0000
 ROSE M BULGER, 0000
 DARLENE M BURKE, 0000
 THOMAS J CANAAN, 0000
 JAN M CARRIO, 0000
 TIERIAN CASH, 0000
 VICTORIA A CASSANO, 0000
 CHARLES E CASSIDY, 0000
 DONALD J CENTNER, 0000
 JOHN W CHERRY, 0000
 JAMES M CHIMIAK, 0000
 COLIN G CHINN, 0000
 SOREN CHRISTENSEN, 0000
 WALTER L CLEMENTS, 0000
 JEAN S COHN, 0000
 NORMAN B COOK, 0000
 WAYNE A COX, 0000
 JAMES W CRAWFORD III, 0000
 JERRI CURTIS, 0000
 JERRY F CUSHMAN, 0000
 KAREN A DALY, 0000
 ROBERT G DARLING, 0000
 PAUL DATO, 0000
 DAVID R DAVIS, 0000
 HARRY W DAVIS, 0000
 ROBERT A DEEDMAN, 0000
 PAUL M DELANEY JR., 0000
 ARNOLD G DELFINER, 0000
 MARLENE DEMAIIO, 0000
 KIM E DIEFENDERFER, 0000
 MARK A DOBBS, 0000
 WILBUR C DOUGLASS III, 0000
 MICHAEL C DUBIK, 0000
 ANNE DUNNEHAYES, 0000
 ROBERT D EVANS, 0000
 JUDITH A FIDELLOW, 0000
 DEBORAH M FITZGERALD, 0000
 DONALD J FLEMMING, 0000
 JEFFREY L FORD, 0000
 HEIDI A FOWLER, 0000
 KARL K FUNC, 0000
 CAROLE J GAASCH, 0000
 MICHAEL J GENTILE, 0000
 TAMMY S GERSTENFELD, 0000
 THU P GETKA, 0000
 MICHAEL A GIORGIONE, 0000
 RICHARD F GONZALEZ, 0000
 GARY G GOODELL, 0000
 JOHN GORMAN, 0000
 GREGORY M GORSUCH, 0000
 DAVID J GRAFF, 0000
 THOMAS A GRIEGER, 0000
 JEFFREY H GRODEN, 0000
 PHILLIP E GWALTNEY, 0000
 MARK A HANDLEY, 0000
 BILLY W HANES JR., 0000
 CHRISTIAN W HANSEN III, 0000
 BEVERLY C HARRELLBRUDER, 0000
 KATHLEEN G HARTMANN, 0000
 THOMAS E HATLEY, 0000
 OLAF G HAUCEN, 0000
 DAVID F HAYES, 0000
 JOHN R HEIL, 0000
 LOUIS J HEINDEL, 0000
 MARY J HERDEN, 0000
 JAMES C HIGGINS, 0000
 KENNETH A HIRSCH, 0000
 GREG W HOEKSEMA, 0000
 WHITNEY H HOWARD, 0000
 DENNIS L HUFFORD, 0000
 BRADLEY W HUNT, 0000
 WILLIAM HURST, 0000
 GLEN M IMAMURA, 0000
 MICHAEL G IRELAND, 0000
 JAMES R JACKSON, 0000
 MAX B JENKINS, 0000
 KURT A JOHNSON, 0000
 MARK H JOHNSTON, 0000
 SHAUN B JONES, 0000
 EDWARD J KANE JR., 0000
 JOHN M KELSO, 0000
 BILL C KINNEY, 0000
 DOUGLAS R KNITTEL, 0000
 KELLY K KOELLER, 0000
 FREDERICK O KUHN, 0000
 GREGORY T KUHN, 0000
 JEFFERY J KUHN, 0000
 BRENDA A LARKIN, 0000
 MARC G LAVERDIERE, 0000
 ANDREW W LEWIS, 0000
 BARBETTE H LOWNDES, 0000
 JOSEPH D LUDOVICI, 0000
 DIANE C LUNDY, 0000
 LORETTA A MADDEN, 0000
 DENNIS M MAHAN, 0000
 MICHAEL E MAHONY, 0000
 STEPHEN E MANDIA, 0000
 JOSEPH F MANNA, 0000
 STEVEN M MARINELLI, 0000
 JAMES A MARRON, 0000
 ROBERT C MARSHALL, 0000
 GREGORY J MARTIN, 0000
 SUSAN L MARTINANDERS, 0000
 WAYNE Z MCBRIDE, 0000
 DAVID R MCCARTHY, 0000
 ERIC C McDONALD, 0000
 JOHN A MCQUESTON, 0000
 WALTER H MELTON, 0000
 NATHANIEL MILTON, 0000
 KATHLEEN H MOELLER, 0000
 JON MOLES, 0000
 ROBERT L MONETTE, 0000
 JOHN F MONROE, 0000

HEIDI L MOOS, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER N MORIN, 0000
 CAROL J MORONES, 0000
 WILLIAM S MUNSON, 0000
 PAMELA L MURPHY, 0000
 FRANCESCA C MUSIC, 0000
 STEVEN M NAGORZANSKI, 0000
 PATRICK J NEHER, 0000
 STEVEN M NICHOLS, 0000
 MURRAY C NORCROSS JR., 0000
 MATTHEW J NUTATIS, 0000
 PETER F OCONNOR, 0000
 TIMOTHY P OMALLEY, 0000
 WAYNE J OSBORNE, 0000
 JAMES R OXFORD JR., 0000
 STEPHEN M PACHUTA, 0000
 THOMAS B PADGETT, 0000
 ASA H PAGE III, 0000
 RICHARD L PARKER, 0000
 MICHAEL J PATTI, 0000
 WILLIAM M PEACOCK III, 0000
 PAULA A PENDRICK, 0000
 GEORGE M PEREZ, 0000
 TODD A PERLA, 0000
 WILLIAM C PERRY III, 0000
 MICHAEL J PESQUEIRA, 0000
 WILLIAM M PETRUSKA, 0000
 KATHLEEN M PIERCE, 0000
 KEVIN R PORTER, 0000
 JAMES D PUTTLER, 0000
 JOAN R QUEEN, 0000
 VINCENT RACANELLI, 0000
 CATHY L REARDEN, 0000
 JAMES T RECTOR, 0000
 BILLY REDMOND, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER P RENNIX, 0000
 CHARLES B RHODES, 0000
 MICHAEL N RIEGER, 0000
 WILLIAM P RIEGER, 0000
 PAMELA K ROARK, 0000
 LAWRENCE H ROBERTS, 0000
 SHELIA C ROBERTSON, 0000
 STEPHEN L ROBINSON, 0000
 STEPHEN M RODGERS, 0000
 KATHLEEN A ROHLEDER, 0000
 ALAN E ROLFE, 0000
 STEVEN J ROMANO, 0000
 JIMMY M SAIKU, 0000
 BRIAN E SARGENT, 0000
 DUANE R SCHAFFER, 0000
 JOHN K SCHMIDT, 0000
 GEORGE J SCHMIEDER, 0000
 JAMES J SCHNEIDER, 0000
 BRIAN M SCOTT, 0000
 TRACY A SCOTT, 0000
 JOHN A SIEFERT, 0000
 NANCY J SILKI, 0000
 KEVIN R SLATES, 0000
 LYMAN M SMITH, 0000
 THOMAS A SNEAD, 0000
 ROBERT J SNYDER, 0000
 ROBERT B SORENSON, 0000
 PAULINE L SUSZAN, 0000
 NANCY A SWANSON, 0000
 WILLIAM J SWARTWORTH, 0000
 EDWARD J SWEENEY, 0000
 ANTHONY G SWERCZEK, 0000
 PAUL TALWAR, 0000
 THOMAS E THIES, 0000
 DAVID E THOMAS, 0000
 DAWN M TOMPKINS, 0000
 RICKY D TOYAMA, 0000
 DANIEL V UNGER IV, 0000
 CHARLES A VACCHIANO, 0000
 JAMES D VALENTE, 0000
 DANIEL O WALKER, 0000
 GRIFFIN L WARREN, 0000
 GREGORY A WASKEWICZ, 0000
 GREGORY L WATFORD, 0000
 SCHUYLER C WEBB, 0000
 NICHOLAS L WEBSTER, 0000
 DANIEL G WHEELAND, 0000
 MARGARET G WILSON, 0000
 ROBERT F WILSON, 0000
 CHARLOTTE O WISE, 0000
 JOHN C WOHLRABE JR., 0000
 GEORGE A WORONKO, 0000
 WALTER F WRIGHT, 0000
 DEBRA D YAREMA, 0000
 GLENN ZAUSMER, 0000
 RICHARD D ZEIGLER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MILTON D ABNER, 0000
 JUDITH L C ACKERSON, 0000
 TOWNSEND G ALEXANDER, 0000
 MARY L ANDERSON, 0000
 DOUGLAS M ANDRE, 0000
 DAVID S ANGOOD, 0000
 LAWRENCE N ASH, 0000
 MICHAEL J BAREA, 0000
 EDWARD BARFIELD, 0000
 THOMAS H BARGE II, 0000
 MARK A BAULCH, 0000
 THOMAS C BAUS, 0000
 THOMAS M BAYLEY, 0000
 SCOTT D BEACH, 0000
 CHARLES D BEHRLE, 0000
 BETSY J BIRD, 0000
 RUSSELL E BIRD, 0000
 MARK W BOCK, 0000
 MARK R BOETTCHER, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER D BOTT, 0000

ROBERT W BOUGHER, 0000
 KATHLEEN J BRANCH, 0000
 JAMES B BRINKMAN, 0000
 MICHAEL A BROWN, 0000
 ROBERT W BROWN, 0000
 GLENN M BRUNNER, 0000
 DAVID L BUCKEY, 0000
 MICHAEL D BUDNEY, 0000
 KENNETH P BUELL, 0000
 JOHN M BURDON, 0000
 BRIAN E BURLINGAME, 0000
 GERALD T BURNETTE, 0000
 LAWRENCE D BURT, 0000
 PAUL J BUSHONG, 0000
 JAMES F CALDWELL JR., 0000
 STEPHEN J CAMACHO, 0000
 JOSEPH F CAMPBELL, 0000
 WELDON J CAMPBELL JR., 0000
 DIANA T CANGELOSI, 0000
 GLENN E CANN, 0000
 CARL A CARPENTER, 0000
 CLARENCE E CARTER, 0000
 WALTER E CARTER JR., 0000
 WILLIAM M CAVITT, 0000
 JOHN M CHANDLER, 0000
 CARLOS M CHAVEZ, 0000
 JOHN N CHRISTENSON, 0000
 RANDY W CLARK, 0000
 RAY L CLARK JR., 0000
 WILLIAM J CLARK JR., 0000
 FRED E CLEVELAND, 0000
 MICHAEL A COLLINS, 0000
 MARK A COMPTON, 0000
 EDWARD M CONNOLLY, 0000
 MICHAEL J CONNOR, 0000
 KATHLENE CONTRES, 0000
 JAMES K COOK, 0000
 GARY T COOPER, 0000
 THOMAS H COPEMAN III, 0000
 CYNTHIA A COVELL, 0000
 SAMUEL G COWARD, 0000
 SCOTT T CRAIG, 0000
 ROBERT B CRISLER, 0000
 THOMAS A CROPPER, 0000
 PAUL A G CRUZ, 0000
 WILLIAM P CULLEN, 0000
 THOMAS J CULORA, 0000
 ALBERT CURRY JR., 0000
 BARRY F DAGNALL, 0000
 THOMAS J DARGAN, 0000
 JOHN R DAUGHERTY, 0000
 PHILIP S DAVIDSON, 0000
 SUSAN A DAVIES, 0000
 RICHARD L DAWE, 0000
 THOMAS P DEE, 0000
 DANA S DERVAY, 0000
 JEFFREY W DESPAIN, 0000
 ERNEST W DOBSON JR., 0000
 ROBERT E DOLAN, 0000
 MICHAEL J DONCH III, 0000
 PATRICK F DONOHUE, 0000
 TIMOTHY J DOOREY, 0000
 WILLIAM G DUBYAK, 0000
 WILLIAM M DUKE JR., 0000
 STEVEN R EASTBURG, 0000
 CRAWFORD A EASTERLING, 0000
 THOMAS J ECCLES, 0000
 ALAN E ESCHBACH, 0000
 ROBERT D ESTVANIK, 0000
 CHARLES EVERETT, 0000
 MANUEL E FALCON, 0000
 RICHARD H FANNEY, 0000
 PEGGY A FELDMANN, 0000
 JOEL D FELLOWS, 0000
 ROBERT A FFIELD, 0000
 TRACEY A FISCHER, 0000
 STEPHEN J FITZGERALD, 0000
 DEBRA M FORD, 0000
 MICHAEL J FOREMAN, 0000
 WILLIAM F FOSTER JR., 0000
 KEVIN K FRANK, 0000
 PETER W FURZE, 0000
 DONALD E GADDIS, 0000
 GARY D GALLOWAY, 0000
 GEORGE G GALYO, 0000
 KRISTINE H GEDDINGS, 0000
 BRADLEY R GEHRKE, 0000
 BARBARA A GERAGHTY, 0000
 JEFFREY L GERANAND, 0000
 JOSEPH C GUAQUINTO, 0000
 WILLIAM J GIERI, 0000
 LLOYD E GILHAM, 0000
 DAVID W GLAZIER, 0000
 MICHAEL D GNOZZIO, 0000
 DEVON G GOLDSMITH, 0000
 ANTHONY J GONZALES, 0000
 LEONARD E GORDON, 0000
 JEFFERY D GRADECK, 0000
 PETER A GUMATOTAO, 0000
 STEPHEN D HANCOCK, 0000
 WILLIAM J HARDEN, 0000
 DAVID C HARDESTY, 0000
 CHARLES G HART, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER C HAYES, 0000
 RICHARD HELMERLE, 0000
 MARK T HELMKAMP, 0000
 ROBERT HERNEGAN, 0000
 WILLIAM H HILARIDES, 0000
 THOMAS W HILLS, 0000
 JOSEPH B HOEING JR., 0000
 DONNA S W HOLLY, 0000
 JOSHUA P HOLTYMAN, 0000
 STEPHEN E HONAN, 0000
 RICHARD W HOOPEL, 0000
 JOSEPH A HORN, 0000
 DOUGLAS M HOWARD, 0000
 MICHELLE J HOWARD, 0000

STEPHEN H HUBER, 0000
 JAMES D HUCK, 0000
 GERARD P HUEBER, 0000
 JONATHAN W HULTS, 0000
 SHANNON M L HURLEY, 0000
 JOHN S HUSAIM, 0000
 PATRICIA A JACKSON, 0000
 PAUL J JAEGER, 0000
 SCOTT E JASPER, 0000
 BRENT W JETT JR., 0000
 ANTHONY W JILES, 0000
 THOMAS E JOHNSTON, 0000
 JEFFERY S JONES, 0000
 MARK D KAVANAUGH, 0000
 MARTIN J KEANEY, 0000
 HOWARD C KEESE, 0000
 GIBSON B KERR, 0000
 WILLIAM L KERVAHN, 0000
 KEVIN C KETCHMARK, 0000
 CRAIG S KLEINT, 0000
 PATRICK N KLUCKMAN, 0000
 MARY M KOLAR, 0000
 TERRY B KRAFT, 0000
 WALTER M KREITLER, 0000
 JEFFREY S KUNKEL, 0000
 NEAL J KUSUMOTO, 0000
 DAVID A LABARBERA, 0000
 ROBERT J LABELLE JR., 0000
 TARA L LACAVERA, 0000
 PAUL A LAIRD, 0000
 DWIGHT E LAMONT, 0000
 DAVID W LANDIS, 0000
 WILLIAM F LARSON, 0000
 MARK S LAUGHTON, 0000
 S J LAUKAITIS, 0000
 WENDY B LAWRENCE, 0000
 DAVID L LEACH, 0000
 JOHN C LEGG, 0000
 HARRY LEHMAN JR., 0000
 LAWRENCE L LEHMAN, 0000
 CRAIG D LESHER, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER R LINDSAY, 0000
 LEE H C LITTLE, 0000
 JEFFREY S LOCKE, 0000
 JOSEPH C LODMELL, 0000
 DONNA M LOONEY, 0000
 MICHAEL E LOPEZALEGRIA, 0000
 WILLIE T LOVETT III, 0000
 DALE A LUMME, 0000
 RUTLEDGE P LUMPKIN, 0000
 WILLIAM M LUOMA, 0000
 KEVIN B LYNCH, 0000
 EILEEN F MACKRELL, 0000
 JOHN L MADDEN, 0000
 THOMAS J MALONE, 0000
 MICHAEL C MANAZIR, 0000
 MICHAEL R MARA, 0000
 STEPHANIE A MARKAM, 0000
 PAMELA A MARKIEWICZ, 0000
 LOUIS D MARQUET, 0000
 RICHARD D MARVIN JR., 0000
 WILLIAM R MASSEY JR., 0000
 JOHN R MATHIS, 0000
 JAMES E MCALOON, 0000
 JOSEPH A MCBREARTY, 0000
 TIMOTHY A MCCANDLESS, 0000
 MARGARET A MCCLOSKEY, 0000
 JEANNE M MCDONNELL, 0000
 ANTHONY E MCFARLANE, 0000
 JOSEPH L MCGETTIGAN, 0000
 KATHLEEN A MCGRATH, 0000

FREDERICK P MCKENNA JR., 0000
 MICHAEL E MCCLAUGHLIN, 0000
 MICHAEL E MCMAHON, 0000
 JAMES P MCMANAMON, 0000
 STEVEN L MCSHANE, 0000
 THOMAS R MEHRINGER, 0000
 MICHAEL E MEIER, 0000
 JEFFREY B MILLER, 0000
 TODD R MILLER, 0000
 MARK E MILLS, 0000
 PATRICK M MILLS, 0000
 ROBERT M MOORE, 0000
 MICHAEL L MORAN, 0000
 JARRATT M MOWERY, 0000
 RICHARD H MOYER, 0000
 DENNIS J MURPHY, 0000
 MARK R MYERS, 0000
 ROBERT M NAVARRO, 0000
 THOMAS F NEDERVOLD, 0000
 BRIAN S NEUNABER, 0000
 MARY B NEWTON, 0000
 R J NIEWOEHNER, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER D NOBLE, 0000
 MARK L NOLD, 0000
 GREGORY R NOWAK, 0000
 KEVIN O'FLAHERTY, 0000
 EDMUND W OCALLAGHAN, 0000
 JAMES E OCONNOR, 0000
 JOHN F OHARA, 0000
 PATRICK W OKANE, 0000
 THOMAS P OKEEFE, 0000
 ROBERT E OLDANI, 0000
 BRIAN C ONEILL, 0000
 GEOFFREY T PACK, 0000
 TIGHE S PARMENTER, 0000
 DEAN M PEDERSEN, 0000
 SAMUEL PEREZ JR., 0000
 ROBERT H PERRY, 0000
 WILLIAM S PERSONIUS, 0000
 MATTHEW T PETERS, 0000
 GEORGE M PETRO, 0000
 DAVID T PITTELKOW, 0000
 BYRON K PRICE, 0000
 DONALD R PRICE, 0000
 DOUGLAS S PRINCE, 0000
 EDWARD J QUINN, 0000
 PATRICK F RAINEY, 0000
 JAMES P RANSOM, 0000
 JOHN B READ III, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER S REAL, 0000
 JEFFREY S REED, 0000
 MICHAEL S REED, 0000
 HELENA E REIDER, 0000
 PAULA M P RICKETTS, 0000
 PETER J RIESTER, 0000
 JOHN W RILEY III, 0000
 DAVID W ROBEBY, 0000
 FREDERICK J ROEGGE, 0000
 JOSEPH N ROGERS, 0000
 MICHAEL S ROGERS, 0000
 EDWARD D ROSEQUIST, 0000
 THOMAS S ROWDEN, 0000
 FRANCIS E SABLAN, 0000
 RIGOBERTO SAEZORTIZ, 0000
 NANCY J SANDERS, 0000
 RICHARD L SAUNDERS, 0000
 ROBERT E SCHUETT, 0000
 DENNIS A SCHULZ, 0000
 MICHAEL A SCHWARTZ, 0000
 ALAN D SCOTT, 0000
 EOLA L SCOTT, 0000

RUSSELL W SCOTT, 0000
 JOSEPH SENSI, 0000
 THOMAS K SHANNON, 0000
 HERMAN A SHELANSKI, 0000
 VINCIEN F SHORTS, 0000
 MARK R SICKERT, 0000
 JOHN H SINGLEY, 0000
 WILLIAM G SIZEMORE II, 0000
 JOSEPH E SKINNER, 0000
 FRANCIS R SLATTERY, 0000
 BRADLEY B SMITH, 0000
 FRED E SMITH, 0000
 GREGORY J SMITH, 0000
 JAY M SMITH, 0000
 MARTIN P SMITH, 0000
 STEPHEN S SMITH, 0000
 KENNETH V SMOLANA, 0000
 DENNIS R SORESENSEN, 0000
 JOSEPH A SPATA, 0000
 LINDA S SPEED, 0000
 JAMES M SPENCE, 0000
 CHERYL L SPOHNHOLTZ, 0000
 JAMES A STEWART, 0000
 SCOTT D STEWART, 0000
 MARK H STONE JR., 0000
 MARK G STORCH, 0000
 EAMON N STORRS, 0000
 THOMAS J STREI JR., 0000
 JOSEPH STUYVESANT, 0000
 PATRICIA M SUDOL, 0000
 MITCHELL T SWECKER, 0000
 JOSEPH A SYCHTERZ III, 0000
 LAUREN TAULMAN, 0000
 KEVIN B TAYLOR, 0000
 THOMAS R TAYLOR JR., 0000
 CATHY A THOMAS, 0000
 FRANK THORP IV, 0000
 HOWARD W THORP JR., 0000
 TIMOTHY S TIBBITS, 0000
 DAVID W TITTLE, 0000
 JAMES W TRUEBLOOD, 0000
 JEFFREY TRUMBORE, 0000
 WAYNE A TUNICK, 0000
 MICHAEL J TURNER, 0000
 RONALD J UNTERREINER, 0000
 WILLIAM H VALENTINE, 0000
 ANTHONY VANARIA IV, 0000
 JAMES T VAZQUEZ, 0000
 KENNETH J VOORHEES, 0000
 ROBERT M WALL, 0000
 DENNIS G WATSON, 0000
 MARION E WATSON JR., 0000
 DAVID B WAUGH, 0000
 THOMAS H WEBBER, 0000
 ANNE L WESTERFIELD, 0000
 CHRISTY J WHEELER, 0000
 JAMES R WHITE JR., 0000
 JOHN G R WILSON, 0000
 JR R D WILSON, 0000
 EDWARD G WINTERS III, 0000
 GARE M WRAGG, 0000
 STEVEN W WRIGHT, 0000
 WALTER J WRIGHT, 0000
 TODD A ZECCHIN, 0000
 ROBERT A ZELLMANN, 0000
 JEFFREY N ZERBE, 0000
 RONALD E ZIEMBKO, 0000
 MICHAEL A ZIESER, 0000