



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2001

No. 24

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable GEORGE ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Virginia.

PRAYER

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

Trust in the Lord with all your heart, and lean not on your own understanding; in all your ways acknowledge Him, and He will direct your paths.—Proverbs 3:5,6.

Gracious God, we put our trust in You. We resist the human tendency to lean on our own understanding; we acknowledge our need for Your wisdom in our search for solutions all of us can support. As an intentional act of will, we commit to You everything we think, say, and do today. Direct our paths as we give precedence to patriotism over party and loyalty to You over anything or anyone else. We need You, Father. Strengthen each one of us and strengthen our oneness. In the name of our Lord. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable GEORGE ALLEN 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 legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2001.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable GEORGE ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADERSHIP TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the 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, with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, or his designee.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader, the Senator from Wyoming, is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business throughout the day. At 12:30, the Senate will recess for weekly party conferences to meet. When the Senate reconvenes at 2:15, there will be an additional period of morning business to allow Senators to introduce legislation and to make statements.

By previous consent, when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it will recess until 8:30 tonight. Senators are reminded to be in the Senate Chamber by 8:30 to proceed as a body at 8:40 this evening to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the President's address.

THE BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, one of the most important things we do in the Senate throughout the year is to put together a budget. The budget, of course, on its face, is how we spend the money. However, it is much more than that. It sets the priorities of the Senate and the Congress and the Government, what the Government will do throughout the year, by adjudicating and allocating these expenditures to certain areas.

In addition, of course, it has to do with the broader issue of what size Government we have, what is the role of the Government, and what is the role of the Federal Government vis-a-vis other governments. So it is one of the most important documents and one of the most important activities we engage in during the entire year.

The President this evening will lay forth his priorities for budgeting, which, of course, will be very important. He will set out the expenditure level for this country. These things all become very important. We are going to hear more about it today.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah, Mr. BENNETT.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, tonight we will hear from President Bush as he presents the budget. I remember when I first came to this town as a very young man back in the 1960s, one of my wise mentors commented that every President enjoys a honeymoon, and it lasts until he offers his first budget. Once we get down to the money, the platitudes stop; that is when the honeymoon ends.

I suppose tonight we will see the end of whatever honeymoon President Bush is experiencing as people begin to disagree with his priorities with respect to the money. That is as it should be.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1593

We should get away from the generalities and, frankly, the hyperbole of the political campaign and down to the realities of governing as quickly as possible.

I can't help but think back over my first experience as a Member of this body some 8 years ago when President Clinton presented his first budget. I was a brand-new Member of the minority. I had gone through the campaign with President Clinton. He and I had both campaigned on the same thing: Change. He, of course, wanted to change the Presidency; I wanted to change the Congress. He succeeded; I didn't. But I at least got elected back into a Congress where the Republicans were very much in the minority.

In his campaign, President Clinton promised a middle-class tax cut. But when he stood before America on that first occasion and presented his first budget, he said things were so much different once he had gotten into the Presidency than he had thought they were when he was running for the Presidency he had to not only rescind his call for a tax cut but ask for a tax increase.

One of the things I am looking forward to tonight is that President George W. Bush will not change from the position he took in the campaign. He promised he would campaign for a tax cut, for tax relief, and I understand tonight he will, in fact, propose that on which he campaigned—tax relief.

He will propose a number of other things. We will go down them in the standard checklist, laundry list fashion of politicians, and say that is too much for this, that is not enough for that, we are in favor of this, but we want to amend that. And we will go down it as if this is a checklist that is cast in bronze. We will fight over the details.

Again, I have learned that is what goes on around here. In fact, however, if we can step back from that process for a minute, we should realize the economy is not a checklist. The economy is a constantly shifting, constantly changing series of literally millions of priorities on the part of individuals. Individuals change jobs; individuals graduate from college; individuals start businesses; individuals see their businesses fail. Sometimes large corporations see their businesses fail. The best projections come to sometimes unpleasant surprises.

Look, for example, at what was billed as the largest merger in the history of the automotive industry, Daimler and Chrysler. Daimler, the organization from Germany, thought they were buying the crown jewel of the American automobile industry in Chrysler, the most profitable of the big three in America, only to discover a few years later their projections had gone awry and they were facing mountains of red ink. Now they are scrambling to change.

We are looking at the best projections we can find with respect to what will happen in the American economy

over the next 10 years, and we are setting down some priorities as to how we will respond if, indeed, those projections come to pass. I make here a very bold prediction: The projections we have before us for the next 10 years will not be accurate.

That is a very far limb I am going out on, I realize, but I feel confident with that. I will be even more specific: They will either be too good or too bad. We have never had the experience of any Federal agency making projections over the coming years with anything like the pinpoint accuracy we presume when we debate budgets around here. We stand here and we say this is so many billion too high for this and so many billion too low, and so on. Then reality comes in, and we are always stunned that it is different from our projections.

When I first came here 8 years ago and debated President Clinton's first projections, we were being told with absolute certainty that we were facing budget deficits as far as the eye could see and we had to have this tax increase to deal with these overwhelming deficits. Now we are being told we are facing budget surpluses that will go on as far as the eye can see into the trillions of dollars.

I happen to think we will, indeed, see surpluses but they will not be in the exact order of magnitude that our current projections say they will. They will be, I say with great confidence, either higher or lower. It is similar to the question someone asked of, I believe it was J.P. Morgan, when they said, "What will the stock market do today?" thinking he was the greatest expert on the stock market. He looked at his questioner with great sagacity, and he said: "It will fluctuate."

What will the economy do? It will grow or it will shrink, and it will do so in a pattern that is virtually impossible to estimate with the exactness that we get budget figures. To say the total surplus over the next 10 years will be exactly \$5.6 trillion is an exercise in guessing—creative guessing, educated guessing, well-researched guessing, but it is still guessing.

So as we get into the budget President Bush will give us, and as we go through the necessary exercise of adopting exact numbers, let us recognize that this is an exercise we go through every year. Every year we adjust the budget, every year we adjust our guesses, every year we try to do a little better than we did the year before, and every year we have a year's more hard data behind us that we hope will help guide us where we are going in the future.

We now know, for example, when President Clinton said we were in a serious recession as we were adopting the budget in 1993, if we look back at the economic data, the recession in fact ended in 1991. It still felt like a recession, but we were, in fact, not in one. I think we took some steps that, in retrospect, we probably should not have

taken on the basis of what things seemed to be rather than on the basis of what things were.

All right, having said that, let me comment on what I see in President George W. Bush's budget. He is setting out his priorities. I think that is what we should focus on: What are the priorities that this President hopes this Congress will adopt as we look to the future.

My own guess of the future surplus is that it is going to be better, in terms of Federal income, than \$5.6 trillion. I think the \$5.6 trillion number which has been adopted as the best summary of the various estimates is probably low. If I were the CEO of a business looking at this kind of forecast, I would say let's get fairly aggressive at trying to grow the business, let's get fairly aggressive at taking those steps that will prepare us for the prosperity that we think lies ahead.

I think there are those who say: No, no, the \$5.6 trillion number is too high; let us get very conservative; let us get very restrictive with what we do with the money in this budget. My own gut tells me that is the way to make sure we do not hit the \$5.6 trillion, that we constrict the growth, and we see to it that this economy gets less rather than more in the future.

But these are the President's priorities as I understand them. Let me just list them and then talk about whether or not it is a good set of priorities. His first priority has to do with improving our educational system. I think our educational system since the demise of the Soviet Union has become the No. 1 survival issue for the United States. If we do not get our educational system geared to the needs of the future, we will pay a huge price in the future. So his priority of improving education strikes me as the right budgetary priority, the thing that should be first.

Next is protecting Social Security. That has become the Holy Grail of American politics. Every politician says he wants to protect Social Security. It is to be expected that President Bush will put it right next to education.

Next, preserve Medicare. I have a little bit of a reaction to that language, "preserve Medicare," because I have found that everybody who deals with Medicare in its present structure hates it. Oh, they don't hate the idea of having money to deal with their health care problem, but the structure is absolutely devastating. Yes, from a budgetary standpoint I think what the President is going to propose is wise. But I hope as we go through that process we can start talking about changing Medicare so human beings can understand it.

Just a quick vignette: I have a constituent who came to me and she said: I am a very intelligent person, I think. I am a college graduate, and I have a professional life. I take care of my mother's medical problems, and my mother is on Medicare.

She said: I am totally defeated by the paper that comes through the mail to me with respect to mother's Medicare, and I finally adopted this strategy. I throw everything away, and once a month I call the Salt Lake Clinic where my mother is being treated and I say, "How much money do I owe you?" And they give me a number, and I write them a check.

She said that is the only way she can deal with the complexities that come out of Medicare.

A much younger man who came to me when we were out in our home States celebrating Presidents Day said: My father just went on Medicare. I had no idea how disastrously complicated that really is and how far short of really meeting his needs it is.

So let's not get carried away in the political rhetoric of preserving Medicare to think that the Medicare system as it is currently running makes any sense at all. Let us understand that if we are going to fund Medicare—and President Bush recommends that we do—we have the responsibility to do some fairly heavy lifting between now and the time that funding comes along, to examine the way Medicare is run.

I hope Secretary Thompson, as the new Secretary of HHS, will take a long, hard look at HCFA and say what can be done to make the Medicare accounting process and examination of claims process intelligible to human beings because it is clearly not that at the moment.

All right: Education, Social Security, Medicare—defense. One of the things we have seen over the last 8 years has been what used to be called the peace dividend. Ever since Ronald Reagan and George Bush's father, Bush the 1st, or Bush the 41st—whatever shorthand title we wish to put on him—ended the cold war and the Soviet Union disappeared, we have seen the defense budget as a percentage of gross domestic product decrease dramatically. We should see that happen. That is the peace dividend we should hope for.

When President Clinton used to stand and say this is the smallest Government in a generation, basically he was talking about the Defense Department. All of the shrinking of civilian jobs in the Government, of which he was so proud, occurred primarily in the Defense Department. We got to the point where we went a little too far with that. Our defense budget is now a smaller percentage of the gross domestic product than it was prior to World War II.

It is back to the 1939–1940 level. It is beginning to show. We do not need the kind of defense we needed during the cold war, but we need a defense that can deter anyone who would like to take us to world war III. It is appropriate that President Bush has listed that as his next priority.

Improving health care. I have already talked about improvements I would like to see in Medicare. President Bush recognizes that this is an area where we need to spend more, not less.

Interestingly, many Republicans say any kind of government expenditure is bad. They want to cut anything. And any budget cut that comes along, they immediately clear. This is an area where we should not be cutting because it is an investment that will, indeed, pay huge dividends in the future. I am delighted, as one who has supported doubling the funding for NIH and other basic research in health care, to note that President Bush is going to double the funding for medical research on such important health issues as cancer. I look forward to the country reaping the benefits of that kind of investment.

The fact that President Bush can talk about that kind of an increase even as he is talking about presiding over a smaller government demonstrates that this is a man who has his priorities straight. This has been a Republican initiative right from the first. It started with Senator Connie Mack of Florida who has had personal experience with the ravages of cancer. He didn't just have a knee-jerk response to those experiences but began to look into what was being done at the National Institutes of Health and the National Cancer Institute, and came back to the rest of us and said this is good, sound investment.

Hearings were held. Testimony was taken. We Republicans led the way on seeing to it that basic health research would be increased very substantially in this country because we recognized the dividends that would pass.

I am delighted to note that President Bush is going to carry on that Republican initiative that began on the floor of this Senate with Senator Mack from Florida and is proposing this kind of an increase for NIH medical research.

Next, the environment. We hear an enormous amount of conversation about the environment. We must cut back on this; we must do that, and so on. Frankly, if you dig into it, from my point of view, much of it is based on what is being called junk science.

Junk science, to summarize it very quickly, is that science that is produced and then taken to the media rather than for peer review. Scientists come to a conclusion and then call a press conference rather than turning to other scientists to say where they went wrong. Once the media has hold of it and has spread it, then there is no calling it back. Then it gets set into the public mind, and the public culture is absolute truth. Those who try to catch up with it after the fact always have difficulty. We have seen examples of that. One that rankled the agricultural field was the excitement over the alar scare where film stars suddenly became scientists and testified before the Congress about all of the apples being tainted. Checking into it carefully and doing peer review indicated that, in fact, alar was not going to poison every man, woman, and child in the United States. But the scare had a tremendous impact on apple growers. Frankly, parents wanted kids to eat more apples.

And it has taken a long time for the reality to catch up with that kind of junk science.

When we are talking about the environment, let's not talk about junk science. Let's talk about some significant investments in the environment that make sense.

President Bush is proposing fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is a \$900 million commitment, and he is giving EPA the second highest operating budget in its history which, for whatever it is worth, happens to be \$59 million higher than the request from President Clinton.

I am not at all impressed with the idea that we must spend more than President Clinton in a certain area. But since there are those in the media who think President Clinton was the example of how you fund efforts on the environment, I think it is important to point out that George W. Bush is not cutting back on that kind of commitment.

Those are his priorities. Identify first; then the standard, Social Security and Medicare; a new one for the administration, which is defense, funding for health care research, and activities to protect the environment. Those are a pretty good series of priorities, in my view.

But there are two others that are in this particular budget that are different from what we have seen. One is a commitment to pay off the debt.

When I first got here 8 years ago, we were told with the same confidence that we are being told about surpluses how we would have deficits as far as the eye could see. Those deficits have disappeared. They have turned into surpluses because the economy has—surprise—grown faster than anybody anticipated it would and registered those projections, inaccurate as that. As that is going on, we must continue to pay down the debt. George W. Bush said we will do that.

It comes down to this: He says: These are my priorities; these are the priorities I recommend to the Congress. Once these priorities are fully funded, we have this much left over. And what do we do with the money left over? He says we do two things: First, we pay down the debt; second, we give whatever is left back to the people who have been overcharged for the Government services they have been buying with their taxes.

I think that is an appropriate arrangement of the money. Here is the priority. Here is what we are going to spend it on. Yes, we are going to be spending more than we were spending in the past, but we still have this much left.

What do we do with that which we have left? We pay our debts and we give money back to people whom we have overcharged. Could anything be fairer than that? Can anything be simpler than that? But the big fight, of course, is going to be on the last item—giving money back to those who have been

overcharged. Who are they? Maybe the people who should get the money back shouldn't be the people who sent it here in the first place. Maybe the money should not go back to the people who were overcharged but to the people who never shopped in the first place.

That would be the conversation we would have if this were a business. Of course, it wouldn't be cast in those terms because this is not a business. This is a government. As a government in a democracy, this means there are votes to be courted. There are special interest groups to be satisfied. When we get back to that area of money to be given back to those who have been overcharged, that is where the heat will come. That is where the rhetoric will come. That is where the shouting will come. That is where we will have our most bitter debates.

I, for one, am encouraged by the fact that the heart of President Bush's tax plan is the reduction of the marginal rate. This is why.

First, there is the question of fairness. Should anybody be required to pay more than a third of his or her income to the Federal Government? If you take a poll—there are those who live by polls in this Chamber—and ask the American people what should be the highest total anybody should pay, over the years the numbers have stayed pretty stable. It is 25 percent. Most Americans think no one should be forced to pay more than 25 percent of his or her income into the Federal Government. We are now close to 40. President Bush is saying no. Let's bring that number back to a third. Let's bring that number back to 33. I don't think that is unreasonable. I think it fits with where the American people think we ought to be.

The second reason why I think we ought to bring down the top rate from roughly 40 to a third is because I recognize that it is in that area that the American entrepreneurial machine takes hold. Look at our counterparts in Europe. Japan: I have owned a business in Japan. I have been involved in a joint venture with companies in Europe. I know that in those countries they have many of the things we have. You think they are almost identical. They have big corporations. They have hard-working people. They have a well-educated workforce. The one thing they don't have that is almost uniquely American, with perhaps the exception of Hong Kong, is they do not have the entrepreneurial spirit. And where do the entrepreneurs fund their businesses? They fund their businesses—the growth, the new jobs, the new creation—at the edge of the marginal tax rate.

If you bring the top marginal tax rate down from 40 percent to 33 percent, you are going to see a whole host of new industries, new enterprises, and new activities spring up that will make it possible for the higher end of the projection of what will happen in the economy come to pass.

Mr. President, that is a brief overview of the President's proposal. I look forward to hearing him flesh it out tonight in his presentation to the joint session of Congress. I express my delight that we are going to hear this President stand true to the things he said during the campaign. It will be a refreshing change.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Utah for his remarks about the budget.

I have had some White House briefings on what would be in the President's budget. It is so refreshing to see a President, who made promises, and tonight is going to unveil his plans to keep the promises he made to the American people.

I, as one Member of the Senate, am certainly going to try to help the President keep those promises because I, too, made those promises to the American people because I believe we can treat this budget as any family in America treats their household budget; that is, we can make priorities. We can decide what we want to spend more money to do, what we want to spend less money to do, and where our priorities are going to be for saving our own money. That is the theory behind the President's budget.

He is basically saying: We are going to cover our priorities. We are going to increase spending in the priority areas. We are going to flat line the areas that are not priorities or areas where the project is complete. And we are going to have more of our own money back in our pocketbooks. At the same time, the President is going to pay down the debt at the greatest rate that we can pay it down. I think that is a balanced approach.

Let's talk about some of the priorities. One that I am very pleased the President is going to put forward is the No. 1 priority, which is education. Public education is the foundation of our country. It is what makes us different from most other countries in the world; and that is we want public education to give every child the chance to reach his or her full potential; that they can go to public schools all their life, and they will have a great education that will allow them to do whatever they want to do in life. That is the American way. We have fallen behind in that dream. The President wants that dream to come back. And Congress is going to support him. We are going to make sure every child can reach his or her full potential in this country with a public education.

So we are going to target those funds so that when the local school district wants to do creative things—wants to have teacher incentives, wants to encourage people to come from careers into the classroom, or from military retirement into the classroom—we will allow that alternative certification to bring that person in to give language

or math or science that is not able to be offered in that school unless we do some creative recruiting.

Those are the kinds of things that we want to foster with the Federal funds. We want the decisions to be made at the local level. We want goals to make sure every child can read by the third grade because we know if a child cannot read in the third grade, they are going to start falling behind. Of course, they are not going to be able to pass algebra if they do not have the basic reading skills. So we take one step at a time. And we start with the basics. That is what the goals will be.

Secondly, tonight our President is going to call for prescription drug benefits and options under Medicare. That is very important. Fifteen years ago, people would have had to go in the hospital; they would have to have major surgery to treat an illness. Today, that can be done with drugs. And, yes, those prescription drugs are expensive. So we need to make sure we are covering those drug costs and giving people the options to be able to afford the drugs they need to stay healthy, while at the same time having their other living expenses be covered.

So we want to have a prescription drug option in Medicare. We want to have benefits for those who cannot afford it. That is going to be a priority in the President's budget.

We are going to keep national defense as our highest priority. We are going to make sure our military is strong and ready. I have visited our troops in the field all over the world. I know morale has been low. We have not focused enough on our national defense and the people who are serving in our military. So we are going to have pay raises, we are going to upgrade the health care for our military personnel and their families, and we are going to make sure they have quality housing.

Just last week, in Texas, I was at Fort Sam Houston and I walked through housing where the paint was peeling. That is not acceptable. We are not going to have that for our military personnel. We are going to give them good, quality housing and health care. We are going to make sure their children have quality education, especially on the bases that have school districts within the bases. We are going to step up to the plate to make sure we are doing what is necessary to give our young people, who are the dependents of military personnel, a quality public education.

So we are going to do those things to upgrade our military. And we are going to make sure we have the quality equipment and the training to give these people who are pledging their lives for our freedom the chance to do their jobs, and to do it right. We are going to support our military.

These are areas where we are going to increase spending.

I believe Congress will support President Bush's initiatives in the budget.

Also, another priority we have not talked very much about is a rainy day

fund. President Bush is going to put in place a rainy day fund. Some people are concerned that maybe our economy will go soft. We do not want to get into a deficit again. So he is going to suggest we have a rainy day fund. And I am going to support him all the way. I will introduce legislation to make sure we have a rainy day fund, just like every home in America will have if they have a quality budget in their homes—a rainy day fund for emergencies.

So those are the priorities we will have in our budget. But it is no less of a priority that we also pay down the debt and that we have more money for taxpayers in their own pocketbooks because they are sending too much to Washington in income taxes.

It is very important that people be able to keep more of the money they earn because people are paying higher taxes than they have ever paid in peacetime. We need to give them some relief, particularly because the economy is a little soft right now. We want people to have the confidence they can spend their money.

But we also want them to be able to save some of their money. So we are going to have a balanced plan that will pay down the debt and will give tax relief for hard-working Americans—for every hard-working American. We are going to have priority spending, and we are going to do what every household in America will do; that is, provide for the priorities in our budget and not spend more in the areas where we do not need to spend more and target those areas where we know we are going to have to do a better job than we have been doing in national defense, in education, in prescription drug options. Those are the things we will focus on in this budget.

I am so pleased our President is showing the leadership we have needed in this country to go in the right direction for responsible stewardship of our taxpayer dollars.

Mr. President, I thank you and look forward to introducing the legislation and working with others who have already introduced legislation to accomplish the goals that will be outlined tonight by the President of the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk has proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PROPOSAL

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I wish to address my colleagues for a few minutes about the budget proposal that the President will put forward tonight. I look forward to the proposal. I think it is going to have a number of priorities for the country and the direction in which the country should move. These priorities include fiscal restraint, debt reduction, and responsible tax relief. It is these three areas that I want to address briefly today. The President will put forward a budget request that certainly has plenty of spending in it—in my estimation, probably too much. It is a \$1.9 trillion budget. That is a very large proposal. It includes responsible tax relief—\$1.6 trillion in tax relief over a 10-year period of time. This will set the stage for an honest discussion of taxes and needed tax cuts.

As colleagues know, the budget surplus projected by the Congressional Budget Office is lower than it would have been without the increases in spending by Congress over the past few years.

I have a chart that points out what happens with surpluses. We should be saving the surplus and cutting taxes with it, however people say: We have all this money, let's spend it. This is what happened during the spending spree in the last 6 months of last year, which reduced the 10-year surplus by \$561 billion alone. That happened during a 6-month period at the end of last year. There is an iron rule of government that if you have money lying on the table, it is going to be spent. We need to pay down the debt and cut taxes; we don't need these sizes of spending increases across the board. We need increases in some areas, and we need to cut spending in other areas.

The second point is fiscal discipline, particularly in the area of corporate welfare. Now is the time, as we look at re-prioritizing—putting more money in some areas and less in others—to address corporate welfare and zero these areas out, putting funds from these areas in such places as the President has proposed, and increasing the budget for the National Institutes of Health.

The President is proposing an increase in NIH funding of \$2.8 billion, or almost 14 percent. I think this is something for which we can all be proud. It is a basic research function. It helps us in discovering what we can do to live longer, healthier lives. That is very good. Let's take the increase in funding from places like corporate welfare and put it into NIH without a huge growth in the overall spending.

I am particularly heartened that the President is looking at doing exactly this—cutting in some areas to produce increases in other areas. Yet, at the same time, the President is trimming the growth of Government spending down to a 4-percent growth rate. This constitutes important increases in

funding for programs in Government that deserve more funding, as well as reductions in other areas of Government that need to be reevaluated.

I want to point out two other things because there are a number of people saying the size of the tax cut is too big. It is \$1.6 trillion over a 10-year period. To give the overall example of what is taking place, here is a pie chart of the Bush tax cut as a portion of the total revenue during this 10-year time period. Total revenue is \$28.4 trillion; the Bush tax cut is \$1.6 trillion. The Bush tax cut proposal is a small portion of total revenue. In a situation where we are overtaxing the public, we can afford to do this.

What about the allocation of this surplus that we have? Are we using enough to pay down the debt? The answer is, yes, we are. We should pay down the debt, and we can pay down the debt. The remaining surplus is \$1.1 trillion; the Bush tax proposal is \$1.6 trillion. The Social Security and Medicare funds set-aside are \$2.9 trillion. This is an allocation of where the overall surplus is going. Most of it is going to Social Security and Medicare.

So what we need is a good, honest debate about tax cuts.

A final point I want to make is about triggers on tax cuts. Some say, well, OK, we will do tax cuts, but if our receipts aren't as large as projected, if the surplus isn't as big as it is projected to be, let's cut the size of this tax cut. I don't think that is a good idea. Tax cuts need to be firmly in place for the community and the Nation to be able to react and say: I am going to have more confidence and wherewithal to spend if I know the tax cut will be here.

I don't think triggers are a good idea. But if triggers get put in for a smaller tax cut—say, if our receipts are lower than we project and we put in a trigger to make the tax cut smaller—we should say if the surplus is bigger than projected, let's have a trigger for a bigger tax cut. If we are going to produce a trigger for a smaller one, let's look at a trigger for a bigger tax cut if receipts are larger than currently being projected in the budget.

This is an exciting time for us in the country as we look at the prospects of the new President putting forward his budget allocations. There is going to be a lot to talk about, in a positive sense, on fiscal restraint, debt reduction, and tax relief—important topics for this body and for the American public.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, if there is time remaining for the majority party, I won't take their time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I believe there will be. The time expires at 11.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Fine.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary status?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I would be pleased to speak for the Republican Party if the Senator wants me to.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator would care to, I would be surprised but certainly happy about it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will follow the Senator.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are talking about the budget this morning, about the tax reductions that the President will speak of this evening, I think talking about the importance of how the budget is arranged, how it matches the needs of our people, of our country. It seems to me, as I think I mentioned before, it is one of the most important decisions we will make, and that is the allocation and indeed the priorities of what our program will be in the coming year.

I want to just talk in more general terms perhaps about some parts of it. First of all, I think in most everything we do here, we ought to try to have a vision of what it is we are seeking to accomplish a little way down the road and, hopefully, sometimes quite a way down the road, 10 or 20 years. What do we want the country to look like in 10, 20 years? What is it we want to do during the next year? That has a great deal of impact on what we do with financing and with the budget.

Of course, one of the priorities has been security and defense. I think, clearly, it is time to take a long look at that and make additional investments in our military and in our defense.

One of the things that needs immediate attention is the welfare of our military men and women. I think all of us have taken the occasion to visit military bases—in some cases overseas—such as Warren Air Force Base in Cheyenne, WY. Last year, I had the opportunity to return to the base where I served in the military, Quantico, VA. The first place they took me, in terms of their needs, was housing for the military.

The President has indicated his desire to immediately increase spending for salaries for the military, housing, and health care. There is no question that ought to be one of our priorities.

Following that, there ought to be a substantial review of our military strategic needs, because changes have taken place in the world and changes have taken place in military structures. That is a wise thing to do in terms of further funding. It seems to me that priority is one that encompasses a notion that we want to take better care of those men and women who have volunteered to be in the service to protect their country, and then take a long look at our capacity to deal with today's threats and the threats we will see tomorrow.

Education: Every time one takes a poll or asks questions of folks in my State or nationwide, education is generally the No. 1 issue. It is easy to be for education, but it is a little bit more difficult to figure out what to do about it. Nevertheless, I think all will agree education is a high priority, that education is something we have to look to down the road. What is more important than providing a good education for the young people who are going to be running this world?

We find ourselves with some differences about how we do that. A strong feeling has existed that Washington ought to decide what the money is for; it ought to be sent from Washington with attached instructions as to how to use it. I believe strongly that the needs in Meeteetse, WY, are different from the needs in Pittsburgh. Local people in the States ought to have the opportunity to use those dollars as they see fit, with some accountability, so we can ensure our kids are getting the best education and can have a successful life. Again, I hope we can see what we want for education.

I am particularly interested in the third priority the President has laid out, and that is energy. We have some problems in energy. Hopefully, some of them are short term. We have some long-term opportunities to do the things in the field of energy that we want to happen. One of them is to improve and increase domestic production so we are not totally dependent on OPEC and overseas imports of foreign energy. That is not wrong necessarily, but we become a victim of imports.

We need an energy policy. We have not had an energy policy over the last number of years. The policies are fairly broad, and they are implemented in more detail, but it is my view that we need a policy for energy. It ought to be one that encourages domestic production, and there are many ways to do that. Some, I suppose, will be by way of taxes. I am not as excited about that as I am the opportunity to encourage domestic production.

I spent last week in Wyoming. Wyoming is one of the large energy producers in this country. We have an opportunity to increase our gas production—we are doing that now—and we have an opportunity to increase oil production. We are the largest producer of coal in the Nation. Coal is a basic resource but can even be better as we do research. Domestic production is one part of a basic policy.

Research: We need to continue research. One area is to make coal cleaner and to enrich coal so we get more Btu's out of coal and bring the transportation costs down.

We want to do more with air quality, and we can. In almost any instance, it is fair to say when you have large electric generators, up in the 1,500-megawatt area, coal is the most efficient producer of energy, and we need to research that.

We need diversity of energy sources. I am a great supporter of natural gas,

but we find ourselves overly dependent on natural gas. Natural gas is a flexible fuel that can be used not only for stationary generation but also can be used for many other things.

I hope we will have some diversity, that we will have hydro, coal, and oil. We ought to also be working on diversity of renewable energy. We can do more in renewables than we have in the past, and that ought to be part of our basic policy.

Transportation: Energy has to be moved. We see the problem in California. Part of the problem is the unwillingness or the inability, at least the absence of transmission lines and pipelines, to move energy. Some people don't like to see transmission lines. They won't see them because it will be dark. That is the choice we have to make. We need to do that. It is increasingly difficult to get the easements to do that.

Conservation: Part of our policy ought to be the more efficient use of energy so that we can get more out of our energy and renewables, as I have mentioned. Of course, one of our goals, one of our missions, ought to be a reasonable price for the consumers. We have seen that change in the last several months. That is not something we want to continue.

We ought to be looking at defense, education, and energy. Medicare is very important to health care. It needs to be revised. There have been a number of efforts to do that. We have not completed those efforts. We need to include some aspect of pharmaceuticals.

What do we want to see in the future? I happen to be cochairman of the conference on rural health care in our caucus. Rural health care is a little different from health care in the large cities. Not every little town in every State is going to have all kinds of medical care. They are not going to have specialists. We need an outreach so that all people in this country have access to health care. It needs to be done differently. We need telemedicine. We need to do a number of things. That is another goal we need to pursue and envision where we want to be.

Social Security: If we do not do something with Social Security, these young people here, who now have 12.5 percent of their salaries withdrawn when they work, will not have benefits. We can change that. We are going to be talking about individual accounts that can be invested in the private sector, that can be invested in equities or bonds and can offer a much higher return so they will have benefits.

I hope, rather than seeking to find a political item to work on for the election of 2002, we can take a longer look at these issues and say here is where we want to be and here is what it takes to do that. We have a great opportunity in terms of tax relief, our budget, our spending, and we have that opportunity now. I hope we take full advantage of it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

TAX CUTS

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I won't speak for the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Kansas, or Republicans but I will speak for myself and I hope many in my party.

First, I start with what I think people in Minnesota and people in the country mean by civility. I don't think they mean there should be no debate. I think people are all for passionate debate. They just want to make sure it is civil debate. What I say on the floor of the Senate is based upon what I honestly believe is good and right for Minnesota and my country, but it is not at all directed at any of my colleagues on the other side in any personal way, nor is it directed at the President in any personal way.

Second, another operational definition before I go forward with my comments: what do people mean by "the center"? I think people want us to govern at the center of their lives. I will say something I heard my colleague from Wyoming mention and I agree. Part of what people are focused on is education—no question. People are focused on health security. People are very focused on affordable child care, which I view as education. It is silly to define education as kindergarten through 12. I think it is pre-K all the way to age 65. Elderly people and other working families are focused on the cost of prescription drugs. Many can't afford it. People are also focused, of course, on how to have a small business or a family farm or have a job from which they can support their family.

Those are issues that are terribly important to people, and there are other issues as well. One we will deal with within the next month will be reform and how we can really move to a political process which, hopefully, will be less dependent on big money and more dependent on big and little people.

I want to speak directly, given this introduction, to the President's tax cut. We have heard from a number of Senators about specifics, so I don't need to go over them. To make a very long story short, after we take this \$1.6 trillion tax cut and add additional costs, interest that has to be paid, and after we look at what we have by way of surplus—that is to say, non-Social Security, non-Medicare—basically, what we have is a tax cut that represents a Robin-Hood-in-reverse approach to public policy. That is what we have when, depending upon whose estimate one believes, the top 1 percent of our population gets anywhere from 40 to 45 percent of the tax benefits of the Bush plan. Unbelievable. It is similar to a subsidy in inverse relationship to need.

Now, again, understand—a Robin-Hood-in-reverse tax cut has the wealthy benefitting. At the same time, let me take the President's words in

his inaugural speech about leaving no child behind. At the same time, one-third of the children in America today live in families who will not receive one dime from this tax cut; 50 percent of African American children live in families in our country who will not receive one dime from this tax cut; and about 57 percent of Latino, Latina children live in families who will not receive one dime from this tax cut because none of it is refundable.

If you live in a family with an income of less than \$27,000 a year, you receive no benefit.

The argument is, they don't pay any taxes. These families pay payroll tax; they pay sales tax. You better believe they pay taxes. These are some of the children who are most deserving in terms of being given a chance to reach their full potential. It is not in this tax cut proposal.

While on the one hand we have most of the benefits going to the top 1 percent, we have very few of the benefits going to those families and those children most in need. It is outrageous.

One amendment I will prepare when we bring this reconciliation bill to the floor will be an amendment to make the child credit refundable. Then we can help a lot of children and a lot of families. For all Senators who say, "we are for children, we are for children, we are for children, we are for the future, leave no child behind," I want to give them a chance to vote on that.

Let me go on and make another point which I think is the second and, to me, the most devastating critique of this tax cut proposal by President Bush. It is not unlike 1981. If we do this, there will be precious little for any investment in any other areas—I think by design. I think this is an administration, in spite of its rhetoric about leaving no child behind, which basically believes most citizens should be on their own.

So there will not be the funding to make sure senior citizens can afford prescription drug costs. No question about it. There will not be the funding for expanding health care coverage for our citizens. No question about it. And there certainly will not be the funding for education and to leave no child behind.

Now, the President tried to argue the other day—it has already been shot down—that there is a huge increase in the education budget. Mr. President, some of it was forward funding from this past year. As it turns out, over the last 5 or 6 years, this is the smallest percentage increase we have seen except for one out of the last 5 years. That hardly represents some dramatic, new investment in children.

So my question is, How do you leave no child behind when only 2 percent of the children who could benefit from early Head Start—2 years of age and under, the most critical years for learning—right now benefit? That is all the funding we have. And there are really no additional resources for early Head Start. Only 50 percent of the chil-

dren who can benefit from Head Start—that is, to give a head start to the children who come from disadvantaged backgrounds—and there is going to be a pittance for any additional funding—when 11 percent of the children who could benefit from affordable child care—that is just low-income families, much less working families, much less moderate-income, middle-income families—11 percent who are of the eligible children right now are able to benefit because we so severely underfund early childhood development.

So we have a President who says he is committed to education, we have a President who says he will leave no child behind, and we have tax cuts that go to the wealthy. But will they benefit the families—one-third of the children who live in low- and moderate-income families, half of the children who live in low- and moderate-income families? We have a tax cut proposal that makes it impossible for us to invest in the health and skills and intellect and character of our children. Frankly, "leave no child behind" becomes just a slogan, and I express indignation about this.

There will be a pittance to make sure our children are kindergarten ready, and then when it comes to some of the K-through-12 programs, let me be really clear. Right now, the Title 1 Program for low- and moderate-income children is funded at the 30-percent level. There is, again, a pittance in this budget for any increase in that funding.

The IDEA program for children with special needs is vastly underfunded. In my State of Minnesota, from the Governor to Democrat to Republicans, they say: Live up to your 40-percent funding commitment, Federal Government. Then we would have some additional resources to do other things for children.

Guess what. In this budget we will see a pittance when it comes to any increase in funding for the IDEA program for children with special needs.

We have an education program called Leave No Child Behind, which is going to rely on testing, testing which makes it clear that we should not rely on one single standardized multiple-choice test which everyone who does testing says we should not do, which is educationally deadening; it puts the kids in a straitjacket; it puts the teachers in a straitjacket. We will not have that.

What we will do is take a lot of schools in this country that have been underfunded because they are in districts that are property-tax poor—not rich; they can't have the same resources; they don't have the same resources as the most affluent of suburbs—schools where children come from homes where English is the second language, children who come from homes where families have to move two or three or four times a year because of inadequate housing, children who come from homes where they are hungry when they come to school, children who come from homes where they

haven't had the good developmental child care; they haven't been read to; they don't know how to use the computer; they haven't had any of those opportunities; they come to kindergarten way behind—this budget does nothing to make sure these children will have the same chance as other children to reach their full potential. Instead, we have tax cuts, 40 percent plus of the benefits going to the top 1 percent of the population.

We have testing. All we are going to do is set up these kids, these schools, and these teachers for failure. We are providing none of the resources and none of the tools to make sure these children can achieve and do well, but we are going to have tests and we are going to test kids starting as young as age 8, every single year, and then we are going to say after 3 years: Schools, if you don't make the grade, we will flunk you and we will move to vouchers.

I think the people who deserve an F grade are the White House and those people in the House and the Senate who do not seem to be willing to be held accountable for the health, skills, intellect, and character of all the children in our country. That, to me, merits a failing grade.

I hope my party does not join in this tax-cutting frenzy. I hope we will focus on honest tax cuts that benefit working families, middle-income families and moderate-income families. I hope we focus on a child care credit for all families so we will be helping all children. I hope we get the help where it is needed. I hope this is not just one huge bonanza for wealthy people.

Frankly, I say to Democrats, this is our moment of truth. Above and beyond tax cuts that work for citizens in this country, we want to make sure there are resources for investment. We must be willing to draw the line and say to President Bush and Republicans: You go with your tax cut plan, 40 to 44 percent of the benefits going to the top 1 percent; we go for investment in children and education. President Bush, you go for a tax cut plan with 44 percent of the benefits going to the top 1 percent; we go for expanding health care coverage. President Bush, Republicans: You go for a tax cut plan that is Robin Hood in reverse, with most of the benefits going to wealthy people; we go for making sure our parents and grandparents can afford prescription drug coverage. President Bush, you go for your tax cut, Robin Hood in reverse, going to wealthy people in this country; we go for affordable housing—that is what we are about. We are supposed to be the party of the people, so let's try to make sure the tax cuts, in combination with the investment, benefit the vast majority of people in this country.

I think it is terribly important for Democrats to find their voice and for us to be as strong as possible, both in opposition to President Bush's tax cut proposal going mainly to the wealthy

and in enunciation of what we stand for. We stand for some tax cuts that are honest tax cuts that benefit the majority of families and citizens in our country, not leaving out those families who are most in need of help, and in addition investment in our children, in education, in health care. That is what we are about.

I am lucky enough to be friends with Marian Wright Edelman, director of the Children's Defense Fund, and her husband Peter, two wonderful people of justice. The theme of the Children's Defense Fund has been "Leave no child behind." That is what they are all about. President Bush is now talking about, "Leave no child behind."

"Leave no child behind" I take seriously. "Leave no child behind" is a beautiful way of calling on all of us in the United States of America to be our own best selves. But if "Leave no child behind" is just an empty slogan and we do not back up the rhetoric with resources, and we don't put our money where our mouth is, and we don't make the true investment, which is not in this tax cut proposal or in the budget we are getting from this President, then, frankly, we will have engaged in just symbolic politics. We will not have done well for children, all the children in our country. That will be a profound mistake, and I think we will not be the better for it.

Without trying to sound pseudo-anything, I look forward to this debate. I am going to have a lot of amendments that are going to focus on leaving no child behind. Education, leave no child behind; health care, leave no child behind; housing, leave no child behind; violence, leave no child behind. We are going to have votes on all of these. If my colleagues have a better proposal for how not to leave any child behind, I am all for it. I certainly do not see it in the proposal of the President.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to the speeches this morning on the Republican side of the aisle about the President's State of the Union Address this evening. It is clear the focal point of the President's speech will be his proposed tax cut.

It is interesting when I read the newspapers across Illinois and here in Washington, DC, that the President is having a difficult time convincing the American people that his tax cut is the right thing to do. I have been around politics and politicians for decades. I cannot think of an easier task than to sell people on the idea of cutting their taxes. But it appears the President is having a tough time making the sale

even though he has suggested this is good for the economy and that it will provide additional spending power for people in America.

Folks are a little skeptical. I think they have a right to be skeptical. If you take a look at the President's proposed tax cut, you will find that Americans like the idea of a tax cut until you suggest to them that we really make choices here on Capitol Hill and in Washington, DC—that you have to make a choice between a tax cut and something else. Frankly, when it gets down to those choices, the support of the American people for the President's proposed tax cut starts to dwindle dramatically because I think the American people understand the whole notion of a tax cut is based on an educated guess of what our economy and our Government will look like—not just next year but 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 years from now.

To say these projections are inaccurate is to be kind because, frankly, they are not much more reliable than a weather report. Imagine a weather forecast for a month from now. Would you take the umbrella or not based on such a forecast? I doubt if many families would not. Yet the President would have us basically say we will now chart the course of America's Government spending for the next 10 years based on these projections and guesses from economists in Washington.

Former President Harry Truman used to say he was looking throughout his professional career for a one-armed economist because he said then they wouldn't be able to say, "on the other hand." He knew, as we know, that even the best economists disagree. Even the best economists are frequently wrong.

Most of the surplus the President is using as a basis for his tax cut doesn't even arrive on Capitol Hill under their projections until 5 years from now. Almost 75 percent of it starts to arrive in the last 5 years of the 10-year period.

So it is reasonable to ask if we are thinking about projections in our economy 5 years from now, how good were these same economists 5 years ago when they had to make an educated guess about what America would look like today. There are a lot of factors that go into that guess. You have to try to assume what the growth of the economy is going to be, the number of people employed. You have to take productivity and inflation into account.

Five years ago, the very best economists sat down with the very best computers and then said this fiscal year we would experience a \$320 billion deficit. That was their best guess 5 years ago. What do we find? Right now we are experiencing a \$270 billion surplus. They missed it by \$590 billion 5 years ago.

This evening the President will begin his speech with the assumption that the economists are right; that we should really base all of our plans and our policies based on economic projections 5 to 10 years from now. I think people are genuinely skeptical; they

understand we have had similar messages from previous Presidents. It wasn't that many years ago that President Ronald Reagan arrived in town. He suggested when he was elected in 1989 that a massive tax cut was the best thing for America. He proceeded to convince a bipartisan group in Congress to vote for that tax cut. The net result of that tax cut was, frankly, a rocky road for the economy throughout his Presidency.

Frankly, I never would have been elected to the House of Representatives had the economy not been so bad in central Illinois in 1982, the second year of the Reagan Presidency. And equally, if not more important, those tax cuts on top of his spending program led to record deficits. We started accumulating more red ink and debt in Washington than ever in our history after President Reagan had convinced the Congress that a tax cut was the best medicine for America.

Fortunately, in the last 8 years we have seen a turnaround. We have seen a fiscally responsible approach. We have seen not only a reduction in Federal spending, a reduction in the size of Government, but an unprecedented era of prosperity. I think the American people value that prosperity more than the promise of a tax cut. They understand that like most free market economies, you will have your downturns. And we are in one of them. I hope it is short lived and shallow. No one can say.

But we want to do the right things here in Washington at this moment with this President to make certain we get back on that track we were on for 8 years under the previous administration.

I can recall in 1993 when the issue came to this Senate floor and to the House of Representatives where I served, and President Clinton suggested we had to take the deficit seriously. We had to put in a combination of spending cuts and tax increases to finally get rid of the deficit. Not a single Republican supported that proposal—not one. It passed in the Senate because Vice President Gore cast the tie-breaking vote.

We have layers of Republican quotes projecting that this idea of giving, I guess, strong medicine to the American economy would be a disaster; that it would really put an end to any prospect of economic growth. Yet we found exactly the opposite occurred.

It is curious to me that President Clinton could come forward as he did in 1993 with a projection for our economy that worked, give us the hard news, face the lumps in the next election, and really come up with a plan to help America. Most families and businesses agreed. For the last 8 years, we have seen 22 million new jobs created in America, more home ownership than ever in our history, inflation under control, the welfare rolls coming down, violent crime coming down, and an expansion across the board in the econ-

omy in virtually everything but the agricultural sector.

We want to return to that. But many of us believe a President's responsibility when it comes to leadership is not just to say what is popular. Being for a tax cut is a popular thing to say. Yet the President is having a tough time selling it.

One of the reasons he is having a tough time selling it is when you take a look at the tax cut, you find out the top 1 percent of wage earners in America under President Bush's tax cut receive 42.6 percent of all of the tax benefits. The bottom 90 percent—people below about \$64,900 in income—receive 29 percent of the benefits.

The President's response is that is not fair to say because the people in the top 1 percent pay all the taxes; they should get a bigger cut. Not so. The people in the top 1 percent in America pay 21 percent of the Federal income taxes. They get 42.6 percent of President Bush's tax cut.

Who are these people? These are folks with an income above \$319,000 a year. These are people with an average income of \$900,000. These are the big winners tonight.

So when you hear the applause after the President says we need a tax cut for America, you are going to hear it the loudest from the top 1 percent. They are the big winners. The folks in the bottom 80 percent are not. These people in the top 1 percent will receive an average of \$46,000 in tax cuts under President Bush's tax plan, while the people in the lower 60 percent, for example, will receive an average tax cut of \$227 a year.

So the President would have us risk the future of our economy by basing a tax cut on projections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 years from now; and then he would turn around and, with those projections, have us enact a tax cut not for the average working person, not for middle-income families, not for people in Illinois struggling to pay heating bills and tuition costs but, no, for people who make at least \$25,000 a month. They are the big winners.

Frankly, what it does, in putting all of this money into the tax cut, is it ties our hands when it comes to important priorities for America. Let me give you an example, for just a minute. The national debt is \$5.7 trillion. That is our mortgage. We have accumulated most of it in the last 14 or 15 years. It is a mortgage that costs us every single day in interest payments. How much is the interest payment on our old mortgage? It is \$1 billion a day—\$1 billion in Federal taxes collected every day to pay interest on old debt in America.

What could we do with \$1 billion a day in America? Boy, I can think of some things. Education, health care, investment in America's infrastructure, medical research—these are items which I think most American families value. But we take that amount of money from families and businesses

and individuals each day—\$1 billion—to pay interest on old debt.

Frankly, if we want to leave our children a great legacy, it is not a legacy of giving a fat tax break to the wealthiest people in America. The best legacy for our kids is to pay down this debt.

Let's burn the mortgage. Let's get it over with. If we are in a time of surplus, let's balance the books once and for all. Shouldn't that be our first priority?

If we go with the President's tax cut, let me tell you what it means. Maybe not in the first year, but in the next several years we are going to find our hands tied when it comes to investing in America.

I doubt there is anybody in this country who would argue with the following statement: The future of America is going to be found in our classrooms. If we do not have good teachers, quality schools, and students learning, can we hope the 21st century will be an American century? I do not think so. The President has put that in as a priority but a much lower priority. The first priority is a big tax cut for the top 1 percent of wage earners in America.

I wish to mention one other thing. I see my colleague from Connecticut. I am going to defer to him in a moment.

Senator MIKULSKI of Maryland came up with a term today which I think is important to think about. She said: We not only have a mortgage, we have a balloon payment coming. Do you know what a balloon payment is? When the baby boomers reach Social Security age and when they decide they need Social Security and Medicare—guess what—the current system is going to be truly taxed, and many of us are going to have to answer as to whether or not, when we had a surplus, we prepared for that balloon payment.

If you have a home and you know a balloon payment is coming, you better get ready for it because then you are going to have to refinance the home if you don't have the amount to pay. We are not going to have the money to pay into Social Security and into Medicare if the President's tax cut goes through as proposed. He will take the money out of education. He is going to make a proposal, I understand, to privatize Social Security, by taking money out of the Social Security trust fund. He already raids the Medicare trust fund to pay for this tax cut, primarily for the wealthiest people in America.

So you say to yourself, now I understand why the President is having a tough time selling what seems on its surface to be such a popular idea—the tax cut. If a politician can't sell a tax cut, how is he going to sell the American people on a tough decision, something that is painful? The President is not having good luck selling it because the American people are skeptical. They think it is far more important to empower families across America to get this economy moving again. They think it is far more important to make

necessary improvements in our future—in education, in health care, and a prescription drug benefit under Social Security, Medicare.

Important, as well, is to pay down the national debt. You will not hear much said about that tonight. It will be mentioned in passing that we are going to take care of all these things—not to worry. But the bottom line is, we know that is not the case. We need to be concerned about it. We need to accept fiscal responsibility, as we did 7 or 8 years ago, in the hopes we can return to the prosperity of our economy which we saw a few months ago.

I will listen carefully to the President's speech tonight. I am sure my colleague from Connecticut will, as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair and thank my friend and colleague from Illinois for yielding the floor but also for his very astute and targeted comments.

This is an important day. I rise to speak, with my colleagues, about exactly the same matters that Senator DURBIN addressed because they are at the heart of our prosperity as a nation and the future of every single American; and that is the state of our economy, the tax cuts that President Bush will be advocating tonight, and the strategies that we must adopt if we are to create the widest opportunities for the largest number of our fellow Americans.

The President and all of us with him are facing a moment of truth tonight. This is an important evening because the lives of every American will be affected for years to come by how Congress and the administration resolve the important fiscal and economic questions that our Nation faces.

I am afraid, as the President prepares to address Congress and the Nation tonight, that he is reaching for the wrong medicine. The American economy appears to have a slight head cold right now. If we take the medicine President Bush is offering, I am afraid we are going to have a bad case of pneumonia.

I have spoken before about my opposition to the size and substance of the President's proposed tax cut. It is a tax cut we can ill afford, based on money that has not yet materialized, and it gives the most to those who need it the least.

But the trouble with the President's plan is not just a matter of numbers; the trouble is also with the values that it represents, such as the value of work and rewarding work. Because instead of helping those who are working hard around our country to become wealthy, President Bush's tax proposal rewards those who already are wealthy and do not need the tax cut he is going to give them. Instead of expanding opportunity, and other great American values, the Bush tax cut threatens our

prosperity. Instead of honoring our obligations to our parents and our children, the Bush tax cut leaves America unprepared to adequately invest in education, health care, retirement security, and national security.

I am not opposed to tax cuts. I know my friend from Illinois, and our other colleagues, are not opposed to tax cuts either. I am for tax cuts that honor America's values and prolong America's prosperity. I am for tax cuts that are prowork, profamily, and progrowth. I am for tax cuts that fit into the context of an overall sound budget framework because our hard-won prosperity will surely wither if we do not balance tax cuts with significant debt reduction and targeted investments that benefit the greatest number of our citizens.

For 8 years, we have enjoyed a steady and remarkable level of growth that actually has revolutionized long-standing assumptions about economic expansion. After two decades of low growth, low productivity, and high unemployment in the 1970s and the 1980s, technological innovations—remarkable technological innovations—dramatically improved the economy and have brought us the closest I have ever seen in my lifetime to true full employment.

Now we are experiencing an economic downturn. It is not a recession, as some, including some in the Bush administration, have called it. But it is a slowdown in our rate of growth. We have a number of tools at our disposal to keep the growth going.

I want to sound the alarm today that unless we deal wisely with the bounteous growth we have had, we risk throwing it all away. Then the current temporary slowdown will, in reality, become a recession. That is what is on the line as we gather to hear President Bush's State of the Union tonight.

The fact is that a new economy has emerged. Yet the administration's policies seem rooted in the old economy. When you count interest costs and other revenue expenses, the Bush tax cut plan weighs in at \$2.3 trillion over the next 10 years. It would consume 96 percent of the entire non-Social Security and non-Medicare surplus, leaving, by my reckoning, just \$100 billion for all other investments that we need to make in national security, retirement security, education, prescription drug benefits, and worker training. The money left over, therefore, is clearly not enough.

What if the surpluses do not materialize? Remember, although we have had 3 good years, all this talk of the trillions of dollars we are arguing about spending is talk about projections; it is not money in the bank. What if those surpluses don't materialize? Well, then, I don't see how the administration, based on its budget plan and bloated tax plan, would have any other options but to either raid the Social Security and Medicare trust funds or to radically slash Government

spending. Indeed, I say that President Bush's tax cut threatens to return us to the failed economic experiments of an earlier era of ballooning deficits, high interest rates, high unemployment, and high capital costs for business as well.

There is another serious shortcoming to the administration's plan. I want to talk about it in a bit of detail for a few moments this morning. President Bush's tax cut plan contains no business and growth incentives which actually could help the economy lift itself out of the slowdown it is in now and regain the extraordinary high levels of growth we have enjoyed for years. With apologies to Gertrude Stein, there is no "there" there when it comes to spurring on the New Economy or innovation or productivity that have been the central driving forces of it for America and America's families over the last several years.

Let's look at some of the tax cut proposals President Bush is going to recommend and see how they relate to the central question of how do we get our economy growing vigorously again.

The estate tax. I am leaving aside whether you are for or against it but trying to gauge the impact on the question of economic growth. The estate tax changes create no economic or investment incentives. The marriage penalty reform corrects a fairness problem. The broad rate changes being described largely benefit an economic elite, as Senator DURBIN's chart showed. At least a third—depending on your reckoning, as much as 43 percent—is going to people whose average income is \$900,000. That won't stimulate the economy.

It is hard to find very many economists, including those who are for the Bush tax cut, who say it will have the effect of getting us out of the economic slowdown we are in that has dropped the markets and begun to lead to some layoffs. You can be for the Bush tax cut on various grounds, and you can be against it on various grounds, but I don't hear very many people arguing that it is the way to stimulate the economy. Why? Because it won't move through the economy rapidly enough to have an effect where it would count.

The fact is that the economic downturn that we have now is primarily focused on the technology sector of the economy. That is why I think we need to think about incentives for growth in that very same technology sector which has driven the growth we have had over the last 8 years. So what are the tools or how might we use a tax cut better?

First, let me address what I think would be the most equitable way to return some of the dividends of our hard-won prosperity to those who need it most. It is just fairness to help those families reward those who are working hard to raise themselves up in America as a matter of equity. For most Americans, the most crushing tax burden is not the income tax. The tax that they

pay most to Washington is not the income tax; it is the payroll tax, the money taken out of their paychecks. It is a regressive tax. It is, in fact, a tax on work.

Many of us here have been putting together proposals that we think would reduce the work penalty by giving every working American a refundable tax credit. That means it would go to people who don't pay income taxes because their income is so low. Unlike the Bush tax cut, which would bestow at least one-third of its benefits on the top 1 percent, whose average income is \$900,000, the payroll tax credit we are talking about would provide real tax relief to middle-class working families and to the lower income workers—not people who are not working, but workers, those I have talked about who pay payroll taxes or have it taken out of their paychecks but have no income tax liability. Beyond that is fairness in sharing our growth with those who need it most.

I think we have to act on business tax incentives that will target the drivers of economic growth in our time in the new economy: Capital investment, a skilled workforce, and productivity. While large businesses have been driving our productivity gains by implementing information technology, small firms, which still account for 98 percent of employers, have been moving more slowly into the new economy simply because they can't afford its entry fees. A potential fix here would give small companies tax credits to invest—and invest now—in information technology. This is like servers and network hardware, broadband hookups, computers, and e-business software. Small business, after all, accounts for 40 percent of our economy and 60 percent of the new jobs; but fewer than one-third of small businesses are wired to the Internet today.

This is a stunning statistic: Those that are wired—the small businesses wired to the Internet—have grown 46 percent faster than their counterparts that are unplugged. If we encouraged small business owners to strive for information technology efficiency now, and phased a credit out in a few years—if we couldn't afford it anymore—we could keep productivity growing and help us grow out of the current economic downturn.

Let me talk about a second potential business tax incentive tool, and that would be one that would zero out—eliminate—capital gains taxes for long-term investments in entrepreneurial firms.

I have long supported, since I came to the Senate in 1989, cuts in capital gains to spur growth and encourage a strong venture capital market. I remember being one of six members of my party who stood to support the capital gains tax cut proposal that then-President Bush proposed. Capital gains have been purged, in my opinion. We finally adopted a broad-based capital gains cut in 1997, and I think that cut,

and earlier more targeted forms of it, have encouraged the boom in entrepreneurship and startups that have institutionalized innovation in the United States.

This country's entrepreneurial depth is an asset we must nurture, and we can do so by cutting the capital gains rate to zero for long-term investments in startups, small entrepreneurial firms.

In the new economy, finally, employers need a knowledgeable labor force that adds value to the new technology. Right now, employers are investing too heavily in remedial education to make up for failures in the performance of our K-12 school system. Employers who are making these remedial education investments to bring our workforce into the new economy should be encouraged to do so with a new education tax credit system—a business education tax credit system.

For the same reason, I am supportive of tax relief for low- and middle-income families struggling to pay the cost of their children's college education. We are talking about a tax deduction for up to \$10,000 a year that is spent by families in this country to educate their children or themselves.

Those are three proposals where business tax cuts would have a direct effect on sustaining economic growth and getting us back to the boom in the American economy that we seem to temporarily have left.

At the end of the debate which President Bush will begin tonight, the best approach, of course, is the responsible approach; the approach that embraces the highest values and most far-reaching and broadly shared goals of the American people.

The goal of any tax cut and prosperity plan cannot be short-term politics. It has to be the long-term economic interests and values of the American people.

We are poised at a crossroads: After 8 years of economic good fortune, we can go forward and continue to pay down the debt, offer sensible, broad-based tax cuts that are both personal and business, and begin paying the IOUs we already owe for retirement benefits for baby boomers; or we can turn back, choosing policies that will undermine our productivity, reward the few, and leave education, health, retirement security, and our national defenses underfunded.

That is a big choice with serious consequences for each and every family and each and every individual in our country. I know the American people want to move forward toward expanded opportunities and continued prosperity. That is the heart of what it means to be an American. I hope we, their representatives, in Congress and in the administration, from both parties, will have the common sense in good times we had when they were bad to build on 8 years of success with fiscal discipline and sound economic policies and humane investments in our future.

That is what is on the line tonight as all of us in both Chambers and the American people listen to President Bush deliver his first State of the Union. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REED. I understand the time is controlled by the Democrats until noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Until the hour of noon, yes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. REED. I thank the Chair.

EDUCATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the last election demonstrated clearly and graphically the importance of education as a concern to the American people. It is perhaps their highest priority. They have indicated overwhelmingly in poll after poll that education reform and improvement is something they desperately want and that this Nation desperately needs. They have also indicated their top priority for the use of the Federal budget is investment in education. Indeed, 81 percent of individuals polled recently indicated they would approve of a bold national commitment to improve education similar to our commitment to build the Interstate Highway System and to do many other projects of critical importance to the American public.

It is, indeed, fitting then that President Bush would embrace this notion of education reform. I commend him for his interest. I welcome the beginning of a very serious debate about how we can at the Federal level assist local communities to improve elementary and secondary education in the United States.

We should begin, I believe, by recognizing that over the past 8 years, we have made progress. We established in Goals 2000 a focus on educational reform. In the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1994, we insisted that high standards be the benchmark and the measuring rod of our commitment to educational reform.

We have also over the last few years passed legislation to diminish class size and to repair and renovate crumbling schools throughout this country. So we begin this process with success, but we also begin with the idea that we have to do much more, and we have to do it together.

We recognize that historically, constitutionally, and culturally, educational policy is the province of State and local governments.

The Federal Government does play a role, and we have played this role quite robustly since 1965. The role may be described as encouraging innovation at the local level and also overcoming inertia at the local level so that every student in America, particularly students from disadvantaged backgrounds, have the opportunity to seize all the opportunities of this great country. This has been our role since 1965.

A characteristic of Federal participation in elementary and secondary education is that it is targeted, particularly with respect to low-income students. We have an obligation to continue this support. We have an obligation to continue to work with the States and localities, in a sense as their junior partner, but as their important partner, to ensure that every child in this country will have the ability to achieve and obtain a quality public education.

President Bush's proposal at this juncture is an outline, it is a prospectus, it is a vision, if you will, for some of the things he would like to see done to improve education. There are elements which we all share, including concentration and focus on high standards and accountability, emphasis on reading, teacher quality, and school safety. And there are other elements with which we disagree.

Among the first order of these elements is the notion of vouchers. I am pleased to see or at least sense that the President has retreated a bit from his campaign discussions about vouchers, recognizing this is not the answer for addressing the needs of our public school system. We have to emphasize parental involvement, teacher preparation, resources to improve curriculum—things that have to be done in the context of public education.

I hope if we continue to emphasize these approaches and deemphasize vouchers that we will make much more progress as we work on educational reform in this Congress.

There is another aspect of the President's proposal that has drawn, I think, justifiable criticism. That is the notion of block granting all of the Federal funds, essentially giving the States a check and saying: Do what you will.

We recognize that we are, as I said previously, the junior partners in this enterprise. Federal spending is roughly 7 percent of all spending on elementary and secondary education. Our focus has always been on assisting the neediest children.

To put all of our funds into a block grant and simply hand it over to the States would, I think, lead to a loss of focus, and, more dangerously, a loss of emphasis by Federal dollars on those poor disadvantaged students. There are many examples of how a block grant has distorted what was a good program before. One which comes to mind is li-

brary books. Back in 1965, we specifically committed, as an aid to local school systems, to provide funding to acquire library books. In fact, many of the books on the shelves today, if you open them up, are stamped "ESEA, 1965." It was a successful program. It put books on the shelves. But, more importantly, it put books in the hands of students throughout this country.

Years ago, this specific program was rolled into a larger block grant. What we have seen is that libraries throughout this country in the schools in America are not what they should be. We have seen books on the shelves that are grossly out of date. Interestingly enough, an effort on my part to publicize and address the lack of appropriate library books through bipartisan legislation was reported in the Washington Times on February 20. Most interesting, though, was a response on February 23 by a school librarian that showed some of the real frustrations that school personnel face with the lack of focused Federal funding for specific programs.

This school librarian, who has worked for 27 years, saw the article and then described the problem in her words.

The money coming down for spending has been diverted by administrators for technology, she says. The computers are bought with book money and the administrators can brag about how wired the schools are. The librarians are ordered to keep the old books on the shelves and count everything, including unbound periodicals and old filmstrips dating back to the 1940s.

And most of all keep their mouth shut about the books—just count and keep quiet. Now do you wonder why librarians keep quiet?

The point is, there is an advantage and value in Federal programs that have specific and explicit policy choices for localities. What we sometimes get in flexibility is lost in focus. We should be conscious and careful as we embrace educational reform to be very clear about those programs we believe should be supported specifically—something like library books—and make sure our education funding is not lumped into some vast category where local administrators, under severe pressure, can find ways to distort our intent to support a specific program.

There is another aspect, too, of the issue of block grants. People will say: This is not about money. If you just give the States more flexibility, they don't need the extra money.

It turns out that most public school reform is based not only upon administrative changes but increased resources for schools. That is the case in Texas. Preceding Governor Bush's term, in fact, going back several terms before that, Texas embarked on a process of redistributing its local school aid. In fact, today it is one of those States which takes resources from wealthy districts and gives them to poor districts. That process began before the testing regime was put in place in Texas.

One can argue that as much as testing might have been a source of improvement, just as much or perhaps more was the fact that now for the first time, local school systems are getting the needed funding to conduct the kinds of programs—buying technology, professional development—that are so necessary.

We have to be conscious, too, as we talk about the Federal role, to recognize if we are going to talk big, we have to have the resources to back it up. It is not all done simply by changing the chairs around the table, by talking about noneconomic reforms, nonresource reforms.

There is another issue, too, that the President has advanced. This is an issue for which I commend him. It is an issue in terms of accountability that I fought for in 1994, along with my colleague, Senator BINGAMAN.

I was a Member of the other body. Senator BINGAMAN was here. In the context of the debate on Goals 2000, we attempted for the first time to talk about not only standards that children must achieve, but the resources those schools must have so these children can meet those standards.

During the course of this debate, we ran into significant opposition, principally opposition from our colleagues on the Republican side. They objected, sometimes in principle, to the notion we would be telling local school systems what to do.

I think this debate was important because it recognized for the first time that Federal resources should not be committed without tough standards of accountability, and that these tough standards should be a way to move the system forward. It recognized when we have tough standards and adequate resources you are more likely to get the kind of improvement in educational quality that we all desperately want.

After the Goals 2000 debate, we started discussions on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This legislation focused on changes to title I. In the context of this debate, I proposed several amendments which would deal with corrective action, to essentially require local school districts to identify those schools that were failing the State standards, and then develop a plan of action that would bring those schools up to the State standards.

Once again, we ran into opposition. I was successful in passing an amendment that exists today in law that requires the State to take corrective action for title I schools following several years of failing to meet the State educational standards. That is on the books today. In fact, the States are already identifying those schools that are not performing up to standards.

In 1998-99, 8,800 schools were identified as needing improvement by the States. Now, interestingly enough, the States are not required to transmit specific school names to the Federal Department of Education, so we don't

know specifically what schools are failing, but we know there are at least 8,800 schools throughout the country that are not meeting State standards.

Unfortunately, because of the time to work through the process of evaluation and corrective action, it is not yet clear whether or not the States have taken effective corrective action. But this notion of accountability, this notion of making sure the States look at their schools, evaluate their schools, propose corrective action and follow through is not a new idea. It exists today for the title I schools. I hope in the process of this debate and reauthorization we can expand the concept of accountability to all schools, that we can put in place real accountability standards, and that these standards will move forward dramatically the educational achievement of our children throughout the United States.

Again, another aspect of the President's proposal related to accountability is his insistence to date that we mandate States to require testing of each student from grades 3 to 8 in order to receive Federal education funding. We all recognize that testing is an essential part of education, but I hope we all recognize that testing alone is not sufficient to improve our schools. Once again we have to have the resources and once again we have to have the commitment to ensure that the resources go to those schools that are most in need.

Tests should be an indicator of how well a school is doing, but they should not be a high-risk evaluation of an individual child, in my view. They are diagnostic tools. We can use them to see generally how well a school is doing. But, as we have been cautioned by the National Research Council, "no single test score can be considered a definitive measure of a student's knowledge," and that "an educational decision that would have a major impact on a test taker should not be based solely or automatically on a single test score."

As we approach this issue of testing, let me be clear: If we are evaluating how a school or school system is doing as a way to provide additional resources or additional corrective action, these tests can be valuable. But if we allow these tests on a one-time basis to determine the future of students, we will be making a very significant mistake.

Also, we should understand the science of testing is a difficult one indeed, and there are many consequences, both intended and unintended, from the application of testing in schools. Again, I think it is appropriate to look at the example of Texas since it is so much in the forefront of our discussions these days. The Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, the TAAS, the test that is used in Texas, has been promoted as almost miraculous in its ability to generate significant gains in educational improvement. But there is evidence that indeed

the success reflected in TAAS is not also shown when other tests are applied to roughly the same group of students in Texas. The National Assessment of Educational Progress is a well recognized test, and studies have shown significant differences between the success rates of students in Texas on that test versus the success rate touted by Texas officials using their own tests.

We have to be very careful about State tests because there is both the technical difficulty of developing those tests and also the political pressure to make tests that everyone will succeed in passing because it helps avoid tough choices about helping schools and tough actions about ensuring that schools that do not work are adequately addressed.

So we have a situation where we have to be careful about the test. We also have to be careful about the effect on students. One other statistic from Texas is that students who are leaving high school short of a diploma and taking a GED instead has increased in Texas significantly from approximately 47,000 in 1989 to 74,000 in 1996. That is an increase of 57 percent. The increase nationally was only 26 percent. So we have to ask ourselves, were people dropping out or being subtly or not so subtly encouraged to leave because of the testing regime that was in place in Texas?

There is another aspect that I alluded to: Not just those who choose to take the GED but those who choose to leave school entirely, forfeit the opportunity to improve their education, at least temporarily, and seek other means, either working or simply just leaving school. Once again, if you look at the cohort class of 1991, the year TAAS was implemented, the percentage of students who progressed from grade 6 to graduation dropped from 65 percent to 55 percent for black and Hispanic students and from 75 percent to 68 percent for white students. Once again you have to ask yourself: Is this testing causing unintended consequences: Dropouts and alternate approaches to educational attainment, like the GED? We have to be careful as we go forward.

We also have to consider another characteristic, and that is whether or not all the students taking the test are being counted in the test results. Another statistic in Texas is the increase in those students who are being classified as "in special education," who are then not counted in a school's accountability ratings.

Again, we have to be very careful as we go forward on this testing issue to ensure that these tests are benchmarks of school performance and are not unfairly marking students on a one-time basis for success or failure, or driving students away from school when in fact school could be more beneficial.

The other factor, too, and something we have to be very much concerned about, is that these testing regimes

cost money. It has been estimated that in my State of Rhode Island, if we were to adopt the President's proposal, each year we would have to spend \$3.2 million simply for test development. On top of that, funding would be needed to implement and administer the tests. That is a significant amount of money in a very small State to devote just to testing, because we also want to do many other things: We want to improve professional development, we want to improve parental involvement, and we want a host of other things that cost money. If all the extra resources, new resources at the local level, are tied up in testing, that is going to take us away from other important initiatives.

As a result, I believe if we are going to embark on any form of mandated Federal testing, the Federal Government should provide this testing money, which is an additional cost that has not yet been recognized by the President's proposal. This brings us, of course, to the notion of how much money will there be for educational reform in this administration.

Everyone wants education reform. We are about to embark on a process of debate and deliberation that will lead, I believe, rather quickly, to a new reauthorization. But whatever we do depends upon how much we are willing to support this legislation with real resources. The President last week announced he is proposing a \$4.6 billion increase in education spending which, by his calculation, will be an 11.5-percent increase in educational spending in our budget.

Let's look a little more closely at those numbers. First, the President's proposal disregards the fact that we have already advanced funded \$2.1 billion in last year's appropriation for the coming year. So you have to, I think, fairly, subtract that \$2.1 billion we have already committed in terms of evaluating how much extra money is going to education. When you do that, you find out the increase is not 11.5 percent but it is 5.7 percent, about \$2.4 billion extra.

You also have to put this in context. That is a 5.7-percent increase, which would be less than what we have done in the last 4 out of 5 years. So one can ask, where is all this extra money? Where is this massive commitment, this bold innovation to fix American education? Where is it? Indeed, if you look back over the last 5 years, we have been averaging up to 13-percent increases in educational spending. We need the money as well as the rhetoric. I hope whatever we do legislatively in terms of authorization we match with robust appropriations.

There is another aspect of the budget with respect to education. This educational increase is not solely devoted to elementary and secondary education, because we also have a significant support system for higher education. When you look at that, the money available just for elementary

and secondary education in the President's proposal is about \$1.6 billion. Again, that is not the robust, huge sums that we need to start an educational revolution in conjunction with the States.

If you look at the President's proposal, his commitment to Reading First, which is his literacy program, is \$900 million. That is far above what we are spending for literacy now. If that commitment is made, then less than \$1 billion would be available for all the other programs, including title I, new testing provisions, teacher quality, safe schools, and afterschool programs.

So we really have to ask ourselves, is there anything beyond the rhetoric, beyond the rhetoric?

Are there resources that are going to go into this educational reform? If we don't commit the money, then this will be an exercise that will be ineffective in addressing the reality of the public education problem in this country.

I believe we have to have real education reform. I believe we can do it. We should build on the success of the past. We should recognize that we already have in place accountability provisions of title I schools upon which we can build. But we also have to do other things such as reinvestigate our direct support of library materials. We have to ensure that there is effective parental involvement. We have to provide teachers with sustained, effective, and intensive mentoring and professional development, as well as provide principals with effective leadership training. We have to help schools and communities work together to address not just the educational challenges of children but some of the health care and social challenges that detract from their education. We can do this, and we should do this.

I hope over the next several weeks and months, throughout the deliberations on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we will come together on an elementary and secondary education development plan that will be significant and meaningful, that will be built on our past success, and that will assist States and localities, and that we will find the funds necessary to translate our words into deeds. By doing so, we will realize educational improvement in America and ensure well-educated young people who can not only man the increasingly complex positions in our economy but continue to be citizens who will sustain and move the country forth.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Member from the State of Wyoming, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the quorum call. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:46 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.

Whereupon, the Senate, at 2:15 p.m., reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

In my capacity as a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 397

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I have a bill at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 397) to amend the Defense Base Closure Realignment Act of 1990 to authorize additional rounds of base closures and realignments under that act in 2003 and 2005, to modify certain authorities relating to closures and realignments under that Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. McCAIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 397 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate my colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI, for his efforts in developing the National Energy Security Act of 2001. This act represents a collection of critically important actions; actions that can move the Nation beyond the almost perpetual energy crises that we've experienced in the last few years.

Our Nation has not followed or even developed a comprehensive energy strategy for far too long. We've all paid the price for that omission. Major changes in energy availability and prices are devastating the lives of many of our citizens.

We have seen oil prices gyrate in the last two years by over three times. At one extreme, we destroyed much of our ability to develop new oil and gas wells. At the other extreme, we impacted the Nation's economy. And throughout the last few years, we have prohibited exploration and utilization of public lands that could have been impacting some of our most critical shortages.

Natural gas prices have more than tripled just this year in many parts of the country. The impact on millions of our citizens has created another major crisis.

We have seen the economy of California, the sixth largest economy when compared to all the nations of the world, brought to its knees by the recent energy shortages. Blackouts have struck in unpredictable patterns, disrupting lives. Unfortunately, California is only the first of many areas that are likely to be impacted by the lack of past coherent policy.

It has been terribly frustrating to me to recognize that most of these problems were caused by our own actions, or lack of actions. We have had help falling into these traps, of course, from OPEC for example. But much of these problems are completely predictable. Actions could and absolutely should have been taken to drastically mitigate the severity of the impacts.

I appreciate that Senator MURKOWSKI has taken care in his bill to recognize and emphasize that there is no one "silver bullet" to solve our nation's energy problems. His bill creates opportunities for all of the major energy sources to maximize their contribution to our nation's energy needs; that's the only credible approach to the severity of the current issues.

His bill recognizes that no single energy source represents a vast untapped resource, ready for immediate exploitation. It recognizes that solutions have to include options that impact our needs in the near term, like more natural gas and safe pipelines, as well as approaches that have much longer lead times, like nuclear power and renewables. And while natural gas enables relatively near term impacts with only modest pollution concerns, it is a finite resource and any credible national energy policy has to address a future without readily obtained supplies of natural gas.

Solutions have to build on our existing major national energy providers, like the coal and nuclear plants that provide more than 70 percent of our electricity today. And where these large providers have risk areas, like air emissions from coal and a credible national strategy for spent nuclear fuel, we must work diligently to address the

risk areas. Where the past administration argued that these risks meant we should minimize the contribution from these sources, we should instead face the reality that these sources represent some of our major national strengths and end biases against their success.

The days of arguing for massive research and incentives only for one single source of energy and only for improved efficiency, as if they alone can solve our nation's long term energy needs, must be put far behind us. They need to be recognized for what they are, important components of a coherent national energy strategy, and absolutely not a "silver bullet."

This National Energy Security Act addresses virtually all of these widely divergent, but critically important, areas of national policy. I enthusiastically support the act as a vitally necessary step in achieving the energy stability that our citizens demand.

In selected areas, like coal and nuclear, additional bills may prove useful to target actions on these specific sources. I'm working on such a bill for nuclear energy, and Senator BYRD has a legislative thrust for clean coal. These bills can build on the National Energy Security Act and strengthen it in some key areas.

I salute the efforts of the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for his untiring efforts to advance this bill. It's not easy to include in one package a set of initiatives that impact all of the major sources of our Nation's energy. From new incentives for oil and gas exploration, to improved pipeline safety, to creation of vitally needed new domestic oil fields, to major expansion of our current woefully inadequate clean coal programs, to strong support for renewables, and to measures to ensure that nuclear energy remains a viable and strong option for our Nation's energy needs—this bill covers the whole range.

I'm proud to join Senator MURKOWSKI as a cosponsor of his National Energy Security Act of 2001 and urge my colleagues to join in supporting this key initiative.

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH ALLBAUGH

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, on February 15, 2001 the Senate voted 91-0 to confirm Mr. Joseph Allbaugh to be Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. I was absent from this vote due to a pre-scheduled surgery that afternoon. Had I been in the Chamber on February 15, I would have voted for Mr. Allbaugh, and my vote would not have affected the outcome on this unanimous demonstration of support for this confirmation. I look forward to working with Mr. Allbaugh at his post at FEMA. This agency is the critical link in the ability of our communities to prepare for and recover from natural disasters which inevitably strike our nation.

THE CHILD CITIZENSHIP ACT OF 2000

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today marks a special day in the lives of tens of thousands of American families. Families who have adopted children from other nations, providing them with safe environments, good food, a good education, and most importantly, loving homes.

Traditionally, adoptive families have had to endure a lengthy and expensive bureaucratic process, and navigate through a daunting maze of paperwork, as they have tried to secure U.S. citizenship for their foreign-born adopted children. All that changed first thing this morning when the Child Citizenship Act of 2000 took effect. This important act of Congress, which passed the Senate unanimously last October, cleared the way today for approximately 75,000 children adopted from abroad to become Americans. When these children went to sleep last night, they were in naturalization limbo. When they woke up this morning, they were citizens of the United States of America. I send my warmest welcome to these new young Americans.

In some cases, adoptive parents were not aware of the need to file applications for citizenship for their adopted children. Many of these children grew up to discover they were not considered U.S. citizens. Some have faced the possibility of having to return to a country they have never known. The Child Citizenship Act of 2000 corrected this injustice.

Today, families in Colorado and across this Nation, celebrate the automatic citizenship of foreign-adopted children who meet the requirements outlined in the act. For the O'Neil family of Englewood, Colorado among many such families across the state and our nation, it is a day of great joy.

Today is a day when we greet many new U.S. citizens. I wish to extend my congratulations to our newest and youngest citizens and their families, as well as to my colleagues who worked so diligently to make this day possible.

TRIBUTE TO ALAN CRANSTON

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, one of the first times I ever came to the Dirksen Senate Office Building, a location where I now have my Senate office, was on December 12, 1969, some 20 months after my injury in Vietnam, when I was summoned to appear before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs about how the Veterans Administration was handling returning Vietnam war veterans. That meeting was chaired by a tall, lean Senator from California named Alan Cranston and it was the start of a three decade friendship. Thus, in 1974 after experiencing what hopefully will prove to be my only electoral defeat, in the Democratic Primary for Lieutenant Governor of Georgia, one of the first people I turned to was Senator Cranston, who generously

accepted my offer to come out to California to campaign for his successful re-election. Then, after the General Election, he came to my aid by serving as guest-of-honor at a fund-raising dinner to pay off my campaign debt. And to top it off, Senator Cranston helped me get a job as a special investigator for the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, which is where I was serving when President Carter selected me to head the VA, in no small part because of the strong recommendation of Alan Cranston.

I hope this short discourse makes it clear the debt of gratitude that I personally owed to Senator Cranston, but more importantly, it is indicative of the kind of man Alan was: dynamic, thoughtful, compassionate. He touched many lives, including veterans who benefited from his tireless commitment especially on behalf of Vietnam era veterans, future generations of Americans who today and for all time to come will benefit from his far-sighted commitment to the protection of our land, air and water and for citizens of the world who benefit from his long-time commitment to world peace, a cause he continued to pursue till the end of his life through the Global Security Institute.

Another part of the Cranston legacy is perhaps somewhat less known to the general public: his efforts on behalf of the disabled. When Alan Cranston came to the Senate in 1969, those with disabilities had virtually no legal protections against various forms of discrimination and indeed faced many barriers, physical and otherwise, to just getting in to the halls of government. To Alan Cranston, that was unacceptable. He led the efforts to enact the landmark Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 which outlawed discrimination against the disabled in all federally funded programs.

Among its many provisions, the 1973 law: Required federally funded buildings to be made accessible; promoted the hiring and advancement of qualified persons with disabilities by the Federal Government; and established the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, which has responsibility for setting standards for accessibility and for assisting and enforcing compliance with accessibility laws. I was honored to be named to that Board by President Carter in 1979.

Throughout the remainder of the 1970's Alan worked to revamp federally assisted State vocational rehabilitation programs by his sponsorship of laws that gave priority to the most seriously disabled and, most importantly, required a focus and follow-through on employment. In 1980, he sponsored successful legislation to make these same improvements in vocational rehabilitation programs for veterans. And in 1990, Senator Cranston was a leading co-sponsor of the Americans with Disabilities Act, which in many ways was a culmination of two

decades of leadership by Senator Cranston on behalf of fairness and opportunity for persons with disabilities.

It was a great honor to have known and worked with Alan Cranston. Our country is a better place because of his achievements, which we celebrate today.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

• Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the Centennial Anniversary of the National Institute of Standards and Technology in Gaithersburg, which will occur on March 3, 2001.

NIST and its scientists, researchers, and other personnel have a tremendous list of accomplishments over the last 100 years. Through its support of industry and its development of critical technology measurements, standards, and applications, NIST has played a critical role in our Nation's technological advances and, indeed, has helped to revolutionize the U.S. economy.

Initially founded as the National Bureau of Standards, NIST is our Nation's oldest Federal laboratory. In fact, the Institute's mission was first stated in the Articles of Confederation and the U.S. Constitution, making it as old as the Republic itself. The initial purpose of the Institute was to establish authoritative national standards of quantities and products. In its first three decades, NIST mainly served industries working to modernize by improving physical measurements, standards development, and testing methods. During this time, the Institute played an instrumental role in the creation of such critical 20th century innovations as the measurement of electricity, improvement of product assembly techniques, development of the aviation and automobile industry, and the creation of the radio.

After aiding the military effort during World War II, the National Institute of Standards and Technology and its workforce helped to develop many of the scientific innovations that have enabled our modern economy to flourish. NIST was able to foster and improve measurements of temperature, force, time, and weights. These and other technical improvements enabled the U.S. space program, aviation and naval industries, and perhaps the most importantly, the computer industry to excel.

In 1988, in part to emphasize its diverse range of activities, the National Bureau of Standards was renamed the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Today, the Institute continues to act as a behind-the-scenes specialist in the systems and operations that collectively drive the U.S. economy, including satellite, communication and transportation networks, and our laboratories, factories, hospitals, and businesses.

Over the years, I have had the opportunity to work closely with a number of individuals at the National Institute of Standards and Technology and I can personally attest to the high caliber, quality, and commitment of its workforce. NIST employs many of our Nation's most dedicated and talented scientists, as is evidenced by its legacy of a number of Nobel-Prize winners.

More recently, I along with the rest of the Maryland delegation have worked with the Institute on a comprehensive ten year initiative to upgrade its laboratory infrastructure, which is expected to be completed by the year 2004. It is our hope that through this effort, with upgraded facilities, to match the quality of its personnel, NIST will be able to continue advancing the scientific and technological infrastructure of U.S. industry into the 21st Century.

Again, we take great pride in the accomplishments of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, in the people that work there, and in having the Institute in Maryland. I commend NIST for its 100 years of success and remarkable achievements and am confident that it will continue its remarkable track record of advancing science and technology for hundreds of years to come. •

SONNY O'DAY

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, on February 7, 2001, the State of Montana bid farewell to a favored son from Laurel, Montana. "Sonny O'Day," the Kid from Meaderville, was a local hero and businessman who held his family, friends and fans close to his heart.

SONNY O'DAY (CHARLES A. GEORGE), 1913-2001

Sonny O'Day, the Kid From Meaderville, boxed his final round, hung up his gloves, snuffed his famous stogie, and exited the ring quietly in his sleep on Wednesday, January 31.

Sonny, whose legal name was Charles Augustus George, was born Carlo Giorgi on March 8, 1913, to David and Rosa, Ragghianti, Giorgi in Lucca, Italy. His father was killed during World War I. Rosa emigrated to America with her three children to marry her brother-in-law, Angelo Giorgi, in 1920. They passed through Ellis Island, where the family name was Americanized to "George," and took the train through the vast expanses of their new country to the Montana mining community of Meaderville, in Butte.

Sonny loved all sports and was a natural athlete. Starting to box as a 10-year-old, Sonny was a protégé of Butte's Pat Sullivan Boxing Club. He represented the club in amateur fights throughout the State. He also was an avid football player, swimmer and diver. The City Championship football photograph of his Franklin School team was proudly displayed in his Wall of Fame.

Sonny was privately religious and moral, and proudly remembered his years as an altar boy at St. Joseph's Parish.

His life-long commitment to family began early when he held his dying mother in his arms at age 14. After her death, Sonny gathered his younger sister and invalid stepfather, Angelo, escorting them back to the family villa in Italy. After Angelo's death, Sonny immediately returned to the U.S. to avoid being conscripted into Mussolini's army.

Upon returning from Italy in the early 1930's, the 16-year-old orphan arrived in New York City, where he was told his pugilism could earn him money. He paid his dues sleeping in an Eastside gym and in Central Park in order to get his big break. Lying about his age, he fought amateur bouts until an agent spotted him and said, "You've got talent, kid, but the Irish control the game. Nobody is gonna come see an Italian boxer!" Sonny's reddish hair and freckles were the perfect fit to a new identity—Sonny O'Day—and new birthdate—St. Patrick's Day.

Spanning the next 17 years, welterweight Sonny fought 529 fights, lost 32 and had, as Sonny used to say, "some draws and the rest wins," in Madison Square Garden, Sunset Garden, and other major venues throughout the United States. He first met World Heavy Weight Champion Jack Dempsey when he refereed one of Sonny's early fights.

Living by the adage: "Smile and the world smiles with you, cry and you cry alone," Sonny was known to greet strangers with his famous smile, booming voice, crunching handshake, and the introductory greeting, "Shake the hand that shook the world!"

His love of Butte was as strong as his handshake. He rarely called the city by name. To him, it was "The Sacred City," and Butte cherished him in return, calling him "The Mayor of Meaderville," "The Meaderville Phantom," and "Butte's Boxing Star."

Sonny took his professional boxing earnings and opened two famous Butte nightclubs in the late 1930's: The Savoy and Melody Lane. There, he entertained sports and Hollywood greats including Gene Tunney, Cary Grant and Barbara Hutton.

He proudly served the U.S. Army during World War II, and married Carra Burton on September 20, 1944, while stationed in Gadsden, Alabama. The couple returned to Montana after the war where he established his bar and tavern in Laurel.

Sonny O'Day's "Boxing Hall of Champions," complete with a boxing ring, was his passion. He entertained beneath his pictures and memorabilia with stories that rhapsodized his listeners. He loved every minute of it, and bragged that he would never retire. Children came in for free candy, and parents came in for Sonny to give the kids their first lessons in self-defense. Sonny's bar was a local tourist attraction for years, and is listed as one of Montana's favorites in a number of publications.

Sonny's St. Patrick's Day celebrations were legendary for thousands of fans who descended on the community. It was customary for the Governor—Republican or Democrat—to call Sonny on St. Patrick's Day to wish him happy birthday. In 1986, Governor Ted Schwinden decided a phone call wasn't good enough, and came to Laurel to host Sonny's St. Patrick's Day party. The Laurel Chamber of Commerce surprised Sonny on St. Patrick's Day 1995 by honoring him for 50 years of business. The highlight was a celebrated bout between Sonny and special guest Todd Foster, fellow Montana boxing welterweight and 1988 Olympian. Foster allowed Sonny his final knockout punch for the "Downtown Laurel Businessmen's Crown."

In 1952, Golden Gloves Boxing came to Montana, and Sonny helped train these young fighters. At the Shrine Temple in Billings, Golden Gloves championships of an eight-State region took place, and Sonny refereed the very first bout and many more over the years.

When boxing turned professional in Montana, Sonny served on the State Athletic Commission for 26 years under seven different governors. This led him to bring 77

professional bouts to Montana, including three world championship fights. As chairman of the Commission, he promoted the Gene Fullmer-Joey Giardello Middleweight Championship of the World title match on April 29, 1960, in Bozeman.

Basements and gyms all over Billings and Laurel were the sites for years to come as Sonny trained young fighters. He estimated that he helped develop 2,500-3,000 fighters during those years.

The Student Council of Eastern Montana College, now Montana State University-Billings, originated the annual Sonny O'Day Smoker, a fund raiser that entertained the greater Billings area from 1975-81.

Sonny's civic community service included 30 years as a Kiwanian, including service as a State Lieutenant Governor; a lifetime member of the Elks; and a founding member of the Montana Gambling Commission. Although he was a professional boxer, he did not believe in corporal punishment, and his daughters fondly remember they never received anything but love from "those registered hands!" Whenever the mines in Butte went on strike, he would spearhead caravans of trucks to take food and presents to the miners. He never forgot to feed the alley cats—even on holidays. For a man who had earned his living by the "manly act of self-defense," as Sonny called it, those who knew him saw a gentle soul who lavished kisses and never hesitated to cry tears of sadness or joy.

His love of cooking was legendary, and no one could enter his home without being invited to dinner. His family never knew who Sonny would bring home to dinner. Jack Dempsey, Sugar Ray Seale, numerous governors and senators, including Mike Mansfield, sat at the family table in Laurel.

Sonny never forgot his Italian roots, and continued to visit and support his sister and her family in Lucca until her death. Visits to the family villa in Lucca rejuvenated him. He was especially proud of the family legacy: The Raggianti Art Museum, renowned in the province of Tuscany.

Sonny is survived by his wife of 56 years, Carra Burton George; his three daughters: Mary-Glynn, Terry, Cromwell of Missoula and grandchildren Charlie, Lauren and David; Nancy, Sam, Talboom of Green River, Wyo. and grandchildren Justin, Carlee, and Jake; and Shelley, Larry, Van Atta of Billings and grandchildren John, Nick, and Marissa; sister-in-law Lois George and her children Michael and Mary Grace, of San Diego, Calif.; and nieces Elisa Mussi and Lalla Volpi, and nephew Carlo Volpi, of Lucca, Italy. He was preceded in death by his parents; brother Gus George; sister Mary Volpi; and son-in-law John Pingree.

God surely must be dancing in Heaven, knowing you're joining Him, Sonny; just as you surely will tell Him, "It's all in the footwork." •

IN HONOR OF THE FIFTH GRADERS AT SHOEMAKER SCHOOL IN MACUNGIE, PENNSYLVANIA

• Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I stand before you today to recognize a select number of outstanding students from Macungie, Pennsylvania. I was honored to hear of a tremendous service that these fine young boys and girls did at Shoemaker School in November of last year.

Seventy-five fifth graders in the Community Service Club of Shoemaker School conducted a walk-a-thon to raise money for paralyzed veterans

across the United States through the Paralyzed Veterans of America. The walk-a-thon occurred over several school days, where the children walked during breaks during the school day. Some children even sacrificed their lunches and walked in the rain and cold weather just to raise a few more dollars.

These fine young Americans set a wonderful example to men, women, and children everywhere. With a little initiative and a lot of heart, the fifth graders at Shoemaker School were able to help paralyzed veterans throughout our great Nation. I commend each and everyone of these dedicated, selfless children, and it is an honor for me to recognize them today. •

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.)

REPORT ON THE EMERGENCY DECLARED WITH RESPECT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA'S DESTRUCTION OF TWO UNARMED U.S. REGISTERED CIVILIAN AIRCRAFT IN INTERNATIONAL AIRSPACE NORTH OF CUBA ON FEBRUARY 14, 1996 IS TO CONTINUE IN EFFECT BEYOND MARCH 1, 2001—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, which states that the emergency declared with respect to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft in international airspace north of Cuba on

February 24, 1996, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 2001.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 27, 2001.

REPORT ON THE PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 8

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was ordered to lie on the table.

To the Congress of the United States:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress:

It is a great privilege to be here to outline a new budget and a new approach for governing our great country.

I thank you for your invitation to speak here tonight. I want to thank so many of you who have accepted my invitation to come to the White House to discuss important issues. We are off to a good start. I will continue to meet with you and ask for your input. You have been kind and candid, and I thank you for making a new President feel welcome.

The last time I visited the Capitol, I came to take an oath. On the steps of this building, I pledged to honor our Constitution and laws, and I asked you to join me in setting a tone of civility and respect in Washington. I hope America is noticing the difference. We are making progress. Together, we are changing the tone of our Nation's capital. And this spirit of respect and cooperation is vital—because in the end, we will be judged not only by what we say or how we say it, but by what we are able to accomplish.

America today is a nation with great challenges—but greater resources. An artist using statistics as a brush could paint two very different pictures of our country. One would have warning signs: increasing layoffs, rising energy prices, too many failing schools, persistent poverty, the stubborn vestiges of racism. Another picture would be full of blessings: a balanced budget, big surpluses, a military that is second to none, a country at peace with its neighbors, technology that is revolutionizing the world, and our greatest strength, concerned citizens who care for our country and for each other.

Neither picture is complete in and of itself. And tonight I challenge and invite Congress to work with me to use the resources of one picture to repaint the other—to direct the advantages of our time to solve the problems of our people.

Some of these resources will come from government—some, but not all. Year after year in Washington, budget debates seem to come down to an old, tired argument: on one side, those who want more government, regardless of the cost; on the other, those who want

less government, regardless of the need.

We should leave those arguments to the last century and chart a different course. Government has a role, and an important one. Yet too much government crowds out initiative and hard work, private charity and the private economy. Our new governing vision says government should be active, but limited, engaged, but not overbearing.

My budget is based on that philosophy. It is reasonable and it is responsible. It meets our obligations and funds our growing needs. We increase spending next year for Social Security and Medicare and other entitlement programs by \$81 billion. We have increased spending for discretionary programs by a very responsible 4 percent, above the rate of inflation. My plan pays down an unprecedented amount of our national debt, and then when money is still left over, my plan returns it to the people who earned it in the first place.

A budget's impact is counted in dollars, but measured in lives. Excellent schools, quality health care, a secure retirement, a cleaner environment, a stronger defense—these are all important needs and we fund them.

The highest percentage increase in our budget should go to our children's education. Education is my top priority and by supporting this budget, you will make it yours as well.

Reading is the foundation of all learning, so during the next 5 years, we triple spending, adding another \$5 billion to help every child in America learn to read. Values are important, so we have tripled funding for character education to teach our children not only reading and writing, but right from wrong.

We have increased funding to train and recruit teachers, because we know a good education starts with a good teacher. And I have a wonderful partner in this effort. I like teachers so much, I married one. Please help me salute our gracious First Lady, Laura Bush.

Laura has begun a new effort to recruit Americans to the profession that will shape our future: teaching. Laura will travel across America, to promote sound teaching practices and early reading skills in our schools and in programs such as Head Start.

When it comes to our schools, dollars alone do not always make the difference. Funding is important, and so is reform. So we must tie funding to higher standards and accountability for results.

I believe in local control of schools: we should not and we will not run our public schools from Washington. Yet when the Federal Government spends tax dollars, we must insist on results.

Children should be tested on basic reading and math skills every year, between grades three and eight. Measuring is the only way to know whether all our children are learning—and I want to know, because I refuse to leave any child behind.

Critics of testing contend it distracts from learning. They talk about “teaching to the test.” But let us put that logic to the test. If you test children on basic math and reading skills, and you are “teaching to the test,” you are teaching . . . math and reading. And that is the whole idea.

As standards rise, local schools will need more flexibility to meet them. So we must streamline the dozens of Federal education programs into five and let States spend money in those categories as they see fit.

Schools will be given a reasonable chance to improve, and the support to do so. Yet if they do not, if they continue to fail, we must give parents and students different options—a better public school, a private school, tutoring, or a charter school. In the end, every child in a bad situation must be given a better choice, because when it comes to our children, failure is not an option.

Another priority in my budget is to keep the vital promises of Medicare and Social Security, and together we will do so. To meet the health care needs of all America's seniors, we double the Medicare budget over the next 10 years.

My budget dedicates \$238 billion to Medicare next year alone, enough to fund all current programs and to begin a new prescription drug benefit for low-income seniors. No senior in America should have to choose between buying food and buying prescriptions.

To make sure the retirement savings of America's seniors are not diverted to any other program—my budget protects all \$2.6 trillion of the Social Security surplus for Social Security and for Social Security alone.

My budget puts a priority on access to health care—without telling Americans what doctor they have to see or what coverage they must choose.

Many working Americans do not have health care coverage. We will help them buy their own insurance with refundable tax credits. And to provide quality care in low-income neighborhoods, over the next 5 years we will double the number of people served at community health care centers.

And we will address the concerns of those who have health coverage yet worry their insurance company does not care and will not pay. Together, this Congress and this President will find common ground to make sure doctors make medical decisions and patients get the health care they deserve with a Patients' Bill of Rights.

When it comes to their health, people want to get the medical care they need, not be forced to go to court because they did not get it. We will ensure access to the courts for those with legitimate claims, but first, let us put in place a strong independent review so we promote quality health care, not frivolous lawsuits.

My budget also increases funding for medical research, which gives hope to many who struggle with serious dis-

ease. Our prayers tonight are with one of your own who is engaged in his own fight against cancer, a fine representative and a good man, Congressman JOE MOAKLEY. God bless you, JOE. And I can think of no more appropriate tribute to JOE than to have the Congress finish the job of doubling the budget for the National Institutes of Health.

My New Freedom Initiative for Americans with Disabilities funds new technologies, expands opportunities to work, and makes our society more welcoming. For the more than 50 million Americans with disabilities, we must continue to break down barriers to equality.

The budget I propose to you also supports the people who keep our country strong and free, the men and women who serve in the United States military. I am requesting \$5.7 billion in increased military pay and benefits, and health care and housing. Our men and women in uniform give America their best and we owe them our support.

America's veterans honored their commitment to our country through their military service. I will honor our commitment to them with a billion dollar increase to ensure better access to quality care and faster decisions on benefit claims.

My budget will improve our environment by accelerating the cleanup of toxic Brownfields. And I propose we make a major investment in conservation by fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Our National Parks have a special place in our country's life. Our parks are places of great natural beauty and history. As good stewards, we must leave them better than we have found them, so I propose providing \$4.9 billion in resources over 5 years for the upkeep of these national treasures.

And my budget adopts a hopeful new approach to help the poor and disadvantaged. We must encourage and support the work of charities and faith-based and community groups that offer help and love one person at a time. These groups are working in every neighborhood in America, to fight homelessness and addiction and domestic violence, to provide a hot meal or a mentor or a safe haven for our children. Government should welcome these groups to apply for funds, not discriminate against them.

Government cannot be replaced by charities or volunteers. And government should not fund religious activities. But our Nations should support the good works of these good people who are helping neighbors in need.

So I am proposing allowing all taxpayers, whether they itemize or not, to deduct their charitable contributions. Estimates show this could encourage as much as \$14 billion a year in new charitable giving—money that will save and change lives.

Our budget provides more than \$700 million over the next 10 years for a Federal Compassion Capital Fund with a focused and noble mission: to provide

a mentor to the more than 1 million children with a parent in prison, and to support other local efforts to fight illiteracy, teen pregnancy, drug addiction, and other difficult problems.

With us tonight is the Mayor of Philadelphia. Please help me welcome Mayor John Street. Mayor Street has encouraged faith-based and community organizations to make a difference in Philadelphia and he has invited me to his city this summer, to see compassion in action.

I am personally aware of just how effective the Mayor is. Mayor Street is a Democrat. Let the record show that I lost his city. But some things are bigger than politics. So I look forward to coming to your city to see your faith-based programs in action.

As government promotes compassion, it also must promote justice. Too many of our citizens have cause to doubt our Nation's justice when the law points a finger of suspicion at groups, instead of individuals. All our citizens are created equal and must be treated equally. Earlier today I asked Attorney General Ashcroft to develop specific recommendations to end racial profiling. It is wrong. We must end it.

In so doing, we will not hinder the work of our Nation's brave police officers. They protect us every day, often at great risk. But by stopping the abuses of a few, we will add to the public confidence our police officers earn and deserve.

My budget has funded a responsible increase in our ongoing operations, it has funded our Nation's important priorities, it has protected Social Security and Medicare, and our surpluses are big enough that there is still money left over.

Many of you have talked about the need to pay down our national debt. I have listened, and I agree.

My budget proposal pays down an unprecedented amount of public debt. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to act now, and I hope you will join me to pay down \$2 trillion in debt during the next 10 years.

At the end of those 10 years, we will have paid down all the debt that is available to retire. That is more debt repaid more quickly than has ever been repaid by any nation at any time in history.

We should also prepare for the unexpected, for the uncertainties of the future. We should approach our Nation's budget as any prudent family would, with a contingency fund for emergencies or additional spending needs. For example, after a strategic review, we may need to increase defense spending, we may need additional money for our farmers, or additional money to reform Medicare. And so my budget sets aside almost a trillion dollars over 10 years for additional needs . . . that is one trillion additional reasons you can feel comfortable supporting this budget.

We have increased our budget at a responsible 4 percent, we have funded our

priorities, we have paid down all the available debt, we have prepared for contingencies—and we still have money left over.

Yogi Berra once said: "When you come to a fork in the road, take it." Now we come to a fork in the road. We have two choices. Even though we have already met our needs, we could spend the money on more and bigger government. That is the road our Nation has traveled in recent years. Last year, government spending shot up 8 percent. That is far more than our economy grew, far more than personal income grew and far more than the rate of inflation. If you continue on that road, you will spend the surplus and have to dip into Social Security to pay other bills.

Unrestrained government spending is a dangerous road to deficits, so we must take a different path. The other choice is to let the American people spend their own money to meet their own needs, to fund their own priorities and pay down their own debts. I hope you will join me and stand firmly on the side of the people.

The growing surplus exists because taxes are too high and government is charging more than it needs. The people of America have been overcharged and on their behalf, I am here to ask for a refund.

Some say my tax plan is too big, others say it is too small. I respectfully disagree. This tax relief is just right.

I did not throw darts at a board to come up with a number for tax relief. I did not take a poll, or develop an arbitrary formula that might sound good. I looked at problems in the tax code and calculated the cost to fix them.

A tax rate of 15 percent is too high for those who earn low wages, so we lowered the rate to 10 percent. No one should pay more than a third of the money they earn in Federal income taxes, so we lowered the top rate to 33 percent. This reform will be welcome relief for America's small businesses, which often pay taxes at the highest rate, and help for small business means jobs for Americans.

We simplified the tax code by reducing the number of tax rates from the current five rates to four lower ones: 10, 15, 25, and 33 percent. In my plan, no one is targeted in or targeted out . . . every one who pays income taxes will get tax relief.

Our government should not tax, and thereby discourage marriage, so we reduced the marriage penalty. I want to help families rear and support their children, so we doubled the child credit to \$1,000 per child. It is not fair to tax the same earnings twice—once when you earn them, and again when you die, so we must repeal the death tax.

These changes add up to significant help. A typical family with two children will save \$1,600 a year on their Federal income taxes. Sixteen hundred dollars may not sound like a lot to some, but it means a lot to many families. Sixteen hundred dollars buys gas

for two cars for an entire year, it pays tuition for a year at a community college, it pays the average family grocery bill for 3 months. That is real money.

With us tonight, representing many American families, are Steven and Josefina Ramos. Please help me welcome them. The Ramoses are from Pennsylvania, but they could be from any one of your districts. Steven is a network administrator for a school district, Josefina is a Spanish teacher at a charter school, and they have a 2-year-old daughter, Lianna. Steven and Josefina tell me they pay almost \$8,000 a year in Federal income taxes; my plan will save them more than \$2,000. Let me tell you what Steven says: "Two thousand dollars a year means a lot to my family. If we had this money, it would help us reach our goal of paying off our personal debt in two years." After that, Steven and Josefina want to start saving for Lianna's college education. Government should never stand in the way of families achieving their dreams. The surplus is not the government's money, the surplus is the people's money.

For lower-income families, my tax relief plan restores basic fairness. Right now, complicated tax rules punish hard work. A waitress supporting two children on \$25,000 a year can lose nearly half of every additional dollar she earns. Her overtime, her hardest hours, are taxed at nearly 50 percent. This sends a terrible message: You will never get ahead. But America's message must be different: We must honor hard work, never punish it.

With tax relief, overtime will no longer be overtime time for the waitress. People with the smallest incomes will get the highest percentage reductions. And millions of additional American families will be removed from the income tax rolls entirely.

Tax relief is right and tax relief is urgent. The long economic expansion that began almost 10 years ago is faltering. Lower interest rates will eventually help, but we cannot assume they will do the job all by themselves.

Forty years ago and then twenty years ago, two Presidents, one Democrat and one Republican, John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan, advocated tax cuts to—in President Kennedy's words—"get this country moving again."

They knew then, what we must do now: To create economic growth and opportunity, we must put money back into the hands of the people who buy goods and create jobs.

We must act quickly. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve has testified before Congress that tax cuts often come too late to stimulate economic recovery. So I want to work with you to give our economy an important jump start by making tax relief retroactive.

We must act now because it is the right thing to do. We must also act now because we have other things to do. We must show courage to confront

and resolve tough challenges: to restructure our Nation's defenses, to meet our growing need for energy, and to reform Medicare and Social Security.

America has a window of opportunity to extend and secure our present peace by promoting a distinctly American internationalism. We will work with our allies and friends to be a force for good and a champion of freedom. We will work for free markets and free trade and freedom from oppression. Nations making progress toward freedom will find America is their friend.

We will promote our values, and we will promote peace. And we need a strong military to keep the peace. But our military was shaped to confront the challenges of the past. So I have asked the Secretary of Defense to review America's armed forces and prepare to transform them to meet emerging threats. My budget makes a downpayment on the research and development that will be required. Yet, in our broader transformation effort, we must put strategy first, then spending. Our defense vision will drive our defense budget, not the other way around.

Our Nation also needs a clear strategy to confront the threats of the 21st century, threats that are more widespread and less certain. They range from terrorists who threaten with bombs to tyrants and rogue nations intent on developing weapons of mass destruction. To protect our own people, our allies and friends, we must develop and we must deploy effective missile defenses.

And as we transform our military, we can discard Cold War relics, and reduce our own nuclear forces to reflect today's needs.

A strong America is the world's best hope for peace and freedom. Yet the cause of freedom rests on more than our ability to defend ourselves and our allies. Freedom is exported every day, as we ship goods and products that improve the lives of millions of people. Free trade brings greater political and personal freedom.

Each of the previous five Presidents has had the ability to negotiate far-reaching trade agreements. Tonight I ask you to give me the strong hand of presidential trade promotion authority, and to do so quickly.

As we meet tonight, many citizens are struggling with the high costs of energy. We have a serious energy problem that demands a national energy policy. The West is confronting a major energy shortage that has resulted in high prices and uncertainty. I have asked Federal agencies to work with California officials to help speed construction of new energy sources. And I have directed Vice President CHENEY, Commerce Secretary Evans, Energy Secretary Abraham, and other senior members of my Administration to recommend a national energy policy.

Our energy demand outstrips our supply. We can produce more energy at home while protecting our environ-

ment, and we must. We can produce more electricity to meet demand, and we must. We can promote alternative energy sources and conservation, and we must. America must become more energy independent.

Perhaps the biggest test of our foresight and courage will be reforming Medicare and Social Security.

Medicare's finances are strained and its coverage is outdated. Ninety-nine percent of employer-provided health plans offer some form of prescription drug coverage . . . Medicare does not. The framework for reform has been developed by Senators FRIST and BREAUX and Congressman THOMAS, and now, it is time to act. Medicare must be modernized. And we must make sure that every senior on Medicare can choose a health plan that offers prescription drugs.

Seven years from now, the baby boom generation will begin to claim Social Security benefits. Everyone in this chamber knows that Social Security is not prepared to fully fund their retirement. And we only have a couple of years to get prepared. Without reform, this country will one day awaken to a stark choice: either a drastic rise in payroll taxes, or a radical cut in retirement benefits. There is a better way.

This spring I will form a presidential commission to reform Social Security. The commission will make its recommendations by next fall. Reform should be based on these principles: It must preserve the benefits of all current retirees and those nearing retirement. It must return Social Security to sound financial footing. And it must offer personal savings accounts to younger workers who want them.

Social Security now offers workers a return of less than 2 percent on the money they pay into the system. To save the system, we must increase that by allowing younger workers to make safe, sound investments at a higher rate of return.

Ownership, access to wealth, and independence should not be the privilege of a few. They are the hope of every American . . . and we must make them the foundation of Social Security.

By confronting the tough challenge of reform, by being responsible with our budget, we can earn the trust of the American people. And, we can add to that trust by enacting fair and balanced election and campaign finance reforms.

The agenda I have set before you tonight is worthy of a great country. America is a nation at peace, but not a nation at rest. Much has been given to us, and much is expected.

Let us agree to bridge old divides. But let us also agree that our good will must be dedicated to great goals. Bipartisanship is more than minding our manners, it is doing our duty.

No one can speak in this Capitol and not be awed by its history. At so many turning points, debates in these cham-

bers have reflected the collected or divided conscience of our country. And when we walk through Statuary Hall, and see those men and women of marble, we are reminded of their courage and achievement.

Yet America's purpose is never found in statues or history. America's purpose always stands before us.

Our generation must show courage in a time of blessing, as our Nation has always shown in times of crisis. And our courage issue by issue, can gather to greatness, and serve our country. This is the privilege, and responsibility, we share. And if we work together, we can prove that public service is noble.

We all came here for a reason. We all have things we want to accomplish, and promises to keep. Juntos podemos, together we can. We can make Americans proud of their government. Together we can share in the credit of making our country more prosperous and generous and just—and earn from our conscience and from our fellow citizens, the highest possible praise: well done, good and faithful servants.

Thank you. Good night. And God Bless America.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 27, 2001.

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-733. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter Deutschland GMBH Model BO 105CB 5 and BO 105CBS 5 Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0102)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-734. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: British Aerospace HP137 Mk1, Jetstream Series 200, and Jetstream Models 3101 and 3201 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0117)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-735. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737-300, 400, and 500 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0110)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-736. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Fokker Model f28 Mark 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0101)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-737. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747-400, -400F; 767-200, and -300 Series Airplanes Equipped with P and W Model PW4000 Series Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0109)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-738. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 757-200 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0108)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-739. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica SA Model EMB 120 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0107)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-740. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: C1 604 Variant of Bombardier Model Canadair CL 600 2B16 Series Airplanes Modified in Accordance with Supplemental Type Certificate SA8060NM-D, SA8072NM-D or SA8086NM-D" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0106)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-741. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Sikorsky Aircraft Corp Model S76A, S76B, and S76C Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0115)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-742. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Dassault Model Falcon 10 and Model Mystere-Falcon 50 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0114)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-743. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Bombardier Model DHC 8 200 and 300 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0113)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-744. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737-300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0112)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-745. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives:

Construcciones Aeronauticas, SA Model CN-235, CN-235-100, and CN-235-200 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0111)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-746. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A300 B2 and A300 B4; Model A300 B4-600, A300 B4-600R, and A300 F4 500R; and Model A310 Series Airplanes; Equipped with Dowty Ram Air Turbines" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0120)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-747. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A330-301, -321, and -322 Series Airplanes and Model A340-211, -212, -214, -311, -312, and -313 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0119)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-748. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: BAE Systems Limited Jetstream Model 4101 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0118)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-749. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter Deutschland GMBH Model MBB-BK 117 Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0094)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-750. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Short Brothers Model SD3-60 SHERPA, AD3-SHERPA, SD3-30, and SD3-60 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0095)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-751. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0099)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-752. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica SA Model EMB 145 Series" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0098)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-753. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10, Model MD-10 and Model MD-11 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0097)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-754. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Ad-

ministration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: British Aerospace HP137 mk1 and Jetstream Series 200 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0096)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-755. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747-400 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0100)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-756. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Pilatus Aircraft LTD Model PC 6 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0105)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-757. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica SA Model EMB 120 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0104)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-758. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A300, A300-600, and A310 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0103)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-759. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Cape Romanzof, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0034)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-760. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Class E Airspace, Atlanta, TX; Confirmation of Effective Date" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0050)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-761. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of Class E Airspace; Cage, OK" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0048)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-762. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A310 and Model A300 B4-600, A300 BR-600R, and A300 F4-600R Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0116)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-763. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives:

Airbus Model A300 B2, A300 B4, A300 B4-600, A300 B4-600R, and A310 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0125)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-764. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0124)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-765. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech Models A36, B36TC, and 58 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0123)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-766. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Model PC 12 and PC 12/45 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0122)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-767. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: British Aerospace HP 137 Mk1, Jetstream Series 200 and Jetstream Models 3101 and 3201 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0121)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-768. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Sikorsky Aircraft Corp Model S 76A, S 76B, and S 76C Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0130)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-769. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Rolls-Royce Deutschland GmbH Model BR700-715A1-30, Br700-715B1-30, and BR700-715C1-30 Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0129)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-770. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech Models 60, A60, and B60 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0128)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-771. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Rolladen Schneider Flugzeugbau GmbH Models LS 4 and LS 4A Sailplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0126)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-772. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Ad-

ministration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: MD Helicopters Inc., Model 369A, H, HE, D, E, FF, and 500 N Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0127)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-773. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Cessna Aircraft Company Model 525 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0135)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-774. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: P and W Canada Models PW306A and PW306B Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0134)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-775. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica SA Model EMB 145 and EMB 135 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0133)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-776. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd. Model Galaxy Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0132)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-777. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Bell Textron Canada Model 206A, B, L, L1, and L3 Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0131)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-778. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class E Airspace, Asoria, OR" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0036)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-779. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class E Airspace, Tillamook, OR" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0037)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-780. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: CFM International Models CFM56-7B Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0137)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-781. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 407 Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0136)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-782. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace, Bowling Green, MO" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0042)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-783. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace, Grant NE" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0041)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-784. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace, Prineville, OR" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0039)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-785. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace, Ogallala, NE" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0040)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-786. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amend Legal Description of Jet Route J 501" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0038)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-787. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace, Bloomfield, IA" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0047)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-788. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace, Sparrevohn, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0046)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-789. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Class E Airspace, Cape Newenham, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0045)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-790. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace, Bassett NE" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0044)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-791. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Council Bluffs, IA" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0043)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-792. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tin City, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0033)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-793. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Penalty Actions in Commercial Space Transportation; Request for Comments" ((RIN2120-AH18)(2001-0001)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-794. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Penalty Actions in Commercial Space Transportation; Delay of Effective Date" ((RIN2120-AH18)(2001-0002)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-795. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Digital Flight Data Recorder Specifications; Correction" ((RIN2120-AG88)(2001-0001)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-796. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amend Class E Airspace; Westminster, MD" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0031)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-797. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E4 Airspace; Gainesville, FL; Correction" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0032)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-798. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Stemme GmbH and Co. KIG Models S10 and S10-V Sailplanes; Request for Comments" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0081)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-799. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Gulfstream Model G 1159A Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0082)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-800. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: SOCAT A Groupe AEROSPATIALE Model TBM 700 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0083)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-801. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (26)" ((RIN2120-AA65)(2001-0012)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-802. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (7)" ((RIN2120-AA65)(2001-0011)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-803. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Dornier Model 328-100 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0089)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-804. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: British Aerospace Model 4101 Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0090)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-805. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Industrie Aeronautiche e Meccaniche Model Piaggio P-180 Airplanes; Removal" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0091)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-806. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Model EC135 P1 and EC135 T1 Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0092)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-807. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: BAe Systems Limited Model ATP Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0087)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-808. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0078)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-809. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Dornier Model 328-300 Series Airplanes"

((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0079)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-810. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Pittsburg, KS; Confirmation of Effective Date" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0029)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-811. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Agusta SpA Model A109E Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0086)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-812. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A300 B2 and B4 Series Airplanes and Model A300 Br-600, A300 Br-600R, and A300 Fr-600R Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0085)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-813. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: BMW Rolls-Royce GmbH Models BR700-710A1-10 and BR700-710A2-20 Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0084)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-814. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: British Aerospace Model BAe 146 and Model Avro 146 RJ Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0088)) received on February 12, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-815. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class E Airspace; St. George, UT" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0054)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-816. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (53)" ((RIN2120-AA65)(2001-0017)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-817. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (36)" ((RIN2120-AA65)(2001-0016)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-818. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (114)" ((RIN2120-AA65)(2001-0015)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-819. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (16)" ((RIN2120-AA65)(2001-0014)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-820. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sugar Land, TX; Request for Comments" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0055)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-821. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Algona, IA; Confirmation of Effective Date" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0056)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-822. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments (6)" ((RIN2120-AA63)(2001-0002)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-823. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (42)" ((RIN2120-AA65)(2001-0013)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-824. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Bombardier Model CL 600-2B19 Series Airplanes; Request for Comments" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0141)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-825. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of VOR Federal V-480 and Jet Route J-120; AK" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0051)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-826. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification and Revocation of VOR and Colored Federal Airways and Jet Routes; AK; Correction" ((RIN2120-AA66)(2001-0052)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-827. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E2 Airspace; Tri-City, DOT" ((RIN2120-

AA66)(2001-0053)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-828. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Agusta SpA Model A 109E Helicopters; Request for Comments" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0140)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-829. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives: Bell Helicopter Textron Inc Models 214B and 214B-1; Request for Comments" ((RIN2120-AA64)(2001-0139)) received on February 15, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 392. A bill to grant a Federal Charter to Korean War Veterans Association, Incorporated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage charitable contributions to public charities for use in medical research; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 394. A bill to make an urgent supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense for the Defense Health Program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 395. A bill to ensure the independence and nonpartisan operation of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 396. A bill to provide for national quadrennial summits on small business and State summits on small business, to establish the White House Quadrennial Commission on Small Business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KYL, Mr. REED, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 397. A bill to amend the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to authorize additional rounds of base closures and realignments under the Act in 2003 and 2005, to modify certain authorities relating to closures and realignments under that Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 398. A bill to combat international money laundering and to protect the United States financial system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS (for himself and Mr. DODD):

S. 399. A bill to provide for fire sprinkler systems, or other fire suppression or prevention technologies, in public and private college and university housing and dormitories, including fraternity and sorority housing and dormitories; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mr. DORGAN):

S. 400. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 401. A bill to normalize trade relations with Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 402. A bill to make an exception to the United States embargo on trade with Cuba for the export of agricultural commodities, medicines, medical supplies, medical instruments, or medical equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

S. 403. A bill to improve the National Writing Project; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 404. A bill to provide for the technical integrity of the FM radio band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. CORZINE):

S. 405. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve outreach programs carried out by the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide for more fully informing veterans of benefits available to them under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. CORZINE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 406. A bill to reduce gun trafficking by prohibiting bulk purchases of handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 407. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, in order to carry out provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 408. A bill to provide emergency relief to small businesses affected by significant increases in the price of electricity; to the Committee on Small Business.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 28. A resolution to authorize testimony and legal representation in State of Idaho v. Fredrick Leroy Leas, Sr.; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. EDWARDS (for himself and Mr. HELMS):

S. Res. 29. A resolution honoring Dale Earnhardt and expressing condolences of the United States Senate to his family on his death; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. Res. 30. A resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget; from the Committee on the Budget; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. AKAKA):

S. Con. Res. 17. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that there should continue to be parity between the adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the adjustments in the compensation of civilian employees of the United States; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. CHAFEE):

S. Con. Res. 18. A concurrent resolution recognizing the achievements and contributions of the Peace Corps over the past 40 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 27

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 27, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

S. 88

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) were added as cosponsors of S. 88, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an incentive to ensure that all Americans gain timely and equitable access to the Internet over current and future generations of broadband capability.

S. 104

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 104, a bill to require equitable coverage of prescription contraceptive drugs and devices, and contraceptive services under health plans.

S. 131

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 131, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the annual determination of the rate of the basic benefit of active duty educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill, and for other purposes.

S. 143

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 143, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, to reduce securities fees in excess of those required to fund the operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to adjust compensation provisions for employees of the Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 145

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) were added as cosponsors 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. 148

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 148, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 164, a bill to prepare tomorrow's teachers to use technology through pre-service and in-service training, and for other purposes.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) 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. 177

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 177, a bill to amend the provisions of title 19, United States Code, relating to the manner in which pay policies and schedules and fringe benefit programs for postmasters are established.

S. 207

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 207, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to introduce new technologies to reduce energy consumption in buildings.

S. 277

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) 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. 278

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 278, a bill to restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services.

S. 280

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from North Da-

kota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 280, a bill to amend the Agriculture Marketing Act of 1946 to require retailers of beef, lamb, pork, and perishable agricultural commodities to inform consumers, at the final point of sale to consumers, of the country of origin of the commodities.

S. 305

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 305, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the reduction in the amount of Survivor Benefit Plan annuities at age 62.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to provide for teacher liability protection.

S. 321

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 321, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide families of disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medicaid program for such children, and for other purposes.

S. 335

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 335, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for distributions from qualified State tuition programs which are used to pay education expenses, and for other purposes.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to strike the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 355

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) were added as cosponsors of S. 355, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the contributions of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to the United States.

S. 366

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to increase the amount of funds available for certain agricultural trade programs.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. CON. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) 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. 20

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 20, a resolution designating March 25, 2001, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy."

S. RES. 23

At the request of Mr. CLELAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 23, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should award the Presidential Medal of Freedom posthumously to Dr. Benjamin Elijah Mays in honor of his distinguished career as an educator, civil and human rights leader, and public theologian.

S. RES. 24

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 24, a resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic schools.

S. RES. 25

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 25, a resolution designating the week beginning March 18, 2001 as "National Safe Place Week."

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 392. A bill to grant a Federal Charter to Korean War Veterans Association, Incorporated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation together with Senators WARNER, CAMPBELL, and MURRAY, which would grant a Federal Charter to the Korean War Veterans Association, Incorporated. This legislation recognizes and honors the 5.7 million Americans who fought

and served during the Korean War for their struggles and sacrifices on behalf of freedom and the principles and ideals of our nation.

The year 2000 marked the 50th Anniversary of the Korean War. In June 1950 when the North Korea People's Army swept across the 38th Parallel to occupy Seoul, South Korea, members of our Armed Forces—including many from the State of Maryland—immediately answered the call of the U.N. to repel this forceful invasion. Without hesitation, these soldiers traveled to an unfamiliar corner of the world to join an unprecedented multinational force comprised of 22 countries and risked their lives to protect freedom. The Americans who led this international effort were true patriots who fought with remarkable courage.

In battles such as Pork Chop Hill, the Inchon Landing and the frozen Chosin Reservoir, which was fought in temperatures as low as fifty-seven degrees below zero, they faced some of the most brutal combat in history. By the time the fighting had ended, 8,176 Americans were listed as missing or prisoners of war—some of whom are still missing—and over 36,000 Americans had died. One hundred and thirty-one Korean War Veterans were awarded the nation's highest commendation for combat bravery, the Medal of Honor. Ninety-four of these soldiers gave their lives in the process. There is an engraving on the Korean War Veterans Memorial which reflects these losses and how brutal a war this was. It reads, "Freedom is not Free." Yet, as a Nation, we have done little more than establish this memorial to publicly acknowledge the bravery of those who fought the Korean War. The Korean War has been termed by many as the "Forgotten War." Freedom is not free. We owe our Korean War Veterans a debt of gratitude. Granting this Federal charter—at no cost to the government—is a small expression of appreciation that we as a Nation can offer to these men and women, one which will enable them to work as a unified front to ensure that the "Forgotten War" is forgotten no more.

The Korean War Veterans Association was originally incorporated on June 25, 1985. Since its first annual reunion and memorial service in Arlington, Virginia, where its members decided to develop a national focus and strong commitment to service, the association has grown substantially to a membership of over 17,000. A Federal charter would allow the Association to continue and grow its mission and further its charitable and benevolent causes. Specifically, it will afford the Korean War Veterans' Association the same status as other major veterans organizations and allow it to participate as part of select committees with other congressionally chartered veterans and military groups. A Federal charter will also accelerate the Association's "accreditation" with the Department of Veterans Affairs which

will enable its members to assist in processing veterans' claims.

The Korean War Veterans have asked for very little in return for their service and sacrifice. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation and ask that the text of the measure be printed in the RECORD immediately following my comments.

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

S. 392

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

SECTION 1. GRANT OF FEDERAL CHARTER TO KOREAN WAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED.

(a) GRANT OF CHARTER.—Part B of subtitle II of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the following:

"CHAPTER 1201—[RESERVED]"; and

(2) by inserting the following:

"CHAPTER 1201—KOREAN WAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED

"Sec.

"120101. Organization.

"120102. Purposes.

"120103. Membership.

"120104. Governing body.

"120105. Powers.

"120106. Restrictions.

"120107. Duty to maintain corporate and tax-exempt status.

"120108. Records and inspection.

"120109. Service of process.

"120110. Liability for acts of officers and agents.

"120111. Annual report.

"§ 120101. Organization

"(a) FEDERAL CHARTER.—Korean War Veterans Association, Incorporated (in this chapter, the 'corporation'), incorporated in the State of New York, is a federally chartered corporation.

"(b) EXPIRATION OF CHARTER.—If the corporation does not comply with the provisions of this chapter, the charter granted by subsection (a) expires.

"§ 120102. Purposes

"The purposes of the corporation are as provided in its articles of incorporation and include—

"(1) organizing, promoting, and maintaining for benevolent and charitable purposes an association of persons who have seen honorable service in the Armed Forces during the Korean War, and of certain other persons;

"(2) providing a means of contact and communication among members of the corporation;

"(3) promoting the establishment of, and establishing, war and other memorials commemorative of persons who served in the Armed Forces during the Korean War; and

"(4) aiding needy members of the corporation, their wives and children, and the widows and children of persons who were members of the corporation at the time of their death.

"§ 120103. Membership

"Eligibility for membership in the corporation, and the rights and privileges of members of the corporation, are as provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

"§ 120104. Governing body

"(a) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—The board of directors of the corporation, and the responsibilities of the board of directors, are as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation.

“(b) OFFICERS.—The officers of the corporation, and the election of the officers of the corporation, are as provided in the articles of incorporation.

“§ 120105. Powers

“The corporation has only the powers provided in its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in each State in which it is incorporated.

“§ 120106. Restrictions

“(a) STOCK AND DIVIDENDS.—The corporation may not issue stock or declare or pay a dividend.

“(b) POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—The corporation, or a director or officer of the corporation as such, may not contribute to, support, or participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

“(c) LOAN.—The corporation may not make a loan to a director, officer, or employee of the corporation.

“(d) CLAIM OF GOVERNMENTAL APPROVAL OR AUTHORITY.—The corporation may not claim congressional approval, or the authority of the United States, for any of its activities.

“§ 120107. Duty to maintain corporate and tax-exempt status

“(a) CORPORATE STATUS.—The corporation shall maintain its status as a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of New York.

“(b) TAX-EXEMPT STATUS.—The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.).

“§ 120108. Records and inspection

“(a) RECORDS.—The corporation shall keep—

“(1) correct and complete records of account;

“(2) minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any of the authority of its board of directors; and

“(3) at its principal office, a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote on matters relating to the corporation.

“(b) INSPECTION.—A member entitled to vote on matters relating to the corporation, or an agent or attorney of the member, may inspect the records of the corporation for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

“§ 120109. Service of process

“The corporation shall have a designated agent in the District of Columbia to receive service of process for the corporation. Notice to or service on the agent is notice to or service on the Corporation.

“§ 120110. Liability for acts of officers and agents

“The corporation is liable for the acts of its officers and agents acting within the scope of their authority.

“§ 120111. Annual report

“The corporation shall submit an annual report to Congress on the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. The report shall be submitted at the same time as the report of the audit required by section 10101 of this title. The report may not be printed as a public document.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle II of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 1201 and inserting the following new item:

“1201. Korean War Veterans Association, Incorporated120101”.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage

charitable contributions to public charities for use in medical research, to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce bipartisan legislation, the Paul Coverdell Medical Research Investment Act.

Under the current tax code, deductible charitable cash gifts to support medical research are limited to 50 percent of an individual's adjusted gross income. This bill would simply increase the deductibility of cash gifts for medical research to 80 percent of an individual's adjusted gross income. For those individuals who are willing and able to give more than 80 percent of their income, the bill also extends the period an individual can carry the deduction forward for excess charitable gifts from five years to ten years.

In what is perhaps the most important change for today's economy, the bill allows taxpayers to donate stock without being penalized for it. Americans regularly donate stock acquired through a stock option plan to their favorite charity. And often they make the donation within a year of exercising their stock options. But current law penalizes these donations by taxing them as ordinary income or as capital gain. These taxes can run as high as 40 percent, which acts as a disincentive to contribute to charities. How absurd that someone who donates \$1,000 to a charity has to sell \$1,400 of stock to pay for it. The person could wait a year and give the stock then, but why delay the contribution when that money can be put to work curing disease today. The Paul Coverdell MRI Act is premised on a simple truth: people should not be penalized for helping others.

PriceWaterhouseCoopers, relying on IRS data and studies of charitable giving, conducted a study on the effects of the Paul Coverdell MRI Act. It concluded that if the proposal were in effect last year there would have been a 4.0 percent to 4.5 percent increase in individual giving in 2000. This amounts to \$180.4 million additional dollars in charitable donations for medical research dollars that would result in tangible health benefits to all Americans. If the additional giving grew every year over five years at the same rate as national income, a billion dollars more would be put to work to cure disease. Over the course of ten years, the number jumps to \$2.3 billion in new money for medical research. For many research efforts, that money could mean the difference between finding a cure or not finding a cure.

The returns from increased funding of medical research not only in economic sayings to the country, but in terms of curing disease and finding new treatments could be enormous. The amount and impact of disease in this country is staggering. Each day more than 1,500 Americans die of cancer. Sixteen million people have diabetes, their lives are shortened by an average of fifteen years. Cardiovascular diseases take approximately one million Amer-

ican lives a year. One and a half million people have Parkinson's Disease. Countless families suffer with the pain of a loved one who has Alzheimer's. And yet these diseases go without a cure. We must work towards the day when they are cured, prevented, or eliminated—just like polio and smallpox were years ago.

Increased funding of medical research by the private sector is needed to save and improve American lives. New discoveries in science and technology are creating even greater opportunities than in the past for large returns from money invested in medical research. The mapping of the human genome is but one example. Dr. Abraham Lieberman, a neurologist at the National Parkinson's Foundation, was quoted in Newsweek as saying that the medical research community today is “standing at the same threshold that we reached with infectious disease 100 years ago.”

The Paul Coverdell MRI Act encourages the financial gifts that will enable that threshold to be overcome. I hope you will join me in supporting it.

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. 393

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 “Paul Coverdell Medical Research Investment Act of 2001”.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN LIMITATION ON CHARITABLE DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 170(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to percentage limitations) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) SPECIAL LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Any medical research contribution shall be allowed to the extent that the aggregate of such contributions does not exceed the lesser of—

“(I) 80 percent of the taxpayer's contribution base for any taxable year, or

“(II) the excess of 80 percent of the taxpayer's contribution base for the taxable year over the amount of charitable contributions allowable under subparagraphs (A) and (B) (determined without regard to subparagraph (C)).

“(ii) CARRYOVER.—If the aggregate amount of contributions described in clause (i) exceeds the limitation of such clause, such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)(1)) as a medical research contribution in each of the 10 succeeding taxable years in order of time.

“(iii) TREATMENT OF CAPITAL GAIN PROPERTY.—In the case of any medical research contribution of capital gain property (as defined in subparagraph (C)(iv)), subsection (e)(1) shall apply to such contribution.

“(iv) MEDICAL RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘medical research contribution’ means a charitable contribution—

“(I) to an organization described in clauses (ii), (iii), (v), or (vi) of subparagraph (A), and

“(II) which is designated for the use of conducting medical research.

“(v) MEDICAL RESEARCH.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘medical research’ has the meaning given such term under the regulations promulgated under subparagraph (A)(ii), as in effect on the date of the enactment of this subparagraph.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 170(b)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended in the matter preceding clause (i) by inserting “(other than a medical research contribution)” after “contribution”.

(2) Section 170(b)(1)(B) of such Code is amended by inserting “or a medical research contribution” after “applies”.

(3) Section 170(b)(1)(C)(i) of such Code is amended by striking “subparagraph (D)” and inserting “subparagraph (D) or (G)”.

(4) Section 170(b)(1)(D)(i) of such Code is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “or a medical research contribution” after “applies”, and

(B) in the second sentence, by inserting “(other than medical research contributions)” before the period.

(5) Section 545(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “and (D)” and inserting “(D), and (G)”.

(6) Section 556(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “and (D)” and inserting “(D), and (G)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply—

(1) to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001, and

(2) to contributions made on or before December 31, 2001, but only to the extent that a deduction would be allowed under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000, had section 170(b)(1)(G) of such Code (as added by this section) applied to such contributions when made.

SEC. 3. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN INCENTIVE STOCK OPTIONS.

(a) AMT ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 56(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to treatment of incentive stock options) is amended—

(1) by striking “Section 421” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), section 421”, and

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

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN MEDICAL RESEARCH STOCK.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—This paragraph shall not apply in the case of a medical research stock transfer.

“(ii) MEDICAL RESEARCH STOCK TRANSFER.—For purposes of clause (i), the term ‘medical research stock transfer’ means a transfer—

“(I) of stock which is traded on an established securities market,

(II) of stock which is acquired pursuant to the exercise of an incentive stock option within the same taxable year as such transfer occurs, and

“(III) which is a medical research contribution (as defined in section 170(b)(1)(G)(iv)).”.

(b) NONRECOGNITION OF CERTAIN INCENTIVE STOCK OPTIONS.—Section 422(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to special rules) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) MEDICAL RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of this section and section 421, the transfer of a share of stock which is a medical research stock transfer (as defined in section 56(b)(3)(B)) shall be treated as meeting the requirements of subsection (a)(1).”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to transfers

of stock made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 394. A bill to make an urgent supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense for the Defense Health Program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, as many Senators know, there has been a major problem in funding for health care for military families and military retirees since 1993. Budgets for the Defense Health Program have been submitted to Congress without requesting enough spending to cover all known medical and health care expenses.

This problem has been recurring year after year because budget officials in the Department of Defense had been “low balling” their predictions of inflation in DoD’s Defense Health Program; they have projected medical inflation at or below the overall economy’s rate. Meanwhile, medical care costs have grown well above the national inflation rate.

Since 1996 DoD has projected an average annual inflation rate of 1.8 percent in the Defense Health Program, but the actual average rate over that time period is 4.9 percent.

Just last year, DoD predicted 2.1 percent inflation for the Defense Health Program in 2001; experts are predicting the rate to be 7.9 percent.

This unacceptable budgeting practice has resulted in expenses being incurred but no funds to pay the bills. Congress has responded by funding these gaps with additional spending, usually in emergency supplemental appropriations bills.

While we have addressed the problem when we ultimately learn the size of the funding gap, the inappropriate budgeting practices of the past have had a major negative impact on military service men and women, military retirees, and the dependents of both.

When military medical personnel and civilian providers do not know if or when they will receive full funding, appointments for healthcare can be complicated, and the services rendered can be delayed or degraded. A system that many already find troublesome can become exasperating.

This problem is not small; it directly affects an active beneficiary population of almost six million, including 1.5 million active duty servicemen and women, 1 million retirees, and 3.3 family dependents.

For several years the problem has been growing, from approximately \$240 million in 1994 to as much as \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 2000. Coincident with the enactment of “Tricare for Life” and other new health care benefits in the Defense Authorization Act for 2001, the problem has remained at this all time high level and is currently estimated to be \$1.2 billion for 2001. Some predict it may ultimately be \$1.4 billion before the year is over.

President Bush has already pledged that he will fully fund Tricare costs in

2002 at an estimated \$3.9 billion, and I have every expectation that with the proper advice he will also fully fund all 2002 Defense Health Program costs. However, the earlier 2001 funding gap remains, and I believe Congress can and should act as promptly as possible to fully fund all known costs.

Accordingly, I am introducing legislation to provide a supplemental appropriation of the currently estimated \$1.2 billion for the Defense Health Program for 2001.

Because the money is needed on an urgent basis, I will discuss how we can address this matter with the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee when he convenes a meeting of the Defense Subcommittee on February 28 to conduct hearings on the Military Health System. I fully expect that we will act as promptly as possible and in time to address real needs.

I am also announcing four specific recommendations for the Defense Health Program I will make as Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee for the 2002 congressional budget resolution:

Sufficient budget authority and outlays to enable the enactment of the 2001 appropriations legislation I am introducing today.

An additional \$1.4 billion in fiscal year 2002 to accommodate actual inflation in DoD health care, rather than the unrealistic under-estimate left by the officials of the outgoing Administration.

To accommodate future inflation, the budget resolution will also provide the requisite amounts of budget authority and outlays to accommodate 5 percent inflation for the next ten years. While I have every expectation that President Bush and Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld will address this underfunding in the 2002 budget, I am adding these amounts, totaling \$18 billion over 10 years, just in case their review of the defense budget has not yet addressed the unacceptable budgeting practices of the past.

In its current estimates, the Congressional Budget Office has not included additional discretionary spending in its “baseline” for the “Tricare for Life” program. The technical reasons for this are esoteric, but the money is substantial, \$9.8 billion over 10 years. If this money were not also added now, we would just be engaging in another form of underfunding.

Congress and the executive branch have made various promises to both active duty and retired military personnel for their healthcare and the healthcare of their dependents. It is unacceptable to make these promises but not to include in the budget the money required to make good on them. The steps I am taking today are the first steps toward making that happen.

By Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 395. A bill to ensure the independence and nonpartisan operation of the

Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Independent Office of Advocacy Act of 2001. This bill is designed to build on the success achieved by the Office of Advocacy over the past 24 years. It is intended to strengthen that foundation to make the Office of Advocacy a stronger, more effective advocate for all small businesses throughout the United States. This bill was approved unanimously by the Senate during the 106th Congress; however, it was not taken up in the House of Representatives prior to the adjournment last month. It is my understanding the House Committee on Small Business under its new chairman, DON MANZULLO, is likely to act on similar legislation this year.

The Office of Advocacy is a unique office within the Federal Government. It is part of the Small Business Administration, SBA/Agency, and its director, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy, is nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. At the same time, the Office is also intended to be the independent voice for small business within the Federal Government. It is supposed to develop proposals for changing government policies to help small businesses, and it is supposed to represent the views and interests of small businesses before other Federal agencies.

As the director of the Office of Advocacy, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy has a dual responsibility. On the one hand, he is the independent watchdog for small business. On the other hand, he is also a part of the President's administration. As you can imagine, those are sometimes difficult roles to play simultaneously.

The Independent Office of Advocacy Act of 2001 would make the Office of Advocacy and the Chief Counsel for Advocacy a fully independent advocate within the executive branch acting on behalf of the small business community. The bill would establish a clear mandate that the Office of Advocacy will fight on behalf of small businesses regardless of the position taken on critical issues by the President and his administration.

The Independent Office of Advocacy Act of 2001 would direct the Chief Counsel to submit an annual report on Federal agency compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act to the President and the Senate and House Committees on Small Business. The Reg Flex Act is a very important weapon in the war against the over-regulation of small businesses. When the Senate first debated this bill in the 106th Congress, I offered an amendment at the request of Senator FRED THOMPSON, chairman of the Government Affairs Committee, that would direct the Chief Counsel for Advocacy to send a copy of the report to the Senate Government Affairs Committee. In addition, my amendment also required that copies of

the report be sent to the House Committee on Government Reform and the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary. I believe these changes make good sense for each of the committees to receive this report on Reg Flex compliance, and I have included them in the version of the bill being introduced and debated today.

The Office of Advocacy as envisioned by the Independent Office of Advocacy Act 2001 would be unique within the executive branch. The Chief Counsel for Advocacy would be a wide-ranging advocate, who would be free to take positions contrary to the administration's policies and to advocate change in government programs and attitudes as they impact small businesses. During its consideration of the bill in 1999, the Committee on Small Business adopted unanimously an amendment I offered, which was cosponsored by Senator JOHN KERRY, the committee's ranking Democrat, to require the Chief Counsel to be appointed "from civilian life." This qualification is intended to emphasize that the person nominated to serve in this important role should have a strong small business background.

In 1976, Congress established the Office of Advocacy in the SBA to be the eyes, ears and voice for small business within the Federal Government. Over time, it has been assumed that the Office of Advocacy is the "independent" voice for small business. While I strongly believe that the Office of Advocacy and the Chief Counsel should be independent and free to advocate or support positions that might be contrary to the administration's policies, I have come to find that the Office has not been as independent as necessary to do the job for small business.

For example, funding for the Office of Advocacy comes from the salaries and expense account of the SBA's budget. Staffing is allocated by the SBA Administrator to the Office of Advocacy from the overall staff allocation for the Agency. In 1990, there were 70 full-time employees working on behalf of small businesses in the Office of Advocacy. Today's allocation of staff is 49, and fewer are actually on-board as the result of the longstanding hiring freeze at the SBA. The independence of the Office is diminished when the Office of Advocacy staff is reduced to allow for increased staffing for new programs and additional initiatives in other areas of SBA, at the discretion of the Administrator.

In addition, the General Accounting Office, GAO, undertook a report for me on personnel practices at the SBA, GAO/GGD-99-68. I was alarmed by the GAO's finding that during the past eight years, the Assistant Advocates and Regional Advocates hired by the Office of Advocacy shared many of the attributes of schedule C political appointees. In fact Regional Advocates are frequently cleared by the White House personnel office—the same procedure followed for approving Schedule C political appointees.

The facts discussed in the GAO report cast the Office of Advocacy in a whole new light. The report raised questions, concerns and suspicions regarding the independence of the Office of Advocacy. Has there been a time when the Office did not pursue a matter as vigorously as it might have were it not for direct or indirect political influence? Prior to receipt of the GAO Report, my response was a resounding "No." But since receipt of the GAO report, a question mark arises.

Let me take a moment and note that I will be unrelenting in my efforts to insure the complete independence of the Office of Advocacy in all matters, at all times, for the continued benefit of all small businesses. However, so long as the administration controls the budget allocated to the Office of Advocacy and controls who is hired, the independence of the Office may be in jeopardy. We must correct this situation, and the sooner we do it, the better it will be for the small business community. As our government is changing over to President Bush's administration, this would be a opportune time to establish, once and for all, the actual independence of the Office of Advocacy.

The Independent Office of Advocacy Act of 2001 builds a firewall to prevent the political intrusion into the management of day-to-day operations of the Office of Advocacy. The bill would require that the SBA's budget include a separate account for the Office of Advocacy. No longer would its funds come from the general operating account of the Agency. The separate account would also provide for the number of full-time employees who would work within the Office of Advocacy. No longer would the Chief Counsel for Advocacy have to seek approval from the SBA Administrator to hire staff for the Office of Advocacy.

The bill would also continue the practice of allowing the Chief Counsel to hire individuals critical to the mission of the Office of Advocacy without going through the normal competitive procedures directed by federal law and the Office of Personnel Management, (OPM). I believe this special hiring authority, which is limited only to employees within the Office of Advocacy, is beneficial because it allows the Chief Counsel to hire quickly those persons who can best assist the Office in responding to changing issues and problems confronting small businesses.

Mr. President, the Independent Office of Advocacy Act is a sound bill. It is the product of a great deal of thoughtful, objective review and consideration by me, the staff of the Committee on Small Business, representatives of the small business community, former Chief Counsels for Advocacy and others. These individuals have also devoted much time and effort in actively participating in a committee roundtable discussion on the Office of Advocacy, which my committee held on April 21, 1999. As I stated earlier, the

Committee on Small Business approved this bill by a unanimous 17-0 vote, and it was later approved unanimously by the Senate. I urge each of my colleagues to review this legislation closely.

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. 395

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 "Independent Office of Advocacy Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) excessive regulations continue to burden United States small businesses;

(2) Federal agencies are reluctant to comply with the requirements of chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, and continue to propose regulations that impose disproportionate burdens on small businesses;

(3) the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (referred to in this Act as the "Office") is an effective advocate for small businesses that can help to ensure that agencies are responsive to small businesses and that agencies comply with their statutory obligations under chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, and under the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-121; 106 Stat. 4249 et seq.);

(4) the independence of the Office is essential to ensure that it can serve as an effective advocate for small businesses without being restricted by the views or policies of the Small Business Administration or any other executive branch agency;

(5) the Office needs sufficient resources to conduct the research required to assess effectively the impact of regulations on small businesses; and

(6) the research, information, and expertise of the Office make it a valuable adviser to Congress as well as the executive branch agencies with which the Office works on behalf of small businesses.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to ensure that the Office has the statutory independence and adequate financial resources to advocate for and on behalf of small business;

(2) to require that the Office report to the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committees on Small Business of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration in order to keep them fully and currently informed about issues and regulations affecting small businesses and the necessity for corrective action by the regulatory agency or the Congress;

(3) to provide a separate authorization for appropriations for the Office;

(4) to authorize the Office to report to the President and to the Congress regarding agency compliance with chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code; and

(5) to enhance the role of the Office pursuant to chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 4. OFFICE OF ADVOCACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of Public Law 94-305 (15 U.S.C. 634a et seq.) is amended by striking sections 201 through 203 and inserting the following:

"SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

"This title may be cited as the 'Office of Advocacy Act'.

"SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

"In this title—

"(1) the term 'Administration' means the Small Business Administration;

"(2) the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration;

"(3) the term 'Chief Counsel' means the Chief Counsel for Advocacy appointed under section 203; and

"(4) the term 'Office' means the Office of Advocacy established under section 203.

"SEC. 203. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF ADVOCACY.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Administration an Office of Advocacy.

"(2) APPROPRIATION REQUESTS.—Each appropriation request prepared and submitted by the Administration under section 1108 of title 31, United States Code, shall include a separate request relating to the Office.

"(b) CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The management of the Office shall be vested in a Chief Counsel for Advocacy, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of the office.

"(2) EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTION.—The individual appointed to the office of Chief Counsel may not serve as an officer or employee of the Administration during the 5-year period preceding the date of appointment.

"(3) REMOVAL.—The Chief Counsel may be removed from office by the President, and the President shall notify the Congress of any such removal not later than 30 days before the date of the removal, except that 30-day prior notice shall not be required in the case of misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or if there is reasonable cause to believe that the Chief Counsel has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed.

"(c) PRIMARY FUNCTIONS.—The Office shall—

"(1) examine the role of small business concerns in the economy of the United States and the contribution that small business concerns can make in improving competition, encouraging economic and social mobility for all citizens, restraining inflation, spurring production, expanding employment opportunities, increasing productivity, promoting exports, stimulating innovation and entrepreneurship, and providing the means by which new and untested products and services can be brought to the marketplace;

"(2) assess the effectiveness of Federal subsidy and assistance programs for small business concerns and the desirability of reducing the emphasis on those programs and increasing the emphasis on general assistance programs designed to benefit all small business concerns;

"(3) measure the direct costs and other effects of government regulation of small business concerns, and make legislative, regulatory, and nonlegislative proposals for eliminating the excessive or unnecessary regulation of small business concerns;

"(4) determine the impact of the tax structure on small business concerns and make legislative, regulatory, and other proposals for altering the tax structure to enable all small business concerns to realize their potential for contributing to the improvement of the Nation's economic well-being;

"(5) study the ability of financial markets and institutions to meet small business cred-

it needs and determine the impact of government demands on credit for small business concerns;

"(6) determine financial resource availability and recommend, with respect to small business concerns, methods for—

"(A) delivery of financial assistance to minority and women-owned enterprises, including methods for securing equity capital;

"(B) generating markets for goods and services;

"(C) providing effective business education, more effective management and technical assistance, and training; and

"(D) assistance in complying with Federal, State, and local laws;

"(7) evaluate the efforts of Federal agencies and the private sector to assist minority and women-owned small business concerns;

"(8) make such recommendations as may be appropriate to assist the development and strengthening of minority, women-owned, and other small business concerns;

"(9) recommend specific measures for creating an environment in which all businesses will have the opportunity—

"(A) to compete effectively and expand to their full potential; and

"(B) to ascertain any common reasons for small business successes and failures;

"(10) to determine the desirability of developing a set of rational, objective criteria to be used to define small business, and to develop such criteria, if appropriate;

"(11) make recommendations and submit reports to the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committees on Small Business of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Administrator with respect to issues and regulations affecting small business concerns and the necessity for corrective action by the Administrator, any Federal department or agency, or the Congress; and

"(12) evaluate the efforts of each department and agency of the United States, and of private industry, to assist small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, as defined in section 3(q) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)), and small business concerns owned and controlled by serviced-disabled veterans, as defined in such section 3(q), and to provide statistical information on the utilization of such programs by such small business concerns, and to make appropriate recommendations to the Administrator and to the Congress in order to promote the establishment and growth of those small business concerns.

"(d) ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS.—The Office shall, on a continuing basis—

"(1) serve as a focal point for the receipt of complaints, criticisms, and suggestions concerning the policies and activities of the Administration and any other department or agency of the Federal Government that affects small business concerns;

"(2) counsel small business concerns on the means by which to resolve questions and problems concerning the relationship between small business and the Federal Government;

"(3) develop proposals for changes in the policies and activities of any agency of the Federal Government that will better fulfill the purposes of this title and communicate such proposals to the appropriate Federal agencies;

"(4) represent the views and interests of small business concerns before other Federal agencies whose policies and activities may affect small business;

"(5) enlist the cooperation and assistance of public and private agencies, businesses, and other organizations in disseminating information about the programs and services provided by the Federal Government that are of benefit to small business concerns, and information on the means by which small

business concerns can participate in or make use of such programs and services; and

“(6) carry out the responsibilities of the Office under chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code.

“(e) OVERHEAD AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—The Administrator shall provide the Office with appropriate and adequate office space at central and field office locations of the Administration, together with such equipment, office supplies, and communications facilities and services as may be necessary for the operation of such offices, and shall provide necessary maintenance services for such offices and the equipment and facilities located therein.”.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Title II of Public Law 94-305 (15 U.S.C. 634a et seq.) is amended by striking section 206 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 206. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

“(a) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not less than annually, the Chief Counsel shall submit to the President and to the Committees on Small Business of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on agency compliance with chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code.

“(b) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—In addition to the reports required under subsection (a) of this section and section 203(c)(11), the Chief Counsel may prepare and publish such reports as the Chief Counsel determines to be appropriate.

“(c) PROHIBITION.—No report under this title shall be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget or to any other department or agency of the Federal Government for any purpose before submission of the report to the President and to the Congress.”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Title II of Public Law 94-305 (15 U.S.C. 634a et seq.) is amended by striking section 207 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office to carry out this title such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year.

“(b) AVAILABILITY.—Any amount appropriated under subsection (a) shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until expended.”.

(d) INCUMBENT CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY.—The individual serving as the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve in that position after such date in accordance with section 203 of the Office of Advocacy Act, as amended by this section.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my friend and colleague, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business, KIT BOND, in introducing the “Independent Office of Advocacy Act.” This legislation will help ensure the Small Business Administration’s (SBA) Office of Advocacy has the necessary autonomy to remain an independent voice for America’s small businesses. I would like to thank the Chairman and his staff for working with me and my staff to make the necessary changes to this legislation to garner bipartisan support.

This legislation is similar to a bill introduced by Chairman BOND, which I supported, during the 106th Congress. While this legislation received strong support in the Senate Committee on

Small Business and on the floor of the Senate, the House did not take any action. I am hopeful that this legislation will be enacted during the 107th Congress.

The Independent Office of Advocacy Act rewrites the law that created the Small Business Administration’s Office of Advocacy to allow for increased autonomy. It reaffirms the Office’s statutory and financial independence by preventing the President from firing the advocate without 30 days prior notice to Congress and by creating a separate authorization for the Office from that of SBA’s. It also states that the Chief Counsel shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation, and shall not have served in the Administration for a period of 5 years prior to the date of appointment.

The legislation also makes women-owned businesses an equal priority of the Office of Advocacy by adding women-owned business to the primary functions of the Office of Advocacy, wherever minority owned business appears. It also adds new reporting requirements and additional functions to the Office of Advocacy with regard to enforcement of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act, SBREFA. The provisions regarding SBREFA are already a part of existing law in Chapter 6 Title 5 of US Code, and will now, rightly, be added to the statute establishing the Office of Advocacy.

But at its heart, this legislation will allow the Office of Advocacy to better represent small business interests before Congress, Federal agencies, and the Federal Government without fear of reprisal for disagreeing with the position of the current Administration.

For those of my colleagues without an intimate knowledge of the important role the Office of Advocacy and its Chief Counsel play in protecting and promoting America’s small businesses, I will briefly elaborate its important functions and achievements. From studying the role of small business in the U.S. economy, to promoting small business exports, to lightening the regulatory burden of small businesses through the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) and the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act, SBREFA, the Office of Advocacy has a wide scope of authority and responsibility.

The U.S. Congress created the Office of Advocacy, headed by a Chief Counsel to be appointed by the President from the private sector and confirmed by the Senate, in June of 1976. The rationale was to give small businesses a louder voice in the councils of government.

Each year, the Office of Advocacy works to facilitate meetings for small business people with congressional staff and executive branch officials, and convenes ad hoc issue-specific meetings to discuss small business concerns. It has published numerous reports, compiled vast amounts of data and successfully lightened the regu-

latory burden on America’s small businesses. In the area of contracting, the Office of Advocacy developed PRO-Net, a database of small businesses used by contracting officers to find small businesses interested in selling to the Federal government.

The U.S. Congress, the Administration and of course, small businesses, have all benefitted from the work of the Office of Advocacy. For example, between 1998 and 2000, regulatory changes supported by the Office of Advocacy saved small businesses around \$20 billion in annual and one-time compliance costs.

Mr. President, small businesses remain the backbone of the U.S. economy, accounting for 99 percent of all employers, providing 75 percent of all net new jobs, and accounting for 51 percent of private-sector output. In fact, and this may surprise some of my colleagues, small businesses employ 38 percent of high-tech workers, an increasingly important sector in our economy.

Small businesses have also taken the lead in moving people from welfare to work and an increasing number of women and minorities are turning to small business ownership as a means to gain economic self-sufficiency. Put simply, small businesses represent what is best in the United States economy, providing innovation, competition and entrepreneurship.

Their interests are vast, their activities divergent, and the difficulties they face to stay in business are numerous. To provide the necessary support to help them, SBA’s Office of Advocacy needs our support.

The responsibility and authority given the Office of Advocacy and the Chief Counsel are crucial to their ability to be an effective independent voice in the Federal Government for small businesses. When the Senate Committee on Small Business held a Roundtable meeting about the Office of Advocacy with small business concerns on April 21, 1999, every person in the room was concerned about the present and future state of affairs for the Office of Advocacy. These small businesses asked us to do everything we could to protect and strengthen this important office. I believe this legislation accomplishes this important goal.

I have always been a strong supporter of the Office of Advocacy and I am pleased to join with Chairman BOND in introducing this legislation, which will ensure that it remains an independent and effective voice representing America’s small businesses.

By Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 396. A bill to provide for national quadrennial summits on small business and State summits on small business, to establish the White House Quadrennial Commission on Small Business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I am introducing

the White House Quadrennial Small Business Summit Act of 2001. This bill is designed to create a permanent independent commission that will carry-on the extraordinary work that has been accomplished by three White House Conferences on Small Business. The Small Business Commission will direct national and state Small business summits, and small business delegates from every state will attend the summits.

Last year, representatives of small businesses and organizers of prior White House Conferences on Small Business worked closely with the Committee on Small Business to develop legislation similar to the bill I am introducing today. The bill passed the Senate last year as part of the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000, S. 3121; however, it was dropped in Conference.

For the past 15 years, small businesses have been the fastest growing sector of the U.S. economy. When large businesses were restructuring and laying off significant numbers of workers, small businesses not only filled the gap, but their growth actually caused a net increase in new jobs. Today, small businesses employ over one-half of all workers in the United States, and they generate nearly 55 percent of the gross domestic product. Were it not for small businesses, our country could not have experienced the sustained economic upsurge that has been ongoing since 1992.

Because small businesses play such a significant role in our economy, in both rural towns and bustling inner cities, I believe it is important that the Federal government sponsor a national conference every four years to highlight the successes of small businesses and to focus national attention on the problems that may be hindering the ability of small businesses to start up and grow.

Small business ownership is, has been, and will continue to be the dream of millions of Americans. Countries from all over the world send delegations to the United States to study why our system of small business ownership is so successful, all the while looking for a way to duplicate our success in their countries. Because we see and experience the successes of small businesses on a daily basis, it is easy to lose sight of the very special thing we have going for us in the United States, where each of us can have the opportunity to own and run our own business.

The White House Quadrennial Small Business Summit Act of 2001 is designed to capture and focus our attention on small business every four years. In this way, we will take the opportunity to study what is happening throughout the United States to small businesses. In one sense, the bill is designed to put small business on a pinnacle so we can appreciate what they have accomplished. At the same time, and just as important, every four years we will have an opportunity to learn

from small businesses in each state what is not going well for them, such as, actions by the Federal government that hinder small business growth or state and local regulations that are a deterrent to starting a business.

My bill creates an independent, bipartisan White House Quadrennial Commission on Small Business, which will be made up of 8 small business advocates and the Small Business Administration's Chief Counsel for Advocacy. Every four years, during the first year following a presidential election, the President will name four National Commissioners. In the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of each body will each name one National Commissioner.

Widespread participation from small businesses in each state will contribute to the work leading up to the national Small Business Summit. Under the bill, the Small Business Summit will take place one year after the Quadrennial Commissioners are appointed. The first act of the Commissioners will be to request that each Governor and each U.S. Senator name a small business delegate and alternate delegate from their respective states to the National Convention. Each U.S. Representative will be asked to name a small business delegate and alternate from his or her Congressional district. And the President will name a delegate and alternate from each state.

The delegates to the Small Business Summit must be owners or officers of small businesses. Prior to the national Small Business Summit, there will be individual State Summits at which additional delegates will be elected to attend the national Summit. Three delegates and three alternates will be elected from each Congressional district within the state.

The small business delegates will play a major role leading up to the Small Business Summit. We will be looking to the small business delegates to develop and highlight issues of critical concern to small businesses. The work at the state level by the small business delegates will need to be thorough and thoughtful to make the Small Business Summit a success.

My goal will be for the small business delegates to think broadly, that is, to think "out of the box." Their attention should include but not be restricted to the traditional issues associated with small business concerns, such as access to capital, tax reform and regulatory reform. In my role as Chairman of the Committee on Small Business, I will urge the delegates to focus on a wide array of issues that impact significantly on small businesses, including the importance of a solid education and the need for skilled, trained workers.

Once the small business delegates are selected, the Small Business Commission will serve as a resource to the delegates for issue development and for planning the State Conferences. The Small Business Commission will have a

modest staff, including an Executive Director, that will work full time to make the State and National Summits successes. A major resource to the Small Business Commission and its staff will be the Chief Counsel for Advocacy from the SBA. The Chief Counsel and the Office of Advocacy will serve as a major resource to the Small Business Commission, and in turn, to the small business delegates, by providing them with both substantive background information and other administrative materials in support of the State and National Summits.

Mr. President, small businesses generally do not have the resources to maintain full time representatives to lobby our Federal government. They are too busy running their businesses to devote much attention to educating government officials as to what is going well, what is going poorly, and what needs improvement for the small business community. The White House Quadrennial Small Business Summit will give small businesses an opportunity every four years to make its mark on the Congress and the Executive Branch. I urge each of my colleagues to review their proposal, and I hope they will agree to join me as co-sponsors of the "White House Quadrennial Small Business Summit Act of 2001."

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. 396

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 "White House Quadrennial Small Business Summit Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration;

(2) the term "Chief Counsel" means the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration;

(3) the term "Small Business Commission" means the national White House Quadrennial Commission on Small Business established under section 6;

(4) the term "Small Business Summit"—

(A) means the White House Quadrennial Summit on Small Business conducted under section 3(a); and

(B) includes the last White House Conference on Small Business occurring before 2002;

(5) the term "small business" has the meaning given the term "small business concern" in section 3 of the Small Business Act;

(6) the term "State" means any of the 50 States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands; and

(7) the term "State Summit" means a State Summit on Small Business conducted under section 3(b).

SEC. 3. NATIONAL AND STATE QUADRENNIAL SUMMITS ON SMALL BUSINESS.

(a) **QUADRENNIAL SUMMITS.**—There shall be a national White House Quadrennial Summit

on Small Business once every 4 years, to be held during the second year following each Presidential election, to carry out the purposes set forth in section 4.

(b) **STATE SUMMITS.**—Each Small Business Summit referred to in subsection (a) shall be preceded by a State Summit on Small Business, with not fewer than 1 such summit held in each State, and with not fewer than 2 such summits held in any State having a population of more than 10,000,000.

SEC. 4. PURPOSES OF SMALL BUSINESS SUMMITS.

The purposes of each Small Business Summit shall be—

(1) to increase public awareness of the contribution of small business to the national economy;

(2) to identify the problems of small business;

(3) to examine the status of minorities and women as small business owners;

(4) to assist small business in carrying out its role as the Nation's job creator;

(5) to assemble small businesses to develop such specific and comprehensive recommendations for legislative and regulatory action as may be appropriate for maintaining and encouraging the economic viability of small business and thereby, the Nation; and

(6) to review the status of recommendations adopted at the immediately preceding Small Business Summit.

SEC. 5. SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To carry out the purposes set forth in section 4, the Small Business Commission shall conduct Small Business Summits and State Summits to bring together individuals concerned with issues relating to small business.

(b) **SUMMIT DELEGATES.**—

(1) **QUALIFICATION.**—Only individuals who are owners or officers of a small business shall be eligible for appointment or election as delegates (or alternates) to the Small Business Summit, or be eligible to vote in the selection of delegates at the State Summits pursuant to this subsection.

(2) **APPOINTED DELEGATES.**—Two months before the date of the first State Summit, there shall be—

(A) 1 delegate (and 1 alternate) appointed by the Governor of each State;

(B) 1 delegate (and 1 alternate) appointed by each Member of the House of Representatives, from the congressional district of that Member;

(C) 1 delegate (and 1 alternate) appointed by each Member of the Senate from the home State of that Member; and

(D) 53 delegates (and 53 alternates) appointed by the President, 1 from each State.

(3) **ELECTED DELEGATES.**—The participants at each State Summit shall elect 3 delegates and 3 alternates to the Small Business Summit for each congressional district within the State, or part of the State represented at the Summit, or not fewer than 9 delegates, pursuant to rules developed by the Small Business Commission.

(4) **POWERS AND DUTIES.**—Delegates to each Small Business Summit shall—

(A) attend the State summits in his or her respective State;

(B) elect a delegation chairperson, vice chairperson, and other leadership as may be necessary;

(C) conduct meetings and other activities at the State level before the date of the Small Business Summit, subject to the approval of the Small Business Commission; and

(D) direct such State level summits, meetings, and activities toward the consideration of the purposes set forth in section 4, in order to prepare for the next Small Business Summit.

(5) **ALTERNATES.**—Alternates shall serve during the absence or unavailability of the delegate.

(c) **ROLE OF THE CHIEF COUNSEL.**—The Chief Counsel shall, after consultation and in coordination with the Small Business Commission, assist in carrying out the Small Business Summits and State Summits required by this Act by—

(1) preparing and providing background information and administrative materials for use by participants in the summits;

(2) distributing issue information and administrative communications, electronically where possible through an Internet web site and e-mail, and in printed form if requested;

(3) maintaining an Internet web site and regular e-mail communications after each Small Business Summit to inform delegates and the public of the status of recommendations and related governmental activity; and

(4) maintaining, between summits, an active interim organization of delegate representatives from each region of the Administration, to advise the Chief Counsel on each of the major small business issue areas, and monitor the progress of the Summits' recommendations.

(d) **EXPENSES.**—Each delegate (and alternate) to each Small Business Summit and State Summit—

(1) shall be responsible for the expenses of that delegate related to attending the summits; and

(2) shall not be reimbursed either from funds made available pursuant to this section or the Small Business Act.

(e) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Small Business Commission shall appoint a Summit Advisory Committee, which shall be composed of 10 individuals who were participants at the most recently preceding Small Business Summit, to advise the Small Business Commission on the organization, rules, and processes of the Summits.

(2) **PREFERENCE.**—Preference for appointment under this subsection shall be given to individuals who have been active participants in the implementation process following the most recently preceding Small Business Summit.

(f) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**—Small Business Summits and State Summits shall be open to the public, and no fee or charge may be imposed on any attendee, other than an amount necessary to cover the cost of any meal provided, plus, with respect to State Summits, a registration fee to defray the expense of meeting rooms and materials of not to exceed \$20 per person.

SEC. 6. WHITE HOUSE QUADRENNIAL COMMISSION ON SMALL BUSINESS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established the White House Quadrennial Commission on Small Business.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT.**—The Small Business Commission shall be composed of 9 members, including—

(A) the Chief Counsel;

(B) 4 members appointed by the President;

(C) 1 member appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

(D) 1 member appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate;

(E) 1 member appointed by the Majority Leader of the House of Representatives; and

(F) 1 member appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) **SELECTION.**—Members of the Small Business Commission described in subparagraphs (B) through (F) of paragraph (1) shall be selected from among distinguished individuals noted for their knowledge and experience in fields relevant to the issue of small business and the purposes set forth in section 4.

(3) **TIME OF APPOINTMENT.**—The appointments required by paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be made not later than 18 months before the opening date of each Small Business Summit; and

(B) shall expire 6 months after the date on which each Small Business Summit is convened.

(c) **ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON.**—At the first meeting of the Small Business Commission, a majority of the members present and voting shall elect a member of the Small Business Commission to serve as the Chairperson.

(d) **POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMISSION.**—The Small Business Commission—

(1) may enter into contracts with public agencies, private organizations, and academic institutions to carry out this Act;

(2) shall consult, coordinate, and contract with an independent, nonpartisan organization that—

(A) has both substantive and logistical experience in developing and organizing conferences and forums throughout the Nation with elected officials and other government and business leaders;

(B) has experience in generating private resources from multiple States in the form of event sponsorships; and

(C) can demonstrate evidence of a working relationship with Members of Congress from the majority and minority parties, and at least 1 Federal agency; and

(3) shall prescribe such financial controls and accounting procedures as needed for the handling of funds from fees and charges and the payment of authorized meal, facility, travel, and other related expenses.

(e) **PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION OF SUMMITS.**—In carrying out the Small Business Summits and State Summits, the Small Business Commission shall consult with—

(1) the Chief Counsel;

(2) Congress; and

(3) such other Federal agencies as the Small Business Commission determines to be appropriate.

(f) **REPORTS REQUIRED.**—Not later than 6 months after the date on which each Small Business Summit is convened, the Small Business Commission shall submit to the President and to the Chairpersons and Ranking Members of the Committees on Small Business of the Senate and the House of Representatives a final report, which shall—

(1) include the findings and recommendations of the Small Business Summit and any proposals for legislative action necessary to implement those recommendations; and

(2) be made available to the public.

(g) **QUORUM.**—Four voting members of the Small Business Commission shall constitute a quorum for purposes of transacting business.

(h) **MEETINGS.**—The Small Business Commission shall meet not later than 20 calendar days after the appointment of the initial members of the Small Business Commission, and not less frequently than every 30 calendar days thereafter.

(i) **VACANCIES.**—Any vacancy on the Small Business Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(j) **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF.**—The Small Business Commission may appoint and compensate an Executive Director and such other personnel to conduct the Small Business Summits and State Summits as the Small Business Commission may determine to be advisable, without regard to title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the Executive

Director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(k) **FUNDING.**—Members of the Small Business Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Small Business Commission.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out each Small Business Summit and the State Summits required by this Act, \$5,000,000, which shall remain available until expended. New spending authority or authority to enter contracts as provided in this title shall be effective only to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

(b) **SPECIFIC EARMARK.**—No amount made available to the Small Business Administration may be made available to carry out this title, other than amounts made available specifically for the purpose of conducting the Small Business Summits and State Summits.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KYL, Mr. REED, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 397. A bill to amend the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to authorize additional rounds of base closures and realignments under the Act in 2003 and 2005, to modify certain authorities relating to closures and realignments under that Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would authorize two rounds of U.S. military installation realignment and closures to occur in 2003 and 2005. I am pleased to have Senators LEVIN, HAGEL, LIEBERMAN, KYL, REED, KOHL, VOINOVICH, FEINGOLD, JEFFORDS and DEWINE as co-sponsors of this bill.

Although I would prefer to say that this is a new idea—it isn't. In 1970, the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel, "Fithugh Commission") made reference to "consolidation of military activities at fewer installations would contribute to more efficient operations and would produce substantial savings." In 1983, the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control, "Grace Commission" made strong recommendations for military base closures. In 1997, the Quadrennial Defense Review recommended that, even after four base closure rounds in 1988, 1991, 1993 and 1995, the Armed Forces "must shed excess infrastructure." Likewise, the 1997 Defense Reform Initiative and the National Defense Panel "strongly urged Congress and the Department of Defense to move quickly to restore the base realignment and closure, BRAC, process."

Mr. President, we have too many military bases. The cold war is over. We will never have a requirement for as many bases as we have today. Clear-

ly we could save, according to most conservative estimates, somewhere between \$3 and \$4 billion a year of taxpayer dollars that are now expended unnecessarily on keeping military bases open.

The Congressional Budget Office, former Secretaries DICK CHENEY and William Cohen, nearly all the Service Chiefs and other respected defense experts have been consistent in their plea that the Pentagon be permitted to divest themselves of excess infrastructure beyond what was eliminated during the prior rounds of base closings. Through the end of 1998, the Pentagon had closed 97 major bases in the United States after four previous rounds of BRAC. Since then, it has closed none. Moreover, the savings from closing additional unneeded bases should be used for force modernization purposes.

We have heard over the last several years of the dire situation of our military forces. We have heard testimony of plunging readiness, modernization programs that are decades behind schedule, and quality of life deficiencies that are so great we cannot retain or recruit the personnel we need. As a result of this realization, there has been a groundswell of support in Congress for the Armed Forces, including a number of pay, retirement and medical benefit initiatives and the promise of a significant increase in defense spending.

All of these proposals are excellent starting points to help rebuild our military, but we must not forget that much of it will be in vain if the Department of Defense is obligated to maintain 23 percent excess capacity in infrastructure. When we actually look for the dollars to pay for these initiatives, it is unconscionable that some would not look to the billions of dollars to be saved by base realignment and closure. Only 30 percent of the defense budget funds combat forces, while the remaining 70 percent is devoted to support functions such as bases. Continuing to squander precious dollars in this manner will make it impossible for us to adequately modernize our forces for the future. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have stated repeatedly that they desire more opportunities to streamline the military's infrastructure. We cannot sit idly by and throw money and ideas at the problem when part of the solution is staring us in the face.

This proposed legislation offers a significant change to present law. Under this legislation, privatization in-place would be permitted only when explicitly recommended by the Commission. Additionally, the Secretary of Defense must consider local government input in preparing his list of desired base closures.

Total BRAC savings realized from the four previous closure rounds exceed total costs to date. Department of Defense figures suggest previous base closures will save, after one-time closing costs, \$15 billion through fiscal year 2001, \$25 billion through fiscal year 2003

and \$6.1 billion a year thereafter. Additional needed closures can save \$20 billion by 2015, and \$3 billion a year thereafter. Sooner or later these surplus bases will be closed anyway. The sooner the issue is addressed, the greater will be the savings that will ultimately go toward defense modernization and greater pay raises for service members.

Previous base closure rounds have had many success stories. For example, after England Air Force Base closed in 1992, Alexandria, Louisiana benefitted from the creation of over 1,400 jobs—nearly double the number of jobs lost. Across the U.S. about 60,000 new jobs have been created at closing military bases. At bases closed more than 2 years, nearly 75 percent of the civilian jobs have been replaced.

In Charleston, South Carolina, where the number of defense job losses, as a percentage of the work force, was greater than at any other base closure location, 23 major entities are reusing the former Navy facilities and providing more than 3,300 jobs and another 13 more civilian industrial applications are pending adding soon even more newly created jobs to that number. Additionally, roughly 75 percent of the 6 million square feet of leasable space on the base is occupied. This is comparable to the successes in my home state of Arizona with the closure of Williams Air Force Base in the Phoenix East Valley. This is not to say that base closures are easy for any community, but it does suggest that communities can and will continue to thrive.

We can continue to maintain a military infrastructure that we do not need, or we can provide the necessary funds to ensure our military can fight and win future wars. Every dollar we spend on bases we do not need is a dollar we cannot spend on training our troops, keeping personnel quality of life at an appropriate level, maintaining force structure, replacing old weapons systems, and advancing our military technology.

We must finish the job we started by authorizing these two final rounds of base realignment and closure. I urge my colleagues to join us in support of this critical bill and to work diligently throughout the year to put aside local politics for what is clearly in the best interest of our military forces.

Mr. President, I believe this measure is long overdue. I believe the additional \$3 to \$4 billion a year we could save by closing unnecessary bases could be used for the betterment of the quality of life of our men and women in the military. I believe it is hard to understand why, when the overwhelming majority of outside opinion, whether it be liberal or conservative organizations that are watchdogs of our defense policies and programs, all agree we have too many bases. We needed these bases during the cold war and we needed them very badly. They obviously contributed enormously to our ability to win the cold war. No one envisions future threats that would require the

number of bases that are part of our military establishment today.

I hope that the chairmen of the Armed Services Committee in past years who have strongly opposed base closing rounds will now join with me and others in seeing this legislation through the Armed Services Committee and to the floor of the Senate.

It makes sense. I believe that the record is replete with examples of bases that have been closed which ultimately after a period of a few years have ended up of greater benefit to the surrounding communities than when the bases were military bases. But more importantly than that, we simply can't afford some of them as we make the tough decisions and follow the President's guidance on the fundamental reevaluation of our systems technology and weapons systems that we need to make in order to meet the challenges of the post-cold-war era. A part of that is to make available as much funding as possible not only for the quality of life of the men and women in the military but for our ability to develop a viable missile defense system, and to bring to our military the best equipment that this Nation's technology can provide.

I hope we will move on this issue. I anticipate, hopefully, that the administration will also, again as past administrations have, support another round of base closings.

I ask unanimous consent the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be appropriately referred.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill to authorize two additional base realignment and closure rounds be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 397

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT BASE CLOSURE ROUNDS IN 2003 AND 2005.

(a) COMMISSION MATTERS.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—Subsection (c)(1) of section 2902 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of clause (ii);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new clauses (iv) and (v):

“(iv) by no later than January 24, 2003, in the case of members of the Commission whose terms will expire at the end of the first session of the 108th Congress; and

“(v) by no later than March 15, 2005, in the case of members of the Commission whose terms will expire at the end of the first session of the 109th Congress.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or for 1995 in clause (iii) of such subparagraph” and inserting “, for 1995 in clause (iii) of that

subparagraph, for 2003 in clause (iv) of that subparagraph, or for 2005 in clause (v) of that subparagraph”.

(2) MEETINGS.—Subsection (e) of that section is amended by striking “and 1995” and inserting “1995, 2003, and 2005”.

(3) STAFF.—Subsection (i)(6) of that section is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “and 1994” and inserting “, 1994, and 2004”.

(4) FUNDING.—Subsection (k) of that section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph (4):

“(4) If no funds are appropriated to the Commission by the end of the second session of the 107th Congress for the activities of the Commission in 2003 or 2005, the Secretary may transfer to the Commission for purposes of its activities under this part in either of those years such funds as the Commission may require to carry out such activities. The Secretary may transfer funds under the preceding sentence from any funds available to the Secretary. Funds so transferred shall remain available to the Commission for such purposes until expended.”.

(5) TERMINATION.—Subsection (l) of that section is amended by striking “December 31, 1995” and inserting “December 31, 2005”.

(b) PROCEDURES.—

(1) FORCE-STRUCTURE PLAN.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 2903 of that Act is amended by striking “and 1996,” and inserting “1996, 2004, and 2006.”.

(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Subsection (b) of such section 2903 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and by no later than December 31, 2001, for purposes of activities of the Commission under this part in 2003 and 2005,” after “December 31, 1990.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) in the first sentence, by inserting “and by no later than February 15, 2002, for purposes of activities of the Commission under this part in 2003 and 2005,” after “February 15, 1991.”; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by inserting “, or enacted on or before March 31, 2002, in the case of criteria published and transmitted under the preceding sentence in 2001” after “March 15, 1991”.

(3) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATIONS.—Subsection (c)(1) of such section 2903 is amended by striking “and March 1, 1995,” and inserting “March 1, 1995, March 14, 2003, and May 16, 2005.”.

(4) COMMISSION REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—Subsection (d) of such section 2903 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “or by no later than July 7 in the case of recommendations in 2003, or no later than September 8 in the case of recommendations in 2005,” after “pursuant to subsection (c).”;

(B) in paragraph (4), by inserting “or after July 7 in the case of recommendations in 2003, or after September 8 in the case of recommendations in 2005,” after “under this subsection.”; and

(C) in paragraph (5)(B), by inserting “or by no later than May 1 in the case of such recommendations in 2003, or no later than July 1 in the case of such recommendations in 2005,” after “such recommendations.”.

(5) REVIEW BY PRESIDENT.—Subsection (e) of such section 2903 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or by no later than July 22 in the case of recommendations in 2003, or no later than September 23 in the case of recommendations in 2005,” after “under subsection (d).”;

(B) in the second sentence of paragraph (3), by inserting “or by no later than August 18 in the case of 2003, or no later than October 20 in the case of 2005,” after “the year concerned.”; and

(C) in paragraph (5), by inserting “or by September 3 in the case of recommendations in 2003, or November 7 in the case of recommendations in 2005,” after “under this part.”.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER BASE CLOSURE AUTHORITY.—Section 2909(a) of that Act is amended by striking “December 31, 1995,” and inserting “December 31, 2005.”.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION OF BASE CLOSURE AUTHORITIES UNDER 1990 BASE CLOSURE LAW.

(a) COST SAVINGS AND RETURN ON INVESTMENT UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE SELECTION CRITERIA.—Subsection (b) of section 2903 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2867 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) Any selection criteria proposed by the Secretary relating to the cost savings or return on investment from the proposed closure or realignment of a military installation shall be based on the total cost and savings to the Federal Government that would result from the proposed closure or realignment of such military installation.”.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATIONS TO COMMISSION.—Subsection (c) of such section 2903 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph (4):

“(4)(A) In making recommendations to the Commission under this subsection in any year after 2000, the Secretary shall consider any notice received from a local government in the vicinity of a military installation that the government would approve of the closure or realignment of the installation.

“(B) Notwithstanding the requirement in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall make the recommendations referred to in that subparagraph based on the force-structure plan and final criteria otherwise applicable to such recommendations under this section.

“(C) The recommendations made by the Secretary under this subsection in any year after 2000 shall include a statement of the result of the consideration of any notice described in subparagraph (A) that is received with respect to an installation covered by such recommendations. The statement shall set forth the reasons for the result.”; and

(3) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “paragraph (5)(B)” and inserting “paragraph (6)(B)”;

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “24 hours” and inserting “48 hours”.

(c) PRIVATIZATION IN PLACE.—Section 2904(a) of that Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

“(3) carry out the privatization in place of a military installation recommended for closure or realignment by the Commission in each such report after 2000 only if privatization in place is a method of closure or realignment of the installation specified in the recommendation of the Commission in such report and is determined to be the most-cost effective method of implementation of the recommendation.”.

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL AND CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.

(a) COMMENCEMENT OF PERIOD FOR NOTICE OF INTEREST IN PROPERTY FOR HOMELESS.—Section 2905(b)(7)(D)(ii)(I) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2867 note) is amended by striking “that date” and inserting “the date of publication of such determination in a newspaper

of general circulation in the communities in the vicinity of the installation under subparagraph (B)(i)(IV)".

(b) OTHER CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) That Act is further amended by inserting "or realignment" after "closure" each place it appears in the following provisions:

- (A) Section 2905(b)(3).
- (B) Section 2905(b)(5).
- (C) Section 2905(b)(7)(B)(iv).
- (D) Section 2905(b)(7)(N).
- (E) Section 2910(10)(B).

(2) That Act is further amended by inserting "or realigned" after "closed" each place in appears in the following provisions:

- (A) Section 2905(b)(3)(C)(ii).
- (B) Section 2905(b)(3)(D).
- (C) Section 2905(b)(3)(E).
- (D) Section 2905(b)(4)(A).
- (E) Section 2905(b)(5)(A).
- (F) Section 2910(9).
- (G) Section 2910(10).

(3) Section 2905(e)(1)(B) of that Act is amended by inserting "or realigned or to be realigned," after "closed or to be closed".

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to once again join my colleague from the Armed Services Committee, Senator McCain, along with our cosponsors Senators Lieberman, Voinovich, Reed, Kyl, Hagel, Kohl, Feingold, DeWine, and Jeffords in introducing legislation that allows the Department of Defense to close excess, unneeded military bases.

For the past four years, former Secretary of Defense Bill Cohen asked the Congress to authorize two additional base closure rounds. But Congress did not act.

We have a new Congress, a new President, and a new Secretary of Defense, but we also have some unfinished business to attend to. Base closure is one of the most important examples. And as we promised we would be, Senator McCain and I and our cosponsors are back.

General Shelton, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the other chiefs have repeatedly said we need to close more military bases, and I expect they will once again tell us we need to realign or close more bases when the President's budget is submitted later this year.

The legislation we are introducing today is intended to start the debate, and I hope the administration will make a similar legislative proposal to the Congress.

This legislation calls for two additional base closure rounds, in 2003 and 2005, that would basically follow the same procedures that were used in 1991, 1993 and 1995, with two notable exceptions.

First, the whole process would start and finish two months later in 2005 than it would in 2003 and did in previous rounds, to give a new President, if there is one in 2005, sufficient time to nominate commissioners.

Second, under our legislation, privatization in place would not be permitted at closing installation unless the Base Closure Commission expressly recommends it.

In a November 1998 report, the General Accounting Office listed five key elements of the base closure process

that "contributed to the success of prior rounds". Our legislation retains all of those key elements. GAO also stated that they "have not identified any long-term readiness problems that were related to domestic base realignments and closures, that "DOD continues to retain excess capacity" and that "substantial savings are expected" from base closures.

Mr. President, every expert and every study agrees on the basic facts—the Defense Department has more bases than it needs, and closing bases saves substantial money over time, usually within a few years.

The April 1998 report the Department of Defense provided to the Congress clearly demonstrated that we have excess capacity. For example, the report showed that by 2003:

The Army will have reduced its classroom training personnel by 43 percent, while classroom space will have been reduced by only 7 percent.

The Air Force will have reduced the number of fighters and other small aircraft by 53 percent since 1989, while the base structure for those aircraft will be only 35 percent smaller.

The Navy will have 33 percent more hangars for its aircraft than it requires.

Experts inside and outside of Government agree with the Defense Department on this issue. As the Congressional Budget Office stated in a letter to me, "the [DoD] report's basic message is consistent with CBO's own conclusions: past and future BRAC rounds will lead to significant savings for DoD."

Every year we delay another base closure round, we waste about \$1.5 billion in annual savings that we can never recoup. And every dollar we waste on bases we do not need is a dollar we cannot spend on things we do need.

The new administration is now undertaking several strategy reviews. It is possible that those reviews will conclude that the military we want for the future needs exactly the base structure we have today and that all our forces are in exactly the right place and none of them need to be realigned to different locations. It is possible that they will conclude Secretary Cohen and General Shelton didn't know what they were talking about and we really don't have any excess infrastructure.

I will be astounded if any serious defense review reaches such a conclusion. But even if it did, it is important to understand that this legislation does not prejudice or pre-empt these reviews. What it does is prepare us to act whatever the result of those reviews.

Should the new administration decide they don't want to propose any closures or realignments, this bill would not force them to. It authorizes two more rounds; it does not require them. And the Defense Department would have ample time to conclude their reviews before the first round would start in 2003, so the results of

their strategy reviews could be fully incorporated into the force structure plan the new rounds would be based on.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 398. A bill to combat international money laundering and to protect the United States financial system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I believe the United States must do more to stop international criminals from legitimizing their profits from the sale of drugs, from terror or from organized crime by laundering money into the United States financial system.

That is why today, along with SENATORS GRASSLEY, SARBANES, LEVIN and ROCKEFELLER, I AM INTRODUCING THE INTERNATIONAL COUNTER-MONEY LAUNDERING AND FOREIGN ANTICORRUPTION ACT OF 2001, WHICH WILL GIVE THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY THE TOOLS TO CRACK DOWN ON INTERNATIONAL MONEY LAUNDERING HAVENS AND PROTECT THE INTEGRITY OF THE U.S. FINANCIAL SYSTEM FROM THE INFLUX OF TAINTED MONEY FROM ABROAD. DURING THE 106TH CONGRESS, THE HOUSE BANKING COMMITTEE REPORTED OUT THIS LEGISLATION WITH A BIPARTISAN 33-1 VOTE.

Money laundering is the financial side of international crime. It occurs when criminals seek to disguise money that was illegally obtained. It allows terrorists, drug cartels, organized crime groups, corrupt foreign government officials and others to preserve the profit from their illegal activities and to finance new crimes. Money laundering provides the fuel that allows criminal organizations to conduct their ongoing affairs. It has a corrosive effect on international markets and financial institutions. Money launderers rely upon the existence of jurisdictions outside the United States that offer bank secrecy and special tax or regulatory advantages to non residents, and often complement those advantages with weak financial supervision and regulatory regimes.

Today, the global volume of laundered money is estimated to be 2-5 percent of global Gross Domestic Product, between \$600 billion and \$1.5 trillion. The effects of money laundering extend far beyond the parameters of law enforcement, creating international political issues while generating domestic political crises.

International criminals have taken advantage of the advances in technology and the weak financial supervision in some jurisdictions to smuggle their illicit funds into the United States financial system. Globalization and advances in communications and technologies allow criminals to move their illicit gains faster and farther than ever before. The ability to launder money into the United States through these jurisdictions has allowed corrupt

foreign officials to systematically divert public assets for their personal use, which in turn undermines U.S. efforts to promote stable democratic institutions and vibrant economies abroad.

In December 2000, a federal inter-agency working group in support of the President's International Crime Control Strategy released an International Crime Threat Assessment. This report states that international banking and financial systems are currently being used to legitimize and transfer criminal proceeds and that huge sums of money are laundered in the world's largest financial markets including the United States. The report warns that international criminal groups will use changes in technology and the world economy to enhance their capability to launder and move money and may be able to cause significant disruption to international financial systems.

In October 2000, the General Accounting Office determined that Euro-American Corporate Services, Inc. had formed more than 2,000 corporations for Russian brokers. From 1991 through January 2000, more than \$1.4 billion in wire transfer transactions was deposited into 236 accounts for these corporations opened at two United States banks. More than half of these funds were then transferred out of the U.S. banking system. The GAO believes that these banking activities raise questions about whether the U.S. banks were used to launder money.

In February 2000, State and Federal regulators formally sanctioned the Bank of New York for "deficiencies" in its anti-money laundering practices including lax auditing and risk management procedures involving their international banking business. The sanctions were based on the Bank of New York's involvement in an alleged money laundering scheme where more than \$7 billion in funds were transmitted from Russia into the bank. Federal investigators are currently attempting to tie the \$7 billion to criminal activities in Russia such as corporate theft, political graft or racketeering.

In November 1999, the minority staff of the Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on Investigations released a report on private banking and money laundering. The report describes a number of incidences where high level government officials have used private banking accounts with U.S. financial institutions to launder millions of dollars from foreign governments. The report details how Raul Salinas, brother of former President of Mexico, Carlos Salinas, used private bank accounts to launder money out of Mexico. Representatives from Citigroup testified at a Subcommittee hearing that the bank had been slow to correct controls over their private banking accounts.

Earlier this month, the Minority Staff of the U.S. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, head-

ed by Senator CARL LEVIN, released a report that reveals that most U.S. banks lack appropriate anti-money laundering safeguards on their correspondent accounts. This report proves that high risk foreign banks that are denied their own correspondent accounts at U.S. banks can get the same access by opening correspondent accounts at other foreign banks that have U.S. accounts. The report recommends that U.S. regulators and law enforcement offer increased assistance to help banks identify high-risk foreign banks.

During the 1980s, as Chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, I began an investigation of the Bank of Credit and Commerce International (BCCI), and uncovered a complex money laundering scheme. Unlike any ordinary bank, BCCI was from its earliest days made up of multiplying layers of entities, related to one another through an impenetrable series of holding companies, affiliates, subsidiaries, banks-within-banks, insider dealings and nominee relationships.

By fracturing corporate structure, record keeping, regulatory review, and audits, the complex BCCI family of entities was able to evade ordinary legal restrictions on the movement of capital and goods as a matter of daily practice and routine. In designing BCCI as a vehicle fundamentally free of government control, its creators developed an ideal mechanism for facilitating illicit activity by others.

BCCI's used this complex corporate structure to commit fraud involving billions of dollars; and launder money for their clients in Europe, Africa, Asia and the Americas. Fortunately, we were able to bring many of those involved in BCCI to justice. However, my investigation clearly showed that rogue financial institutions have the ability to circumvent the laws designed to stop financial crimes.

In recent years, the U.S. and other well-developed financial centers have been working together to improve their anti-money laundering regimes and to set international anti-money laundering standards. Back in 1988, I included a provision in the State Department Reauthorization bill that requires major money laundering countries to adopt laws similar to our own on reporting currency or face sanctions. This provision led to Panama and Venezuela negotiating what were called Kerry agreements with the United States decreasing their vulnerability to the placement of U.S. currency by drug traffickers in the process.

Unfortunately, other nations—some small, remote islands—have moved in the other direction. Many have passed laws that provide for excessive bank secrecy, anonymous company incorporation, economic citizenship, and other provisions that directly conflict with well-established international anti-money laundering standards. In doing

so, they have become money laundering havens for international criminal networks. Some even blatantly advertise the fact that their laws protect anyone doing business from U.S. law enforcement.

Last year, the Financial Action Task Force, an intergovernmental body established to develop and promote policies to combat financial crime, released a report naming fifteen jurisdictions—including the Bahamas, The Cayman Islands, Russia, Israel, and the Philippines—that have failed to take adequate measures to combat international money laundering. This is a clear warning to financial institutions in the United States that they must begin to scrutinize many of their financial transactions with customers in these countries. Soon, the Financial Action Task Force will develop bank advisories and criminal sanctions that effectively drive legitimate financial business from these nations, depriving them of a lucrative source of tax revenue. This report has provided important information that governments and financial institutions around the world should learn from in developing their own anti-money laundering laws and policies.

Last year, the Financial Stability Forum released a report that categorizes offshore financial centers according to their perceived quality of supervision and degree of regulatory cooperation. The Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) began a new crackdown on harmful tax competition. Members of the European Union reached an agreement in principle on sweeping changes to bank secrecy laws, intended to bring cross-border investment income within the net of tax authorities.

The actions by the Financial Action Task Force, the European Union and others show a renewed international focus and commitment to curbing financial abuse around the world. I believe the United States has a similar obligation to use this new information to update our anti-money laundering statutes.

The International Counter-Money Laundering and Anticorruption Act of 2001, which I am introducing today, would provide the tools the U.S. needs to crack down on international money laundering havens and protect the integrity of the U.S. financial system from the influx of tainted money from abroad. The bill provides for actions that will be graduated, discretionary, and targeted, in order to focus actions on international transactions involving criminal proceeds, while allowing legitimate international commerce to continue to flow unimpeded. It will give the Secretary of the Treasury—acting in consultation with other senior government officials and the Congress—the authority to designate a specific foreign jurisdiction, foreign financial institution, or class of international transactions as being of "primary money laundering concern."

Then, on a case-by-case basis, the Secretary will have the option to use a series of new tools to combat the specific type of foreign money laundering threat we face. In some cases, the Secretary will have the option to require banks to pierce the veil of secrecy behind which foreign criminals hide. In other cases, the Secretary will have the option to require the identification of those using a foreign bank's correspondent or payable-through accounts. If these transparency provisions were deemed to be inadequate to address the specific problem identified, the Secretary would have the option to restrict or prohibit U.S. banks from continuing correspondent or payable-through banking relationships with money laundering havens and rogue foreign banks. Through these steps, the Secretary will help prevent laundered money from slipping undetected into the U.S. financial system and, as a result, increase the pressure on foreign money laundering havens to bring their laws and practices into line with international anti-money laundering standards. The passage of this legislation will make it much more difficult for international criminal organizations to launder the proceeds of their crimes into the United States.

This bill fills in the current gap between bank advisories and International Emergency Economic Powers Act, IEEPA, sanctions by providing five new intermediate measures. Under current law, the only counter-money laundering tools available to the federal government are advisories, an important but relatively limited measure instructing banks to pay close attention to transactions that involve a given country, and full-blown economic sanctions under the IEEPA. This legislation gives five additional measures to increase the government's ability to apply pressure effectively against targeted jurisdictions or institutions.

This legislation will in no way jeopardize the privacy of the American public. The focus is on foreign jurisdictions, financial institutions and classes of transactions that present a threat to the United States, not on American citizens. The actions that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to take are designated solely to combat the abuse of our banks by specifically identified foreign money laundering threats. This legislation is in no way similar to the Know-Your-Customer regulations that were proposed by bank regulators in 1999. Further, the intent of this legislation is not to add additional regulatory burdens on financial institutions, but, to give the Secretary of the Treasury the ability to take action against existing money laundering threats.

Let me repeat, this legislation only gives the discretion to use these tools to the Secretary of the Treasury. There is no automatic trigger that forces action whenever evidence of money laundering is determined. Before any action is taken, the Secretary of the Treas-

ury, in consultation with other key government officials, must first determine whether a specific country, financial institution or type of transaction is of primary money laundering concern. The Treasury Secretary will develop a calibrated response that will consider the effectiveness of the measure to address the threat, whether other countries are taking similar steps, and whether the response will cause harm to U.S. financial institutions and other firms.

This legislation will strengthen the ability of the Secretary to combat international money laundering and help protect the integrity of the U.S. financial system. This bill has been supported by the heads of all the major federal law enforcement agencies.

Today, advances in technology are bringing the world closer together than ever before and opening up new opportunities for economic growth. However, with these new advantages come equally important obligations. We must do everything possible to insure that the changes in technology do not give comfort to international criminals by giving them new ways to hide the financial proceeds of their crimes. This legislation is a first step toward limiting the scourge of money laundering and will help stop the development of international criminal organizations. I believe this legislation deserves consideration by the Senate during the 107th Congress.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators KERRY, GRASSLEY, and LEVIN in introducing the International Counter-Money Laundering and Foreign Anti-Corruption Act of 2001, "ICMLA". This legislation is identical to a bill I co-sponsored last year.

Money laundering poses an ongoing threat to the financial stability of the U.S. It is estimated by the Department of the Treasury that the global volume of laundered money accounts for between 2-5 percent of the global GDP. Although serious efforts to combat international money laundering began in the mid-1980's, recent scandals about the involvement of some of the most prominent U.S. banks in money laundering schemes have highlighted key weaknesses in current laws.

The ICMLA is designed to bolster the United States' ability to counter the laundering of the proceeds of drug trafficking, organized crime, terrorism and official corruption from abroad. The bill broadens the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, ensures that banking transactions and financial relationship do not contravene the purposes of current anti-money laundering statutes, provides a clear mandate for subjecting foreign jurisdictions that facilitate money laundering to special scrutiny, and enhances reporting of suspicious activities. The bill similarly strengthens current measures to prevent the use of the U.S. financial system for personal gain by corrupt foreign officials and to facilitate the repa-

triation of any stolen assets to the citizens of countries to whom such assets belong.

First, Section 101 of the ICMLA gives the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with other key government officials, discretionary authority to impose five new "special measures" against foreign jurisdictions and entities that are of "primary money laundering concern" to the United States. Under current law, the only counter-money laundering tools available to the federal government are advisories, an important but relatively limited measure instructing banks to pay close attention to transactions that involve a given country, and full-blown economic sanctions under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, "IEEPA". The five new intermediate measures will increase the government's ability to apply well-calibrated pressure against targeted jurisdictions or institutions. These new measures include: 1. requiring additional record keeping/reporting on particular transactions, 2. requiring the identification of the beneficial foreign owner of a U.S. bank account, 3. requiring the identification of those individuals using a U.S. bank account opened by a foreign bank to engage in banking transactions a "payable-through account", 4. requiring the identification of those using a U.S. bank account established to receive deposits and make payments on behalf of a foreign financial institution, a "correspondent account", and 5. restricting or prohibiting the opening or maintaining of certain correspondent accounts. The Democratic staff of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee recently completed an investigation and published results critical of certain correspondent banking activities.

Second, the bill seeks to enhance oversight into illegal activities by clarifying that the "safe harbor" from civil liability for filing a Suspicious Activity Report, "SAR", applies in any litigation, including suit for breach of contract or in an arbitration proceeding. Under the Bank Secrecy Act, "BSA", any financial institution or officer, director, employee, or agent of a financial institution is protected against private civil liability for filing a SAR. Section 201 of the bill amends the BSA to clarify the prohibition on disclosing that a SAR has been filed. These reports are the cornerstone of our nation's money-laundering efforts because they provide the information necessary to alert law enforcement to illegal activity.

Third, the bill enhances enforcement of Geographic Targeting Orders, "GTO". These orders lower the dollar thresholds for reporting transactions within a defined geographic area. Section 202 of the bill clarifies that civil and criminal penalties for violations of the Bank Secrecy Act and its regulations also apply to reports required by

GTO's. In addition, the section clarifies that structuring a transaction to avoid a reporting requirement by a GTO is a criminal offense and extends the presumptive GTO period from 60 to 180 days.

Fourth, Section 203 of the bill permits a bank, upon request of another bank, to include suspicious illegal activity in written employment references. Under this provision, banks would be permitted to share information concerning the possible involvement of a current or former officer or employee in potentially unlawful activity without fear of civil liability for sharing the information.

Finally, Title III of the bill addresses corruption by foreign officials and ruling elites. Earlier this year, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the financial services regulators, issued guidelines to financial institutions operating in the U.S. on appropriate practices and procedures to reduce the likelihood that such institutions could facilitate proceeds expropriated by or on behalf of foreign senior government officials. Title III would help build upon efforts to combat corruption by foreign officials and ruling elites. It provides that the U.S. government should make clear that it will take all steps necessary to identify the proceeds of foreign government corruption which have been deposited in U.S. financial institutions and return such proceeds to the citizens of the country to whom such assets belong. It also encourages the U.S. to continue to actively and publicly support the objectives of the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering with regard to combating international money laundering.

The ICMLA addresses many of the shortcomings of current law. The Secretary of Treasury is granted additional authority to require greater transparency of transactions and accounts as well as to narrowly target penalties and sanctions. The reporting and collection of additional information on suspected illegal activity will greatly enhance the ability of bank regulators and law enforcement to combat the laundering of drug money, proceeds from corrupt regimes, and other illegal activities.

The House Banking Committee passed the identical anti-money laundering bill by a vote of 31 to 1 on June 8, 2000. I hope that we can move this legislation expeditiously in the Senate.

By Mr. EDWARDS (for himself and Mr. DODD):

S. 399. A bill to provide for fire sprinkler systems, or other fire suppression or prevention technologies, in public and private college and university housing and dormitories, including fraternity and sorority housing and dormitories; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I rise today along with my colleague Senator DODD to re-introduce the College Fire

Prevention Act. This measure would provide federal matching grants for the installation of fire sprinkler systems in college and university dormitories and fraternity and sorority houses. I believe the time is now to address the sad situation of deadly fires that occur in our children's college living facilities.

The tragic fire that occurred at Seton Hall University on Wednesday January 19th, 2000 will not be long forgotten. Sadly, three freshman, all 18 years old, died. Fifty-four students, two South Orange firefighters and two South Orange police officers were injured. The dormitory, Boland Hall, was a six-story, 350 room structure built in 1952 that housed approximately 600 students. Astonishingly, the fire was contained to the third floor lounge of Boland Hall. This dormitory was equipped with smoke alarms but no sprinkler system.

Unfortunately, the Boland Hall fire was not the first of its kind. And it reminded many people in North Carolina of their own tragic experience with dorm fires. In 1996, on Mother's Day and Graduation Day, a fire in the Phi Gamma Delta fraternity house at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill killed five college juniors and injured three others. The 3-story plus basement fraternity house was 70 years old. The National Fire Protection Association identified several factors that contributed to the tragic fire, including the lack of fire sprinkler protection.

Sadly, there have been countless other dorm fires. On December 9, 1997, a student died in a dormitory fire at Greenville College in Greenville, Illinois. The dormitory, Kinney Hall, was built in the 1960s and had no fire sprinkler system. On January 10, 1997, a student died at the University of Tennessee at Martin. The dormitory, Ellington Hall, had no fire sprinkler system. On January 3, 1997 a student died in a dormitory fire at Central Missouri State University in Warrensburg, Missouri. On October 21, 1994, five students died in a fraternity house fire in Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania. The list goes on and on. In a typical year between 1980 and 1998, the National Fire Protection Association estimates there were an average of 1,800 fires at dormitories, fraternities, and sororities, involving 1 death, 70 injuries, and 8 million dollars in property damage.

So now we must ask, what can be done? What can we do to curtail these tragic fires from taking the lives of our children, our young adults? We should focus our attention on the lack of fire sprinklers in college dormitories and fraternity and sorority houses. Sprinklers save lives. Indeed, the National Fire Protection Association has never recorded a fire that killed more than 2 people in a public assembly, educational, institutional, or residential building where a sprinkler system was operating properly.

Despite the clear benefits of sprinklers, many college dorms do not have

them. New dormitories are generally required to have advanced safety systems such as fire sprinklers. But such requirements are rarely imposed retroactively on existing buildings. In 1998, 93 percent of the campus building fires reported to fire departments occurred in buildings where there were smoke alarms present. However, only 34 percent of them had fire sprinklers present.

At my state's flagship university at Chapel Hill, for example, only six of the 29 residence halls have sprinklers. A report published by The Raleigh News & Observer in the wake of the Seton Hall fire also noted that only seven of 19 dorms at North Carolina State University are equipped with the life-saving devices, and there are sprinklers in two of the 10 dorms at North Carolina Central University. At Duke University, only five of 26 dorms have sprinklers.

The legislation I introduce today authorizes the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the United States Fire Administration, to award grants to States, private or public colleges or universities, fraternities, or sororities to assist them in providing fire sprinkler systems for their student housing and dormitories. These entities would be required to produce matching funds equal to one-half of the cost. This legislation authorizes \$100 million for fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

In North Carolina, we decided to initiate a drive to install sprinklers in our public college and university dorms. The overall cost is estimated at 57.5 million dollars. Given how much it is going to cost North Carolina's public colleges and universities to install sprinklers, I think it's clear that the \$100 million that this measure authorizes is just a drop in the bucket. But my hope is that by providing this small incentive we can encourage more colleges to institute a comprehensive review of their dorm's fire safety and to install sprinklers. All they need is a helping hand. With this modest measure of prevention, we can help prevent the needless and tragic loss of young lives.

Parents should not have to worry about their children living in fire traps. When we send our children away to college, we are sending them to a home away from home where hundreds of other students eat, sleep, burn candles, use electric appliances and smoke. We must not compromise on their safety. In short, the best way to ensure the protection of our college students is to install fire sprinklers in our college dormitories and fraternity and sorority houses. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation. Thank you.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy 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. 399

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 "College Fire Prevention Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On Wednesday, January 19, 2000, a fire occurred at a Seton Hall University dormitory. Three male freshmen, all 18 years of age, died. Fifty-four students, 2 South Orange firefighters, and 2 South Orange police officers were injured. The dormitory was a 6-story, 350-room structure built in 1952, that housed approximately 600 students. It was equipped with smoke alarms but no fire sprinkler system.

(2) On Mother's Day 1996 in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, a fire in the Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity House killed 5 college juniors and injured 3. The 3-story plus basement fraternity house was 70 years old. The National Fire Protection Association identified several factors that contributed to the tragic fire, including the lack of fire sprinkler protection.

(3) It is estimated that between 1980 and 1998, an average of 1,800 fires at dormitories, fraternities, and sororities, involving 1 death, 70 injuries, and \$8,000,000 in property damage were reported to public fire departments.

(4) Within dormitories, fraternities, and sororities the number 1 cause of fires is arson or suspected arson. The second leading cause of college building fires is cooking, while the third leading cause is smoking.

(5) The National Fire Protection Association has no record of a fire killing more than 2 people in a completely fire sprinklered public assembly, educational, institutional, or residential building where the sprinkler system was operating properly.

(6) New dormitories are generally required to have advanced safety systems such as fire sprinklers. But such requirements are rarely imposed retroactively on existing buildings.

(7) In 1998, 93 percent of the campus building fires reported to fire departments occurred in buildings where there were smoke alarms present. However, only 34 percent had fire sprinklers present.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

SEC. 4. GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Education, in consultation with the United States Fire Administration, is authorized to award grants to States, private or public colleges or universities, fraternities, and sororities to assist them in providing fire sprinkler systems, or other fire suppression or prevention technologies, for their student housing and dormitories.

(b) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Education may not award a grant under this section unless the entity receiving the grant provides, from State, local, or private sources, matching funds in an amount equal to not less than one-half of the cost of the activities for which assistance is sought.

SEC. 5. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

(a) APPLICATION.—Each entity desiring a grant under this Act shall submit to the Secretary of Education an application at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require.

(b) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this Act, the Secretary shall give priority to applicants that demonstrate in the application submitted under subsection (a) the in-

ability to fund the sprinkler system, or other fire suppression or prevention technology, from sources other than funds provided under this Act.

(c) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—An entity that receives a grant under this Act shall not use more than 4 percent of the grant funds for administrative expenses.

SEC. 6. DATA AND REPORT.

The Comptroller General shall—

(1) gather data on the number of college and university housing facilities and dormitories that have and do not have fire sprinkler systems and other fire suppression or prevention technologies; and

(2) report such data to Congress.

SEC. 7. ADMISSIBILITY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any application for assistance under this Act, any negative determination on the part of the Secretary of Education with respect to such application, or any statement of reasons for the determination, shall not be admissible as evidence in any proceeding of any court, agency, board, or other entity.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mr. DORGAN):

S. 400. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 401. A bill to normalize trade relations with Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 402. A bill to make an exception to the United States embargo on trade with Cuba for the export of agricultural commodities, medicines, medical supplies, medical instruments, or medical equipment and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am introducing today a series of bills that would end the embargo on trade with Cuba and normalize our economic relations with this country that is a mere ninety miles off our shore. I should add that Congressman CHARLES RANGEL is offering a set of companion bills in the House today.

Last July, I led a small group of Senators to Havana. During our brief visit, we met with Fidel Castro. But we also spent three hours with a group of six dissidents who had spent years in prison, yet have chosen heroically to continue their dissent from within Cuba. We met with the leader of Cuba's largest independent NGO. It was clear to me that our Cuba policy was outdated and needed fundamental change.

I have long fought against unilateral economic sanctions, unless our national security was at stake. The Cuba embargo is a unilateral sanction, but our national security is not at stake. The Defense Department has concluded that Cuba does not represent any security threat to this nation. None of our closest allies supports the embargo. Nor do any of our trading partners in the Americas.

Unilateral sanctions do not work. The embargo has not changed the behavior of the Cuban government and its leadership. It has not changed the

behavior of Fidel Castro. But the embargo has hurt the people of Cuba. And the embargo has hurt American farmers and businesses, as our Asian, European, and Canadian competitors have rushed in to fill the gap in the Cuban market.

The U.S. International Trade Commission released a report on the economic impact of U.S. sanctions on Cuba. The ITC found that the embargo costs US exporters, farmers, manufacturers, and service providers between \$650 million and one billion dollars a year in lost sales. This is intolerable.

We should lift the embargo. We should engage Cuba economically. We should engage the people of Cuba.

The bills I am introducing today do just that. The first bill, on which I am joined by Senators ROBERTS, LINCOLN, and DORGAN, is the "Free Trade with Cuba Act", that would lift the embargo completely. The second bill, on which I am joined by Senators ROBERTS and LINCOLN, is the "United States-Cuba Trade Act of 2001", that would remove Cuba from Jackson-Vanik treatment and provide normal trade relations status on a permanent basis. The third bill, on which I am also joined by Senators ROBERTS and LINCOLN, is the "Cuban Humanitarian Trade Act of 2001", that removes the restrictions on food and medicine exports imposed in the last Congress, repeals the codification of travel restrictions, and removes limitations on remittances to individual Cuban citizens.

I am not suggesting that we embrace Fidel Castro. Far from it! His leadership, his treatment of his own people, his failed economic, political, and social policies—these are unacceptable to all Americans. But the world has changed since the United States initiated the embargo forty years and ten Presidents ago. It does us no good to wait until Castro is gone from the scene before we begin to develop normal relations with the Cuban people and with Cuba's future leaders. If we fail to develop those relationships now, the inevitable transition to democracy and a market economy will be much harder on all of the Cuban people. And events in Cuba could easily escalate out of control and put the United States in the middle of a dangerous domestic crisis on the island.

Jim Hoagland, in a recent Washington Post column, wrote about his concern "when sanctions linger too long and become a political football and a substitute for policy, as is the case today in Cuba." This accurately describes where we are today.

To help further edify my colleagues on this issue, I would like to enter into the record a column from the February 9 Wall Street Journal by Philip Peters, Vice President of the Lexington Institute, who explains how changes in U.S. policy can help the Cuban people who continue to suffer under Castro's policies of political and economic repression.

The three bills that I am offering today serve our national interest, will

help us move toward a peaceful transition in the post-Castro era, and will help the Cuban people now. I urge support from all my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional material be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, February 9, 2001]

“LET YANKEE TOURISTS SHOWER DOLLARS ON CUBA’S POOR”

(By Philip Peters)

In her final press conference as Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright’s message to the Cuban people was succinct. In reference to the aging Fidel Castro she said, “I wish them the actuarial tables.” It was an odd statement on behalf of a superpower that could have used the previous eight years to exercise considerable influence on its small island neighbor.

It was also a fitting end to the Clinton administration’s passive approach to Cuba policy, where the impulse to reassess strategy was nearly always trumped by the imperative of avoiding political risk in Florida. Even in 1998, when Republican leaders such as Sen. John Warner and former Secretary of State George Shultz urged the creation of a presidential bipartisan commission—a golden opportunity to conduct a long overdue post-Cold War review that could have included the full range of Cuban-American voices—politics held the Clinton White House back.

President Bush has an opportunity to make a fresh start. Today’s strict embargo policy, based on the goal of denying hard currency to the Cuban government, made sense during the Cold War when Cuba was a genuine security threat and Washington had reason to make Cuba an expensive satellite for the Soviet Union to maintain.

Today, with sanctions twice tightened during the 1990s, Fidel Castro remains firmly in power. With the Soviet-era security threat gone, it is time to recognize that isolating Cuba from commerce and contact with Americans is counterproductive because it reduces American influence in Cuba. President Bush’s Cuba policy is not yet defined, but Secretary of State Colin Powell has said that “We will only participate in those activities with Cuba that benefit the people directly and not the government.”

This standard sounds good in theory, but in practice it is impossible to achieve. Virtually every form of economic activity with Cuba benefits both the people and the government. Today, European and Canadian trade, investment and tourism benefit Cuban state enterprises. But they also increase the earnings of Cuban workers, expose Cubans to foreigners and non-socialist ideas, bring capitalist business practices, and reshape the Cuban economy to fit its comparative advantages in the global system. This adds up to humanitarian benefits for the Cuban people, and a head start on a future transition to a more market-oriented economy.

U.S. economic activity also benefits both the state and the people of Cuba. Family remittances, estimated by the United Nations at over \$700 million annually, bring more foreign exchange than sugar exports. Many of these dollars land in the Cuban treasury when Cubans spend them in state retail stores. U.S.-Cuba phone connections allow families to communicate, but generate over \$70 million a year for the state phone company. A strict application of Secretary Powell’s own standard would cut off these valuable benefits.

The trick, then, for an administration that seems to want to end unilateral trade sanctions everywhere but Cuba, will not be to reach for Secretary Powell’s unattainable standard. Rather, it will be to choose among forms of engagement that serve America’s humanitarian interest in helping Cubans to prosper, our long-term economic interest of nudging Cuba toward a market economy, and our political interest in exposing Cubans to Americans and American ideas.

President Bush could begin by supporting the congressional consensus, expressed last year by greater than three-to-one majorities in the House and Senate, to lift all restrictions on food and medicine sales. This step would begin to reverse the implicit assumption in U.S. policy that American interests are somehow served if products such as rice, powdered milk, and drugs are more scarce or expensive for Cubans to acquire. It would also support the calls by Cuban dissidents such as Elizardo Sanchez and the Christian Liberation Movement for an end to this part of the embargo. It “hurts the people, not the regime,” Mr. Sanchez says, and is “an odd way of demonstrating support for human rights.”

President Bush could then end all restrictions on Cuban-American remittances, now limited to \$1,200 a year, and on family visits, which are permitted only in cases of “humanitarian emergency” a cruel regulation that forces families to lie by the thousands each December when they visit relatives at Christmas.

Finally, the president could support an end to the travel ban imposed on Americans—a mistaken policy that treats free contact between American and Cuban societies as a detriment rather than an opportunity. “If we have a million Americans walking on the streets of Havana, you will have something like the pope’s visit multiplied by 10,” independent journalist Manuel David Orrio told the Chicago Tribune in 1999. A Havana clergyman told me last month that visiting Americans “would permeate this place with the idea of a free society.”

Like other international travelers, Americans’ spending would boost Cubans’ earnings in hotels and restaurants and expand Cuba’s incipient private sector. An influx of U.S. travelers would immediately create a shortage of lodging that would be filled partially by Cubans who legally rent rooms in their homes. Demand for the services of artisans, taxis and private restaurants would also increase, adding to the disposable income that sustains other entrepreneurs, from carpenters and repairmen to food vendors and tutors.

As this sector, now 150,000 strong, gains income and expands, demand would increase for the freely priced, privately sold produce in Cuba’s 300 farmers markets, benefitting farmers across Cuba who have no contact with tourists. Americans would experience “the interface between the entrepreneurial folks” that President Bush lauds as a virtue of open trade with communist China, to say nothing of the value of their personal contact with Cubans. This may be why a Florida International University poll shows a slim majority of Cuban-Americans, and three fourths of the most recent Cuban immigrants, supporting an end to the travel ban.

A policy opening of this type would leave the trade embargo largely intact for future review, and it would do nothing to diminish America’s stark opposition to Cuban human rights practices. However, it would increase concrete support to the Cuban people, and it would spur the development of free-market activity in the post-Castro Cuba that is now taking shape.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

S. 403. A bill to improve the National Writing Project; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, today, I am introducing legislation reauthorizing the National Writing Project, the only Federal program to improve the teaching of writing in America’s classrooms.

Literacy is at the foundation of school and workplace success, of citizenship in a democracy, and of learning in all disciplines. The National Writing Project has been instrumental in helping teachers develop better teaching skills so they can help our children improve their ability to read, write, and think.

The National Writing Project is a twenty-seven-year old national network of university-based teacher training programs designed to improve the teaching of writing and student achievement in writing and has had federal support since 1991. Successful writing teachers attend Invitational Summer Institutes at their local universities. During the school year these teachers provide workshops for other teachers in the schools. At 167 sites in 49 states, the National Writing Project trains over 100,000 teachers every year.

The program has become a national model for other disciplines and is now recognized by the Department of Education as an important part of national education policy. The program also generates an average of \$6.32 in private, state, and local funds for every federal dollar appropriated. The National Writing Project is making teachers better at their jobs.

I introduced the National Writing Project Act for the first time in 1990. Since then, I have worked with other Senators to ensure that it has remained a program that supports states and local schools in their efforts to have better teachers. Last Congress when I introduced this bill, it was cosponsored by 52 Senators. I hope it will receive even greater support in the 107th Congress. I invite other Senators to join me in sponsoring this legislation.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 404. A bill to provide for the technical integrity of the FM radio band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that will allow our communities and churches to benefit from low-power radio service.

Mr. President, low-power FM radio service provides community based organizations, churches, and other non-profit groups with a new, affordable opportunity to reach out to the public, helping to promote a greater awareness of local issues important to our communities. As such, low-power FM is supported by many national and local organizations who seek to provide the public with increased sources of news

and perspectives in an otherwise increasingly consolidated medium.

Last Congress, special interests forces opposed to low-power FM radio, most notably the National Association of Broadcasters and National Public Radio, mounted a vigorous behind-the-scenes campaign to kill low-power FM radio. And unfortunately, these special interests succeeded in attaching an appropriations rider in the dead of the night—without a single debate on the floor of the Senate—that effectively did just that.

Mr. President, the Low Power Radio Act of 2001 seeks to remedy this derailment of the democratic process. The Low Power Radio Act of 2001 will allow the FCC to license low-power FM radio service, while at the same time protecting existing full-power stations from interference. Specifically, the legislation directs the FCC—the expert agency with the experience and engineering resources to make such a determination—to determine which, if any, low-power radio stations are causing interference to existing full-power stations, and determine what the low-power FM station must do to alleviate it. Thus, this legislation strikes a fair balance by allowing non-interfering low-power FM stations to operate without further delay, while affecting only those low-power stations that the FCC finds to be causing harmful interference in their actual, everyday operations. This is totally consistent with the fact that low-power FM is a secondary service which, by law, must cure any interference caused to any primary, full-power service.

This legislation will provide an efficient and effective means to detect and resolve harmful interference. By providing a procedural remedy that authorizes the FCC to impose damages on frivolous complaints, the bill will discourage the creation of low-power stations most likely to cause harmful interference while at the same time discouraging full-power broadcasters from making unwarranted interference claims.

In the interests of would-be new broadcasters, existing broadcasters, but, most of all, the listening public, I urge the enactment of the Low Power Radio Act of 2001.

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. 404

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 “Low Power Radio Act of 2001”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this Act to ensure the technical integrity of the FM radio band, while permitting the introduction of low power FM transmitters into such band without causing harmful interference.

SEC. 3. HARMFUL INTERFERENCE PROHIBITED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any low-power FM radio licensee determined by the Federal Communications Commission to be transmitting a signal causing harmful interference to one or more licensed radio services shall, if so ordered by the Commission, cease the transmission of the interfering signal, and may not recommence transmitting such signal until it has taken whatever action the Commission may prescribe in order to assure that the radio licensee that has sustained the interference remains able to serve the public interest, convenience and necessity as required by the Commission's rules.

(b) COMPLAINT.—Any radio service licensee or subcarrier program provider may file a complaint with the Commission against any low-power FM radio licensee for transmitting a signal that is alleged to cause harmful interference. The complaint shall be filed in a form, and contain such information as, prescribed by the Commission.

(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—In any complaint filed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b), the Commission shall render a final decision no later than 90 calendar days after the date on which the complaint was received by the Commission.

(d) PUNITIVE DAMAGES.—In any final decision rendered pursuant to this section, the Commission is authorized to impose punitive damages not to exceed 5 times the low-power FM station's costs if the Commission finds that the complaint was frivolous and without any merit or purpose other than to impede the provision of non-interfering low-power FM service.

(e) SECTION 316(a)(3) OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT.—Section 316(a)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 316(a)(3)) shall not apply to a complaint filed pursuant to this section.

(f) RULES.—The Commission shall adopt rules implementing the provisions of this section within 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) HARMFUL INTERFERENCE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “harmful interference” means interference which endangers the functioning of a radio navigation service or of other safety services or that seriously degrades, obstructs, or repeatedly interrupts a radio service operating in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission.

(h) REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—

(1) RESTORATION OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT.—Section 336 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 336) is amended by striking subsection (h) and redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (h).

(2) NULLIFICATION OF ACTION UNDER REPEALED PROVISION.—Any action taken by the Federal Communications Commission under section 336(h) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 336(h)) as added by section 143(a) of Division B of A Bill Making miscellaneous appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (106 Pub. L. 554; Appendix-H.R. 5666) before the date of enactment of this Act is null and void.

(3) REPEAL.—The Act entitled A Bill Making miscellaneous appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (106 Pub. L. 554; Appendix-H.R. 5666) is amended by striking section 143.

SEC. 4. DIGITAL RADIO TRANSITION.

The Federal Communications Commission shall complete all rulemakings necessary to implement the transition to digital radio no later than February 23, 2002.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 407. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for the reg-

istration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, in order to carry out provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce implementing legislation for the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, Protocol. I have introduced identical bills in the last two Congresses, but the Senate unfortunately did not consider those bills. Chairman Hatch has joined me in introducing this legislation, and I thank him for his leadership on this and other intellectual property matters of such critical importance to the economy and industry of our country.

This bill is part of my ongoing effort to update American intellectual property law to ensure that it serves to advance and protect American interests both here and abroad. The Protocol would help American businesses, and especially small and medium-sized companies, protect their trademarks as they expand into international markets. Specifically, this legislation will conform American trademark application procedures to the terms of the Protocol in anticipation of the U.S.'s eventual ratification of the treaty. Ratification by the United States of this treaty would help create a “one stop” international trademark registration process, which would be an enormous benefit for American businesses. This bill is one of many measures I have introduced and supported over the past few years to ensure that American trademark holders receive strong protection in today's world of changing technology and complex international markets.

Over the past few years, Senator HATCH and I have worked together successfully on a number of initiatives to bolster trademark protection and keep our trademark laws up-to-date. For example, in the 104th Congress, we supported the Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995, enacted to provide intellectual property rights holders with the power to enjoin another person's commercial use of famous marks that would cause dilution of the mark's distinctive quality. In the 105th Congress, we introduced legislation, S. 2193, to implement the Trademark Law Treaty. S. 2193 simplified trademark registration requirements around the world by establishing a list of maximum requirements which Treaty member countries can impose on trademark applicants. The bill passed the Senate on September 17, 1998, and was signed by the President on October 30, 1998. I am proud of this legislation since all American businesses, and particularly small American businesses, will benefit as a result.

Also, in the 105th Congress, I introduced S. 1727 to authorize a comprehensive study of the effects of adding new generic Top Level Domains on trademark and other intellectual property rights. This bill became law as part of

the Next Generation Internet Research Act, S. 1609, which was signed into law on October 28, 1998.

In the 106th Congress, Senator HATCH and I worked together for enactment of the Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act, which protects against the registration, in bad faith with intent to profit, as a domain name of another person's trademark or the name of a living person. This bill was passed as part of the FY 2000 Omnibus Appropriations bill on November 29, 1999.

Also in the 106th Congress, we worked to pass the Trademark Amendments Act, which enhanced protection for trademark owners and consumers by making it possible to prevent trademark dilution before it occurs, by clarifying the remedies available under the Federal trademark dilution statute, by providing recourse against the Federal Government for its infringement of others' trademarks, and by creating greater certainty and uniformity in the area of trade dress protection. The bill passed the Senate on July 1, 1999, and was enacted on August 5, 1999.

Together, these measures represent significant steps in our efforts to ensure that American trademark law adequately serves and promote American interests.

The legislation I introduce today with Senator HATCH would ease the trademark registration burden on small and medium-sized businesses by enabling them to obtain trademark protection in all signatory countries with a single trademark application filed with the Patent and Trademark Office. Currently, in order for American companies to protect their trademarks abroad, they must register their trademarks in each and every country in which protection is sought. Registering in multiple countries is a time-consuming, complicated and expensive process—a process which places a disproportionate burden on smaller American companies seeking international trademark protection.

I first introduced the Madrid Protocol Implementation Act in the 105th Congress as S. 2191, then again in the 106th Congress as S. 671. The Judiciary Committee reported S. 671 favorably and unanimously, on February 10, 2000. In the House of Representatives, Congressmen Coble and Berman sponsored and passed an identical bill, H.R. 769, on April 13, 1999.

Since 1891, the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, Agreement has provided an international trademark registration system. However, prior to adoption of the Protocol, the U.S. declined to join the Agreement because it contained terms deemed inimical to American intellectual property interests. In 1989, the terms of the Agreement were modified by the Protocol, which corrected the objectionable terms of the Agreement and made American participation a possibility. For example, under the Protocol, applications for

international trademark extension can be completed in English; formerly, applications were required to be completed in French.

Another stumbling block to the United States joining the Protocol was resolved last year. Specifically, the European Community, EC, had taken the position that under the Protocol, the EC, as an intergovernmental member of the Protocol, received a separate vote in the Assembly established by the agreement in addition to the votes of its member states. The State Department opposed this position as a contravention of the democratic concept of one-vote-per-country.

On February 2, 2000, the Assembly of the Madrid Protocol expressed its intent "to use their voting rights in such a way as to ensure that the number of votes cast by the European Community and its member States does not exceed the number of the European Community's Member States." In short, this letter appeared to resolve differences between the Administration and the European Community, EC, regarding the voting rights of intergovernmental members of the Protocol in the Assembly established by the agreement.

Shortly after this letter was forwarded by the Assembly, I wrote to then Secretary of State Madeleine Albright requesting information on the Administration's position in light of the resolution of the voting dispute. At a hearing of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on April 14, 2000, I further inquired of Secretary Albright about the progress the Administration was making on this matter, particularly in light of the fact that differences over the voting rights of the European Union and participation of intergovernmental organizations in this intellectual property treaty were resolved in accordance with the U.S. position.

Subsequently, President Clinton transmitted Treaty Document 106-41, the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement to the Senate for ratification on September 5, 2000. Shortly after transmittal, on September 13, 2000, the Foreign Relations Committee held a hearing to consider Protocol. Unfortunately, no further action was taken on the Protocol or the implementing legislation before the Congress adjourned.

United States membership in the Protocol would greatly enhance the ability of any U.S. business, whether large or small, to protect its trademarks in other countries more quickly, cheaply and easily. That, in turn, will make it easier for American businesses to enter foreign markets and to protect their trademarks in those markets. The Protocol would not require substantive changes to American trademark law, but merely to certain procedures for registering trademarks. Passage of this implementing legislation will help to ensure timely accession to and implementation of the Madrid Protocol, and it will send a clear signal to the international community, U.S.

businesses, and trademark owners that Congress is serious about our Nation becoming part of a low-cost, efficient system to promote the international registration of marks. I look forward to working with Senator HATCH and my other colleagues for ratification of the Protocol and passage of the implementing legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill and the sectional analysis be placed in the RECORD after my statement, as well as any additional statements regarding this bill.

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

S. 407

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 "Madrid Protocol Implementation Act".

SEC. 2. PROVISIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE MADRID AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION OF MARKS.

The Act entitled "An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes", approved July 5, 1946, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1051 and following) (commonly referred to as the "Trademark Act of 1946") is amended by adding after section 51 the following new title:

"TITLE XII—THE MADRID PROTOCOL

"SEC. 60. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this title:

"(1) MADRID PROTOCOL.—The term 'Madrid Protocol' means the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, adopted at Madrid, Spain, on June 27, 1989.

"(2) BASIC APPLICATION.—The term 'basic application' means the application for the registration of a mark that has been filed with an Office of a Contracting Party and that constitutes the basis for an application for the international registration of that mark.

"(3) BASIC REGISTRATION.—The term 'basic registration' means the registration of a mark that has been granted by an Office of a Contracting Party and that constitutes the basis for an application for the international registration of that mark.

"(4) CONTRACTING PARTY.—The term 'Contracting Party' means any country or intergovernmental organization that is a party to the Madrid Protocol.

"(5) DATE OF RECORDAL.—The term 'date of recordal' means the date on which a request for extension of protection that is filed after an international registration is granted is recorded on the International Register.

"(6) DECLARATION OF BONA FIDE INTENTION TO USE THE MARK IN COMMERCE.—The term 'declaration of bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce' means a declaration that is signed by the applicant for, or holder of, an international registration who is seeking extension of protection of a mark to the United States and that contains a statement that—

"(A) the applicant or holder has a bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce;

"(B) the person making the declaration believes himself or herself, or the firm, corporation, or association in whose behalf he or she makes the declaration, to be entitled to use the mark in commerce; and

“(C) no other person, firm, corporation, or association, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form of the mark or in such near resemblance to the mark as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods of such other person, firm, corporation, or association, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.

“(7) **EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.**—The term ‘extension of protection’ means the protection resulting from an international registration that extends to a Contracting Party at the request of the holder of the international registration, in accordance with the Madrid Protocol.

“(8) **HOLDER OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.**—A ‘holder’ of an international registration is the natural or juristic person in whose name the international registration is recorded on the International Register.

“(9) **INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION.**—The term ‘international application’ means an application for international registration that is filed under the Madrid Protocol.

“(10) **INTERNATIONAL BUREAU.**—The term ‘International Bureau’ means the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization.

“(11) **INTERNATIONAL REGISTER.**—The term ‘International Register’ means the official collection of such data concerning international registrations maintained by the International Bureau that the Madrid Protocol or its implementing regulations require or permit to be recorded, regardless of the medium which contains such data.

“(12) **INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.**—The term ‘international registration’ means the registration of a mark granted under the Madrid Protocol.

“(13) **INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION DATE.**—The term ‘international registration date’ means the date assigned to the international registration by the International Bureau.

“(14) **NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.**—The term ‘notification of refusal’ means the notice sent by an Office of a Contracting Party to the International Bureau declaring that an extension of protection cannot be granted.

“(15) **OFFICE OF A CONTRACTING PARTY.**—The term ‘Office of a Contracting Party’ means—

“(A) the office, or governmental entity, of a Contracting Party that is responsible for the registration of marks; or

“(B) the common office, or governmental entity, of more than 1 Contracting Party that is responsible for the registration of marks and is so recognized by the International Bureau.

“(16) **OFFICE OF ORIGIN.**—The term ‘office of origin’ means the Office of a Contracting Party with which a basic application was filed or by which a basic registration was granted.

“(17) **OPPOSITION PERIOD.**—The term ‘opposition period’ means the time allowed for filing an opposition in the Patent and Trademark Office, including any extension of time granted under section 13.

“SEC. 61. INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS BASED ON UNITED STATES APPLICATIONS OR REGISTRATIONS.

“The owner of a basic application pending before the Patent and Trademark Office, or the owner of a basic registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office, who—

“(1) is a national of the United States; or

“(2) is domiciled in the United States; or

“(3) has a real and effective industrial or commercial establishment in the United States,

may file an international application by submitting to the Patent and Trademark Office a written application in such form, together with such fees, as may be prescribed by the Director.

“SEC. 62. CERTIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION.

“Upon the filing of an application for international registration and payment of the prescribed fees, the Director shall examine the international application for the purpose of certifying that the information contained in the international application corresponds to the information contained in the basic application or basic registration at the time of the certification. Upon examination and certification of the international application, the Director shall transmit the international application to the International Bureau.

“SEC. 63. RESTRICTION, ABANDONMENT, CANCELLATION, OR EXPIRATION OF A BASIC APPLICATION OR BASIC REGISTRATION.

“With respect to an international application transmitted to the International Bureau under section 62, the Director shall notify the International Bureau whenever the basic application or basic registration which is the basis for the international application has been restricted, abandoned, or canceled, or has expired, with respect to some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration—

“(1) within 5 years after the international registration date; or

“(2) more than 5 years after the international registration date if the restriction, abandonment, or cancellation of the basic application or basic registration resulted from an action that began before the end of that 5-year period.

“SEC. 64. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION SUBSEQUENT TO INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.

“The holder of an international registration that is based upon a basic application filed with the Patent and Trademark Office or a basic registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office may request an extension of protection of its international registration by filing such a request—

“(1) directly with the International Bureau; or

“(2) with the Patent and Trademark Office for transmittal to the International Bureau, if the request is in such form, and contains such transmittal fee, as may be prescribed by the Director.

“SEC. 65. EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION TO THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE MADRID PROTOCOL.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the provisions of section 68, the holder of an international registration shall be entitled to the benefits of extension of protection of that international registration to the United States to the extent necessary to give effect to any provision of the Madrid Protocol.

“(b) **IF UNITED STATES IS OFFICE OF ORIGIN.**—An extension of protection resulting from an international registration of a mark shall not apply to the United States if the Patent and Trademark Office is the office of origin with respect to that mark.

“SEC. 66. EFFECT OF FILING A REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION TO THE UNITED STATES.

“(a) **REQUIREMENT FOR REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.**—A request for extension of protection of an international registration to the United States that the International Bureau transmits to the Patent and Trademark Office shall be deemed to be properly filed in the United States if such request, when received by the International Bureau, has attached to it a declaration of bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce that is verified by the applicant for, or holder of, the international registration.

“(b) **EFFECT OF PROPER FILING.**—Unless extension of protection is refused under section

68, the proper filing of the request for extension of protection under subsection (a) shall constitute constructive use of the mark, conferring the same rights as those specified in section 7(c), as of the earliest of the following:

“(1) The international registration date, if the request for extension of protection was filed in the international application.

“(2) The date of recordal of the request for extension of protection, if the request for extension of protection was made after the international registration date.

“(3) The date of priority claimed pursuant to section 67.

“SEC. 67. RIGHT OF PRIORITY FOR REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION TO THE UNITED STATES.

“The holder of an international registration with an extension of protection to the United States shall be entitled to claim a date of priority based on the right of priority within the meaning of Article 4 of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property if—

“(1) the international registration contained a claim of such priority; and

“(2)(A) the international application contained a request for extension of protection to the United States; or

“(B) the date of recordal of the request for extension of protection to the United States is not later than 6 months after the date of the first regular national filing (within the meaning of Article 4(A)(3) of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property) or a subsequent application (within the meaning of Article 4(C)(4) of the Paris Convention).

“SEC. 68. EXAMINATION OF AND OPPOSITION TO REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION; NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.

“(a) **EXAMINATION AND OPPOSITION.**—(1) A request for extension of protection described in section 66(a) shall be examined as an application for registration on the Principal Register under this Act, and if on such examination it appears that the applicant is entitled to extension of protection under this title, the Director shall cause the mark to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

“(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c), a request for extension of protection under this title shall be subject to opposition under section 13. Unless successfully opposed, the request for extension of protection shall not be refused.

“(3) Extension of protection shall not be refused under this section on the ground that the mark has not been used in commerce.

“(4) Extension of protection shall be refused under this section to any mark not registrable on the Principal Register.

“(b) **NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.**—If, a request for extension of protection is refused under subsection (a), the Director shall declare in a notification of refusal (as provided in subsection (c)) that the extension of protection cannot be granted, together with a statement of all grounds on which the refusal was based.

“(c) **NOTICE TO INTERNATIONAL BUREAU.**—(1) Within 18 months after the date on which the International Bureau transmits to the Patent and Trademark Office a notification of a request for extension of protection, the Director shall transmit to the International Bureau any of the following that applies to such request:

“(A) A notification of refusal based on an examination of the request for extension of protection.

“(B) A notification of refusal based on the filing of an opposition to the request.

“(C) A notification of the possibility that an opposition to the request may be filed after the end of that 18-month period.

“(2) If the Director has sent a notification of the possibility of opposition under paragraph (1)(C), the Director shall, if applicable, transmit to the International Bureau a notification of refusal on the basis of the opposition, together with a statement of all the grounds for the opposition, within 7 months after the beginning of the opposition period or within 1 month after the end of the opposition period, whichever is earlier.

“(3) If a notification of refusal of a request for extension of protection is transmitted under paragraph (1) or (2), no grounds for refusal of such request other than those set forth in such notification may be transmitted to the International Bureau by the Director after the expiration of the time periods set forth in paragraph (1) or (2), as the case may be.

“(4) If a notification specified in paragraph (1) or (2) is not sent to the International Bureau within the time period set forth in such paragraph, with respect to a request for extension of protection, the request for extension of protection shall not be refused and the Director shall issue a certificate of extension of protection pursuant to the request.

“(d) DESIGNATION OF AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In responding to a notification of refusal with respect to a mark, the holder of the international registration of the mark shall designate, by a written document filed in the Patent and Trademark Office, the name and address of a person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with that person, or mailing to that person, a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Director.

“SEC. 69. EFFECT OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

“(a) ISSUANCE OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—Unless a request for extension of protection is refused under section 68, the Director shall issue a certificate of extension of protection pursuant to the request and shall cause notice of such certificate of extension of protection to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

“(b) EFFECT OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—From the date on which a certificate of extension of protection is issued under subsection (a)—

“(1) such extension of protection shall have the same effect and validity as a registration on the Principal Register; and

“(2) the holder of the international registration shall have the same rights and remedies as the owner of a registration on the Principal Register.

“SEC. 70. DEPENDENCE OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION TO THE UNITED STATES ON THE UNDERLYING INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.

“(a) EFFECT OF CANCELLATION OF INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—If the International Bureau notifies the Patent and Trademark Office of the cancellation of an international registration with respect to some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration, the Director shall cancel any extension of protection to the United States with respect to such goods and services as of the date on which the international registration was canceled.

“(b) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO RENEW INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—If the International Bureau does not renew an international registration, the corresponding extension of protection to the United States shall cease to be valid as of the date of the expiration of the international registration.

“(c) TRANSFORMATION OF AN EXTENSION OF PROTECTION INTO A UNITED STATES APPLICATION.—The holder of an international registration canceled in whole or in part by the International Bureau at the request of the office of origin, under Article 6(4) of the Madrid Protocol, may file an application, under section 1 or 44 of this Act, for the registration of the same mark for any of the goods and services to which the cancellation applies that were covered by an extension of protection to the United States based on that international registration. Such an application shall be treated as if it had been filed on the international registration date or the date of recordal of the request for extension of protection with the International Bureau, whichever date applies, and, if the extension of protection enjoyed priority under section 67 of this title, shall enjoy the same priority. Such an application shall be entitled to the benefits conferred by this subsection only if the application is filed not later than 3 months after the date on which the international registration was canceled, in whole or in part, and only if the application complies with all the requirements of this Act which apply to any application filed pursuant to section 1 or 44.

“SEC. 71. AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.

“(a) REQUIRED AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.—An extension of protection for which a certificate of extension of protection has been issued under section 69 shall remain in force for the term of the international registration upon which it is based, except that the extension of protection of any mark shall be canceled by the Director—

“(1) at the end of the 6-year period beginning on the date on which the certificate of extension of protection was issued by the Director, unless within the 1-year period preceding the expiration of that 6-year period the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with a fee prescribed by the Director; and

“(2) at the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date on which the certificate of extension of protection was issued by the Director, and at the end of each 10-year period thereafter, unless—

“(A) within the 6-month period preceding the expiration of such 10-year period the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with a fee prescribed by the Director; or

“(B) within 3 months after the expiration of such 10-year period, the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with the fee described in subparagraph (A) and an additional fee prescribed by the Director.

“(b) CONTENTS OF AFFIDAVIT.—The affidavit referred to in subsection (a) shall set forth those goods or services recited in the extension of protection on or in connection with which the mark is in use in commerce and the holder of the international registration shall attach to the affidavit a specimen or facsimile showing the current use of the mark in commerce, or shall set forth that any nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark. Special notice of the requirement for such affidavit shall be attached to each certificate of extension of protection.

“SEC. 72. ASSIGNMENT OF AN EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

“An extension of protection may be assigned, together with the goodwill associated with the mark, only to a person who is a national of, is domiciled in, or has a bona fide and effective industrial or commercial estab-

lishment either in a country that is a Contracting Party or in a country that is a member of an intergovernmental organization that is a Contracting Party.

“SEC. 73. INCONTTESTABILITY.

“The period of continuous use prescribed under section 15 for a mark covered by an extension of protection issued under this title may begin no earlier than the date on which the Director issues the certificate of the extension of protection under section 69, except as provided in section 74.

“SEC. 74. RIGHTS OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

“An extension of protection shall convey the same rights as an existing registration for the same mark, if—

“(1) the extension of protection and the existing registration are owned by the same person;

“(2) the goods and services listed in the existing registration are also listed in the extension of protection; and

“(3) the certificate of extension of protection is issued after the date of the existing registration.”

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date on which the Madrid Protocol (as defined in section 60(1) of the Trademark Act of 1946) enters into force with respect to the United States.

MADRID PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION ACT— SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This section provides a short title: the “Madrid Protocol Implementation Act.”

SECTION 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946

This section amends the “Trademark Act of 1946” by adding a new Title XII with the following provisions:

The owner of a registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) or the owner of a pending application before the PTO may file an international application for trademark protection at the PTO.

After receipt of the appropriate fee and inspection of the application, the PTO Director is charged with the duty of transmitting the application to the WIPO International Bureau.

The Director is also obliged to notify the International Bureau whenever the international application has been “. . . restricted, abandoned, canceled, or has expired . . .” within a specified time period.

The holder of an international registration may request an extension of its registration by filing with the PTO or the International Bureau.

The holder of an international registration is entitled to the benefits of extension in the United States to the extent necessary to give effect to any provision of the Protocol; however, an extension of an international registration shall not apply to the United States if the PTO is the office of origin with respect to that mark.

The holder of an international registration with an extension of protection in the United States may claim a date of priority based on certain conditions.

If the PTO Director believes that an applicant is entitled to an extension of protection, he or she publishes the mark in the “Official Gazette” of the PTO. This serves notice to third parties who oppose the extension. Unless an official protest conducted pursuant to existing law is successful, the request for extension may not be refused. If the request for extension is denied, however, the Director notifies the International Bureau of such action and sets forth the reason(s) why. The Director must also apprise

the International Bureau of other relevant information pertaining to requests for extension within the designated time periods.

If an extension for protection is granted, the Director issues a certificate attesting to such action, and publishes notice of the certificate in the "Gazette." Holders of extension certificates thereafter enjoy protection equal to that of other owners of registration listed on the Principal Register of the PTO.

If the International Bureau notifies the PTO of a cancellation of some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration, the Director must cancel an extension of protection with respect to the same goods and services as of the date on which the international registration was canceled. Similarly, if the International Bureau does not renew an international registration, the corresponding extension of protection in the United States shall cease to be valid. Finally, the holder of an international registration canceled in whole or in part by the International Bureau may file an application for the registration of the same mark for any of the goods and services to which the cancellation applies that were covered by an extension of protection to the United States based on that international registration.

The holder of an extension of protection must, within designated time periods and under certain conditions, file an affidavit setting forth the relevant goods or services covered and any explanation as to why their nonuse in commerce is related to "special circumstances," along with a filing fee.

The right to an extension of protection may be assigned to a third party so long as the individual is a national of, or is domiciled in, or has a "bona fide" business located in a country that is a member of the Protocol; or has such a business in a country that is a member of an intergovernmental organization (like the E.U.) belonging to the Protocol.

An extension of protection conveys the same rights as an existing registration for the same mark if the extension and existing registration are owned by the same person, and extension of protection and the existing registration cover the same goods or services, and the certificate of extension is issued after the date of the existing registration.

SECTION 3. EFFECTIVE DATE

This section states that the effective date of the act shall commence on the date on which the Madrid Protocol takes effect in the United States.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce with my distinguished colleague, Senator LEAHY, legislation that will, for the first time, enable American businesses to obtain international trademark protection with the filing of a single application and the payment of a single fee.

For many businesses, a company's trademark is its most valuable asset. This is illustrated now as never before in the growth of the new Internet economy, where so-called "branding" is the name of the game and the cornerstone of any business plan. Whether a business is an e-business or a more traditional Main Street storefront, United States trademark law has proven to be a powerful tool for these businesses in protecting their marks against domestic misappropriation. However, as global trading increases and multinational businesses grow, worldwide trademark protection is becoming extremely im-

portant and desirable. Unfortunately, achieving similar protection on an international scale has always been a much more difficult task. This difficulty stems in large part from the diversity among national trademark laws, as well as the sometimes prohibitive costs of filing individual registrations and seeking foreign representation in each and every country for which trademark protection is sought. As a result, American businesses, and small businesses in particular, are often forced to pick only a handful of countries in which to seek protection for their brand names and hope for the best in the rest of the world.

In the past, Senator LEAHY and I have sponsored a number of bills addressing the international protection of intellectual property. In the trademark arena, we strongly supported legislation implementing the Trademark Law Treaty. That treaty serves to streamline the trademark registration process in member countries around the world and to minimize the hurdles faced by American trademark owners in securing international protection of their marks. The legislation we introduce today will build upon those improvements by allowing trademark owners to seek international protection with a single application filed in the English language with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, USPTO, and with the payment of a single fee. Most important, it paves the way for the USPTO to act as a one-stop shop for international trademark protection without making substantive changes to United States trademark law. Foreign trademark owners must still meet all of the substantive requirements of United States trademark law in order to gain protection in the United States based on an international application filed under the Madrid Protocol. In short, it is a win-win situation for American trademark owners.

As my colleagues here know, United States adherence to the Madrid Protocol was stalled for years over administrative provisions—unrelated to the substance of the Protocol itself—relating to voting rights. Since 1994, the Administration voiced objections to these provisions, which would allow an intergovernmental organization, e.g., the European Union, a vote in certain treaty matters taken before the Assembly, separate and apart from the votes of its member states. Although matters before the Assembly would largely be limited to administrative matters, e.g., those involving formalities and fee changes, the concern expressed has been that these provisions, which appear to violate the democratic principle of one vote for each state, would create an undesirable precedent in future international agreements.

While this stumbling block to United States accession to the Protocol has been the subject of much negotiation between the United States and the European Union, I am pleased that a suc-

cessful resolution on this issue of voting rights has been reached, and I was pleased that the Senate finally received the Administration's request for its advice and consent last year. By passing The Madrid Protocol Implementation Act, we will take an important step in making sure that American trademark owners will be able to take full advantage of the benefits of the Protocol as soon as it comes into force with respect to the United States. This is a particularly important measure for American competitiveness, and for the individual businesses in each of our states. I want to thank Senator LEAHY for his leadership with respect to this legislation, and I look forward to my colleagues' support for it.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 408. A bill to provide emergency relief to small businesses affected by significant increases in the price of electricity; to the Committee on Small Business.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Small Business Electricity Emergency Relief Act. As the electricity crisis in California continues, small businesses are being hit hard by the increase in electricity prices.

Across California, small business owners are opening their electricity bills only to be in a state of shock. In some cases they find that their bills have doubled, and sometimes even tripled. This has resulted in many small businesses having to close their doors and many more facing severe economic hardship.

Under the Small Business Electricity Emergency Relief Act of 2001, the Small Business Administration could make loans to small businesses that have suffered economic injury due to a "sharp and significant increase" in their electricity bills.

This legislation will provide California's small businesses with some much needed financial relief. This will greatly assist small businesses in the San Diego region that suffered dramatic increases in their electricity bills last summer.

Small businesses represent the heart of our great state's thriving economy. This legislation will ensure that these small businesses are provided assistance to help keep their lights on.

STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 28—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN STATE OF IDAHO V. FREDRICK LEROY LEAS, SR.

Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.

S. RES. 28

Whereas, in the case of State of Idaho v. Fredrick Leroy Leas, Sr., C. No. CR-00-01326,

pending in the District Court Of The Second Judicial District Of The State Of Idaho, in and for the County of Latah, testimony has been subpoenaed from Cindy Agidius, an employee in the office of Senator Mike Crapo;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Cindy Agidius is authorized to testify in the case of State of Idaho v. Fredrick Leroy Leas, Sr., except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Cindy Agidius in connection with the testimony authorized in section one of this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 29—HONORING DALE EARNHARDT AND EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE TO HIS FAMILY ON HIS DEATH

Mr. EDWARDS (for himself and Mr. HELMS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. RES. 29

Whereas the Senate has heard with great sadness of the death of Dale Earnhardt in a tragic accident;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt, a native of Kannapolis, North Carolina, represents a genuine American success story, rising from poverty to become a racing legend and accomplished businessman;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt became the first driver to follow Rookie of the Year honors in 1979 with the Winston Cup championship the next year;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt is tied only with Richard Petty in winning seven Winston Cup Series titles during his 26 years in racing;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt followed in his father's footsteps as a stock car driver, and earned the nickname "The Intimidator" for his aggressive racing style with which he went on to win 76 career races, including the 1998 Daytona 500;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt was not only devoted to the sport of racing, but to his family as the loving husband of Teresa, and loving father of Taylor Nicole, Dale Jr., Kelley, and Kerry;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt's love for life and countless contributions to family and the State of North Carolina serve as an inspiration to millions;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt contributed significantly to the growth and popularity of NASCAR in America through his support of and dedication to racing;

Whereas fans across the nation mourn the untimely loss of one of NASCAR's greatest champions;

Whereas in days following the passing of Dale Earnhardt, fellow drivers and NASCAR officials repeatedly referred to him as "the greatest driver in the history of the sport";

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) Recognizes that the world has too soon lost one of its most beloved sports heroes and one of the greatest drivers in racing history; and honors him in his devotion to life, family, and motor sports; and

(2) expresses its deep and heartfelt condolences to the family of Dale Earnhardt on their tragic loss.

SENATE RESOLUTION 30—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. DOMENICI submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on the Budget; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. RES. 30

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget (referred to in this resolution as the "committee") is authorized from March 1, 2001, through February 28, 2003, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2001.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2001, through September 30, 2001, under this section shall not exceed \$2,880,615, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$4,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2001, through September 30, 2002, under this section shall not exceed \$5,112,126, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$4,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2003.—For the period October 1, 2002, through February 28, 2003, expenses of the committee under this section shall not exceed \$2,187,120, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of indi-

vidual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946); and

(2) not to exceed \$4,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 2. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2003.

SEC. 3. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees of the committee who are paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications expenses provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee for the period March 1, 2001, through September 30, 2001, for the period October 1, 2001, through September 30, 2002, and for the period October 1, 2002, through February 28, 2003, to be paid from the appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations" of the Senate.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THERE SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE PARITY BETWEEN THE ADJUSTMENTS IN THE COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES AND THE ADJUSTMENTS IN THE COMPENSATION OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. AKAKA) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

S. CON. RES. 17

Whereas members of the uniformed services of the United States and civilian employees of the United States make significant contributions to the general welfare of the United States;

Whereas increases in the levels of pay of members of the uniformed services and of civilian employees of the United States have not kept pace with increases in the overall levels of pay of workers in the private sector;

Whereas there is a 32 percent gap between the compensation levels of Federal civilian employees and the compensation levels of

private sector workers, and an estimated 10 percent gap between the compensation levels of members of the uniformed services and the compensation levels of private sector workers; and

Whereas in almost every year of the past 2 decades, members of the uniformed services and civilian employees of the United States have received equal adjustments in compensation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that there should continue to be parity between the adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the adjustments in the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senators WARNER, MIKULSKI, BINGAMAN, and KENNEDY in introducing a resolution which would express the sense of the Congress that parity between Federal civilian pay and military pay should be maintained. A comparison of military and civilian pay increases by the Congressional Research Service finds that in 17 of these last 20 years military and civilian pay increases have been identical. Disparate treatment of civilian and military pay goes against longstanding policy of parity for all those who have chosen to serve our Nation—whether that service be in the civilian workforce or in the armed services.

In the 106th Congress, an overwhelming majority of the United States Senate agreed, and approved a bipartisan pay parity amendment on February 24, 1999 by a vote of 94 to 6 during consideration of S. 4, the Soldiers', Sailors', Airmen's, and Marines Bill of Rights Act. In many instances, Federal civilian and military employees work side-by-side doing the important work of the Nation, and the Senate has recognized that we should not undermine the morale of these very dedicated public servants by failing to bring them in line with military personnel.

The rationales for an increase in military and civilian pay are the same. Both the armed services and the Federal civilian workforce need to address critical retention and recruitment problems. This year, the General Accounting Office, GAO, has added "human capital" as one of the areas of high risk for the Federal government. A wave of potential retirements threaten institutional experience and knowledge at every level. An estimated 53 percent of the Federal workforce will be eligible to retire by 2004. By that same time, approximately 60 percent of the Senior Executive Service, our top civilian managers, will be eligible for retirement.

These vacancies will occur in an era in which those entering the workforce are less likely to join public service. As the GAO has noted, the "Federal government has often acted as if its people were costs to be cut rather than assets to be valued." Congress has continually asked Federal employees to make significant sacrifices for the sake of our Nation's fiscal health. FEPCA, leg-

islation passed in 1990 to bring the pay of Federal employees in line with that offered in the private sector, has never been fully implemented. Between 1993 and 1999, the executive branch has cut 17 percent of its workforce, totaling 377,000 full time positions. In 1996, Federal employees were forced to make higher contributions to their retirement plans in order to help pay down the national debt. But through it all, Federal employees have continued to provide high quality service to the American public, usually with fewer resources and personnel.

One way to ensure the Federal government is able to attract and retain qualified public servants is to ensure parity between civil service employees and members of the armed forces. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important resolution.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18—RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PEACE CORPS OVER THE PAST 40 YEARS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. CHAFEE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. CON. RES. 18

Whereas the Peace Corps has become a powerful symbol of the commitment of the United States to encourage progress, create opportunity, and expand development at the grassroots level in the developing world;

Whereas more than 162,000 Americans have served as Peace Corps volunteers in 134 countries in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Central Asia, Eastern and Central Europe, and Central and South America since 1961;

Whereas Peace Corps volunteers have made significant and lasting contributions around the world in agriculture, business, education, health, and the environment, and have improved the lives of individuals and communities around the world;

Whereas Peace Corps volunteers have strengthened the ties of friendship and understanding between the people of the United States and those of other countries;

Whereas Peace Corps volunteers, enriched by their experiences overseas, have brought their communities throughout the United States a deeper understanding of other cultures and traditions, thereby bringing a domestic dividend to the United States;

Whereas Peace Corps volunteers embody and represent many of the most enduring values of the United States, such as a spirit of service, a commitment to helping others, and a call for friendship among nations;

Whereas the Peace Corps continues to receive broad, bipartisan support in Congress and from the American people; and

Whereas March 1, 2001, will mark the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Peace Corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That—

(1) the achievements and contributions of the Peace Corps over the past 40 years be celebrated;

(2) the dedication and sacrifice of Peace Corps volunteers, past and present, be recognized and their continued contributions be acknowledged not only for their service in other countries but also in their own communities; and

(3) the President is requested to honor Peace Corps volunteers and reaffirm the commitment of the United States to international peace and understanding.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a resolution celebrating the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Peace Corps. Many of my colleagues know of my history as a Peace Corps volunteer in the Dominican Republic, and the great impact that that experience had on me. Serving outside of the United States and seeing the shortcomings of other nations, I grew to appreciate this nation more and more, and developed a strong sense of what it means to be an American. And, I was proud to share my experiences as a United States citizen with the people I was sent to help. At the end of the day, the smiling faces of the people in the community in which I was stationed made all my hard work worthwhile.

My experience as a Peace Corps volunteer was almost 33 years ago, when the Peace Corps was still a relatively new organization. But, under the leadership of such distinguished directors as Sargent Shriver, Loret Ruppe, Paul Coverdell, Mark Schneider, and all the other directors in the Peace Corps history, the organization has grown and grown. I am proud to stand here today and report that from its humble beginnings as a method for Americans to share their expertise and assistance with other nations, the Peace Corps has grown into an organization that sends more than 7,000 volunteers to 76 different countries a year.

These volunteers are really the heart and soul of the Peace Corps. They are the ones at the front lines, working hard and making individual connections with the citizens of the countries in which they work. Since 1961, Peace Corps volunteers have brought a wealth of practical assistance to communities in Africa, Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and the Pacific. They have worked at such disparate tasks as halting the spread of AIDS, advising small business owners, protecting the environment, educating students, and increasing farm yields. Volunteers have played a vital role in short-term disaster relief and humanitarian efforts. In the face of many personal and physical challenges, Peace Corps volunteers offer their ingenuity and an approach to problem solving that is both optimistic and pragmatic. Above all, the Peace Corps enduring success is rooted in volunteer's commitment to leave behind skills that allow people to take charge of their own futures.

Peace Corps volunteers also make a difference at home by continuing their community service and strengthening Americans' appreciation of other cultures. By visiting classrooms, working with community groups, and speaking with friends and family members, volunteers help others learn more about

the world in which we live and help build a legacy of service for the next generation.

Today, the Peace Corps continues to strengthen existing programs and expand its activities around the world, including new programs in Mozambique, Bangladesh, and Georgia. The Peace Corps also plans to graduate from several countries where volunteers have made significant progress during a critical period of transformation, including Poland, the Slovak Republic, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Current volunteers are somewhat different than the volunteers of the early years when I was a volunteer. The average age has risen from 22 to 28, the percentage of women has increased from 35 to 60, the number of volunteers with graduate degrees is growing, and today's volunteers represent the most ethnically diverse group so far. However, today's volunteers share a characteristic with their predecessors that is a cornerstone of Peace Corps service—a commitment to the spirit of volunteerism and service that President Kennedy first envisioned 40 years ago.

Today, on Peace Corps Day, thousands of returned volunteers will celebrate by sharing the knowledge and insights gained from their overseas experiences with school groups and local communities throughout the United States. A series of activities are also planned in the Peace Corps countries, where volunteers and their host country colleagues will celebrate their accomplishments and the universal goals of partnership and goodwill.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution celebrating the Peace Corps and its worldwide network on the 40th anniversary of the Peace Corps, and in honoring Peace Corps volunteers, past and present, for their four decades of service to the world.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet at 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, February 28, 2001, in Room SR-301 Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct its organizational meeting for the 107th Congress.

For further information concerning this meeting, please contact Tam Somerville at the committee on 4-6352.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Governmental Affairs will hold hearings entitled "The Role of U.S. Correspondent Banking In International Money Laundering." The upcoming hearings will focus on correspondent banking as a vehicle for money laundering; the role

of offshore banks in international money laundering; and the efforts of financial entities, federal regulators, and law enforcement to limit money laundering activities within the United States.

The hearings will take place on Thursday, March 1; Friday, March 2; and Tuesday, March 6, 2001, at 9:30 a.m. each day, in room 342 of the Dirksen Senate office Building. For further information, please contact Linda Gustitus of the subcommittee's minority staff at 224-9505.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 27, 2001, at 9:30 a.m., in open session to consider the nomination of Paul D. Wolfowitz to be the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 27, 2001, to hear testimony regarding Trade Globalization and American Trade Policies.

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Tuesday, February 27, 2001 at 10:30 am for a hearing to consider the nomination of Sean O'Keefe to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a markup on Tuesday, February 27, 2001 at 2:30 p.m. The markup will take place in Dirksen Room 226.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SUPERFUND, WASTE CONTROL AND RISK ASSESSMENT

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Control and Risk Assessment be authorized to meet on Tuesday, February 27, 2001 at 10:15 am on S. 350, the Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act of 2001.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fellow in my of-

fice, Mr. Michael Yudin, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of my statement.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a legislative fellow, Navy Lieutenant Commander Dell Bull, be granted floor privileges during consideration to amend the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act.

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

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for a joint session to be held at 9 p.m. this evening, Tuesday, February 27, 2001.

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

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN STATE OF IDAHO V. FREDRICK LEROY LEAS, SR.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 28, submitted earlier by Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 280) to authorize testimony and legal representation in State of Idaho v. Fredrick Leroy Leas, Sr.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and the statement of explanation appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 28) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution with its preamble is located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2001

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the joint session is completed this evening, the

Senate then automatically adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m. on Wednesday, February 28. I further ask consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal or proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and 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 until 1 p.m. with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator DURBIN, or his designee, from 11 o'clock until 12 o'clock; Senator THOMAS, or his designee, from 12 o'clock to 1 o'clock; further, that if leader time is used during controlled time, the controlled time be extended accordingly.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow morning the Senate will be in a period of morning business. Following morning business, the Senate may consider the bankruptcy legislation or any nominations that are available. Members will be notified as any votes are scheduled. As a reminder, all Senators are asked to be in the Senate Chamber this evening at 8:30 in order to proceed at 8:40 to the House of Representatives for the President's address.

RECESS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess until 8:30 this evening.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:32 p.m., recessed until 8:30 p.m.; whereupon, Senate reassembled at 8:34 p.m., when called to order by the Vice President (DICK CHENEY).

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

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

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

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 107-1)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States.

Thereupon, the Senate, preceded by the Sergeant at Arms, James W.

Ziglar, the Secretary of the Senate, Gary Sisco, and the Vice President of the United States, DICK CHENEY, proceeded to the hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States, George W. Bush.

(The address delivered by the President of the United States to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered into, at 10:06 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 28, 2001, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27, 2001:

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. HARVEY E. JOHNSON, JR., 0000
CAPT. SALLY BRICE-O'HARA, 0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

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

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES D. BANKERS, 0000
BRIG. GEN. MARVIN J. BARRY, 0000
BRIG. GEN. JOHN D. DORRIS, 0000
BRIG. GEN. PATRICK J. GALLAGHER, 0000
BRIG. GEN. RONALD M. SEGA, 0000

To be brigadier general

COL. FRED F. CASTLE JR., 0000
COL. THOMAS A. DYCHES, 0000
COL. JOHN H. GRUESER, 0000
COL. BRUCE E. HAWLEY, 0000
COL. CHRISTOPHER M. JONIEC, 0000
COL. WILLIAM P. KANE, 0000
COL. MICHAEL K. LYNCH, 0000
COL. CARLOS E. MARTINEZ, 0000
COL. CHARLES W. NEELEY, 0000
COL. MARK A. PILLAR, 0000
COL. WILLIAM M. RAJCZAK, 0000
COL. THOMAS M. STOGSDILL, 0000
COL. DALE TIMOTHY WHITE, 0000
COL. FLOYD C. WILLIAMS, 0000

IN THE ARMY

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. ROBERT M. CARROTHERS, 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 major general

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT M. DIAMOND, 0000

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 major general

BRIG. GEN. EUGENE P. KLYNOOT, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

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

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES F. AMOS, 0000
BRIG. GEN. JOHN G. CASTELLAW, 0000
BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY E. DONOVAN, 0000
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT M. FLANAGAN, 0000
BRIG. GEN. JAMES N. MATTIS, 0000
BRIG. GEN. GORDON C. NATH, 0000
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT M. SHEA, 0000

BRIG. GEN. FRANCES C. WILSON, 0000

IN THE NAVY

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MICHAEL S. BAKER, 0000
CAPT. LEWIS S. LIBBY III, 0000
CAPT. CHARLES A. WILLIAMS, 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. ROBERT E. COWLEY III, 0000
CAPT. ROBERT D. HUFSTADER, JR., 0000
CAPT. NANCY LESCOVAGE, 0000
CAPT. ALAN S. THOMPSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE NAVAL RESERVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JAMES E. BEEBE, 0000
CAPT. HUGO G. BLACKWOOD, 0000
CAPT. DANIEL S. MASTAGNI, 0000
CAPT. PAUL V. SHEBALIN, 0000
CAPT. JOHN M. STEWART, JR., 0000

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

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KENNETH C. BELISLE, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) MARK R. FEICHTINGER, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN A. JACKSON, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN P. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES B. PLEHAL, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOE S. THOMPSON, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 624:

To be major

*BRIAN J. STERNER, 0000

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

To be colonel

WILLIAM N.C. CULBERTSON, 0000
DONALD R. FORDEN, 0000
ROBERT S. MORTENSON, JR., 0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

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

To be lieutenant colonel

LAUREN N. JOHNSON-NAUMANN, 0000
ALAN K. LEWIS, 0000
TERESA A. TOWNE, 0000
JEFFREY W. WATSON, 0000

To be major

ERVIN LOCKLEAR, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

EDWARD J. FALESKI, 0000
TYRONE R. STEPHENS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 9333(C).

To be colonel

WILLIAM D. CARPENTER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR A REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 2114.

To be captain

ANTOIN M. ALEXANDER, 0000
SPRING R. ANDERSON, 0000
LEE S. ASTLE, 0000
SCOTT J. BARNACLE, 0000
BRADLEY J. BOETIG, 0000
TERESA A. BONZANI, 0000
CHRISTINE L. CAMPBELL, 0000
BRETT D. COONS, 0000
AMY A. COSTELLO, 0000
ERIC P. CRITCHLEY, 0000
STEVEN W. DAVIS, 0000
TIMOTHY J. DUNCAN, 0000
HERMAN R. ELLEMBERGER, 0000
ROBERT L. EMERY, 0000
JASON H. EVES, 0000

SHANNON D. FABER, 0000
ERIC M. FLAKE, 0000
STUART R. GROSS, 0000
AUDREY M. HALL, 0000
EVELYN M. HARDER, 0000
STEPHANIE K. HORNE, 0000
DAVID T. HSIEH, 0000
DAVID L. HUANG, 0000
TINA R. KINSLEY, 0000
MICHAEL J. KOZNARSKY, 0000
JIMMY J. LAU, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. LEBRUN, 0000
KI LEE, 0000
JULIA C. MASTERS, 0000
STEPHEN C. MATURO, 0000
EDWARD L. MAZUCHOWSKI II, 0000
PETER G. MICHAELSON, 0000
JEFREY W. MOLLOY, 0000
ANTHONY J. MONTEGUT, 0000
JOSHUA C. MORGANSTEIN, 0000
PATRICIA A. PANKEY, 0000
TIMOTHY M. PHILLIPS, 0000
ERICA D. RADDEN, 0000
MICHAEL T. SHOEMAKER, 0000
MEGAN M. SHUTTS, 0000
LEANNE C. SIENKO, 0000
KAMAL D. SINGH, 0000
SHAYNE C. STOKES, 0000
JAMES E. STORMO, 0000
JEFFREY P. TAN, 0000
DOUGLAS W. WHITE, 0000
KEVIN M. WHITE, 0000
TORY W. WOODARD, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

PHILIP M. ABSHERE, 0000
JOHN T. ADKISSON, 0000
PATRICK D. AIELLO, 0000
JEFFREY R. ALLEN, 0000
BRADLEY J. APLEGATE, 0000
WESLEY A. BEAM, JR., 0000
JOHN N. BELLINGER, JR., 0000
JOHN D. BLEDSOE, JR., 0000
THOMAS M. BOTCHIE, 0000
PAUL D. BROWN, JR., 0000
STANLEY E. CLARKE III, 0000
WILLIAM T. CLAYTON, 0000
FRED D. COVINGTON, JR., 0000
JOHN R. DALLAS, JR., 0000
VINCENT P. DANG, 0000
ROBERT S. DEMPSTER, 0000
SHARON S. DIEFFENDERFER, 0000
DOROTHY J. DONNELLY, 0000
GARY L. EBBEN, 0000
RICHARD G. ELLIOTT, 0000
DARLENE S. FALINSKI, 0000
SHERRIE L. FOWLKES, 0000
MICHAEL W. FRANK, 0000
TONY HART, 0000
DONALD D. HARVEL, 0000
THOMAS G. HEATH, 0000
JAMES B. HINSON, 0000
CYNTHIA T. ISLIN, 0000
JOHN P. JANSON, 0000
KENNETH M. JEFFERSON, 0000
MICHAEL A. JEFFERSON, 0000
FRED R. JOHNSON, 0000
RICHARD C. JULLIA, 0000
ADAM D. KING, 0000
MARTIN G. KLEIN, 0000
TERRY L. LAWSON, 0000
GARY K. LEBARON, 0000
LONNIE J. LEE, 0000
EDWARD C. LEWIS, 0000
HENRY A. LITZ, 0000
JAMES E. MAKOWSKIE, 0000
MICHAEL T. MCCOLLUM, 0000
DONALD L. MCCORMACK, 0000
JAMES M. MCCORMACK, 0000
GEORGE R. MCCURRY III, 0000
PATRICK M. MEAGHER, 0000
DAVID J. MELLISH, 0000
JOHN W. MERRITT, 0000
MICHAEL D. MILLER, 0000
MARSA L. MITCHELL, 0000
PATRICK J. MOISIO, 0000
MICHAEL S. MOORE, 0000
JOHN M. MOTLEY, JR., 0000
CHARLES L. MYERS, 0000
CARL NAGEL III, 0000
BARRON V. NESSELRODE, 0000
COLIS NEWBLE, JR., 0000
RUDOLPH NUDD, JR., 0000
DEAN W. OSWALD, 0000
MICHAEL L. PEPLINSKI, 0000
CHERYL A. PRISLAND, 0000
ESTHER A. RADA, 0000
DON E. REYNOLDS, 0000
WILLIAM P. ROBERTSON, 0000
SAMUEL H. SCHURIG, 0000
DAVID G. SEAMAN, 0000
MARK P. SEARS, 0000
FRANKLIN H. SHARPE, 0000
JEFFREY A. SHELLEY, 0000
RICHARD W. SLOAN, 0000
STEVEN T. SNIPES, 0000
MARK L. STEPHENS, 0000
ROY E. UPTGRAFF III, 0000
JACKIE W. VAUGHN, 0000
WAYNE P. WAKEMAN, 0000
STEPHANIE K. WALSH, 0000
ARTHUR N. WERTS, 0000

TONY L. WEST, 0000
PAUL H. WIETLISBACH, 0000
JOHN M. WILLIAMS, 0000
AARON K. WILSON, 0000
ROBERT P. WRIGHT, 0000

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

To be colonel

WILLIAM R. ACKER, 0000
BRADLEY S. ADAMS, 0000
FREDERICK L. ALLEY, 0000
DARRELL ANDERSON, 0000
MARK W. ARMSTRONG, 0000
MARK A. ARNOLD, 0000
JAMES J. BALDI, 0000
RANDALL R. BARRETT, 0000
ROBERT B. BARTLETT, 0000
GARY E. BEEBE, 0000
CHRISTIN R. BELKOWSKI, 0000
DEBORAH L. BELL, 0000
GEORGE N. J. BENTLEY, 0000
ELAINE BETSCH, 0000
ROBERT I. BLAND, 0000
BETTY A. BOWEN, 0000
RICHARD K. J. BOWERS, 0000
MARTI H. BREIDENSTEIN, 0000
HENRY D. BRINKMAN, 0000
RICHARD J. BROOKS, 0000
RICHARD H. BROWN, 0000
BRAD O. BUCHANAN, 0000
JAMES W. BUCK, 0000
KATHRYN CACIC, 0000
CHESTER CAMP, 0000
OLIN T. CARPENTER, 0000
KARL A. CHIMIAK, 0000
BETTY L. CHRISTIANSEN, 0000
WILLIAM G. CLAPP, 0000
JEAN M. CLIFFORD, 0000
WILLIAM W. COLLIER, 0000
RONNIE D. COMPTON, 0000
THOMAS R. COON, 0000
MARGARET A. COPE, 0000
STEVEN L. CORNELIUS, 0000
DAVID B. COX, 0000
VANCE S. COX, 0000
GRAY K. COYNER, 0000
JOSEPH R. CRITES, 0000
HOWARD S. CUNNINGHAM, 0000
THOMAS A. CURRAN, 0000
JOHN CZABARANEK, 0000
DAVID M. DECKMAN, 0000
ROBERT DECUBELLIS, 0000
ALBERT J. DIAMOND, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. DIXON, 0000
MAXIMO G. DLAROTTA, 0000
PETER DOBY, 0000
JOHN M. DUNPHY, JR., 0000
LAURIE S. ELIASSEN, 0000
DAVID W. ENGEL, 0000
ABRAHAM A. ENGELBERG, 0000
HARRY F. FARMER, JR., 0000
NORMAN A. FRESE, 0000
STANLEY G. FULLER, 0000
STEVEN R. FUSCHER, 0000
KARL M. GAUBY, 0000
ROBERT L. GEIGER, 0000
STEVEN J. GELFAND, 0000
GLENN D. GIANINI, 0000
DONALD E. GILLAM, 0000
GARY M. GILLESPIE, 0000
BRENDA J. GOODMAN, 0000
JACK W. GRADY, 0000
JOHN C. GRAY, 0000
VARENE T. GUMMERSALL, 0000
VIRGINIA W. HADDAD, 0000
LINDA W. HAINES, 0000
DAVID C. HALL, 0000
JUDITH A. HANOVER, 0000
FRANCIS W. HARKINS, JR., 0000
DAVID R. HAULMAN, 0000
EMIL M. HAUSER, 0000
TERRILL K. HEBERT, 0000
STUART S. HELLER, 0000
TIMOTHY HIGGINS, 0000
JOHN C. HILDEBRAND, JR., 0000
DENNIS E. HINK, 0000
ROBERT C. HINOTE, 0000
WILLIAM J. HOAK III, 0000
E. DAVID HOARD, 0000
JAMES F. HOELSCHER, 0000
JAMES R. HOGUE, 0000
DEBORAH J. INMAN, 0000
WALFRED R. JOHNSON, 0000
JAMES P. JOYCE, 0000
JOHN C. KELLY, 0000
RICHARD L. KEMPTON, 0000
RANDALL C. KIES, 0000
STANLEY D. KING, 0000
CHARLES C. KIRK, 0000
STEVEN A. KLEIN, 0000
MICHAEL E. KNIGHT, 0000
THOMAS F. KOESTER, III, 0000
MICHAEL F. KOHN, 0000
SUSAN M. KONCZAL, 0000
RICHARD A. KRAEMER, 0000
DAVID L. KRAMER, 0000
KEVIN J. KUHN, 0000
MARK A. KYLE, 0000
GLENN J. LARSEN, 0000
DONALD C. LATSON, 0000
TERRY L. LAWRENSON, 0000
ERNEST J. LEROY, 0000
JAMES N. LEWIS, JR., 0000
NORMAN E. LINDSEY, 0000

JORGE L. LLAMBES, 0000
PAULA J. LOOMIS, 0000
CHERYL A. MACH, 0000
THOMAS M. MAHONEY, 0000
BOHDAN A. MAKAREWYCZ, 0000
ANTHONY D. MARTIN, 0000
GLENN M. MARTIN, 0000
JOSEPH W. MASON, 0000
WILLIAM B. MATTA, 0000
DONALD K. MATTHEWS, 0000
CRAIG W. MCCOLLUM, 0000
KAREN MCCOY, 0000
ROBERT S. MCCREA, 0000
STEPHEN W. MERRILL, 0000
GREGORY L. MICHAEL, 0000
JERRY D. MILES, 0000
SUSAN L. MILOVICH, 0000
TIMOTHY H. MINER, 0000
EDWARD I. MISKER, 0000
DIANA M. MURAWSKY, 0000
DONALD W. NEAL, JR., 0000
BRUCE L. NELSON, 0000
JOHN R. NUNNALLY, JR., 0000
ELTON J. OGG, 0000
JANET M. O. PALANCA, 0000
GLENN W. PASSAVANT, 0000
JOHN W. PATTON III, 0000
KIM J. PETERSON, 0000
JOHN A. PHELPS, 0000
GREGORY A. PHILLIPS, 0000
RICHARD A. PLEZIA, 0000
PHILIP D. POLAND, 0000
LAWRENCE J. POLKABLA, 0000
HOUSTON H. POLSON, 0000
DAVID S. POST, 0000
AHART W. POWERS, JR., 0000
BOBBY F. PRAYTOR, 0000
ROBERT W. RAMSEY III, 0000
KEVIN L. REINERT, 0000
ROBERT L. RENNER, 0000
MAZHAR RISHI, 0000
RALPH W. RISSMILLER, JR., 0000
DENNIS J. ROBERTSON, 0000
RICHARD O. ROBERTS, JR., 0000
JEFFERY A. ROBERTSON, 0000
SCOTT R. ROBERTS, 0000
SHARYN ANN ROETTGER, 0000
JOHN P. RUSSELL, JR., 0000
DEREK P. RYDHOLM, 0000
PATRICK J. SANJENIS, 0000
DALE W. SANTEE, 0000
GLENN S. SCADDEN, 0000
TIMOTHY A. SCHMIDT, 0000
ROBERT G. SCHULTZ, 0000
NELLIE N. SCOTT, 0000
DEBRA A. SCULLARY, 0000
EDWARD H. SEELIGER, JR., 0000
HARVEY T. SEKIMOTO, 0000
PAMELA A. SEXTON, 0000
GARY W. SHANNON, 0000
RICHARD A. SHOOK, JR., 0000
RENATA T. SIERZEGA, 0000
WILLIAM F. SIMPSON, 0000
FLORENCIO SINGSON, 0000
KATHLEEN D. SMITH, 0000
ROBERT F. STAMPS, 0000
ROBERT A. STENEVIK, 0000
CHRISTOPHER C. STEVENS, 0000
WILLIAM J. STEVENS II, 0000
JAMES N. STEWART, 0000
DAVID L. STOUTAMIRE, 0000
MARTHA A. STOWE, 0000
STEPHEN D. STRINGHAM, 0000
TIMOTHY S. STRONGIN, 0000
JOAN SULLIVAN, 0000
ROBERT R. SWAIN, JR., 0000
CONSTANCE O. TAYLOR, 0000
TONI L. TENGESEN, 0000
CRAIG R. THOMAS, 0000
STEPHEN W. THOMAS, 0000
HOWARD N. THOMPSON, 0000
SAMUEL G. TOTA, 0000
THEODORE L. TRUAX, 0000
CHRISTINE M. TURNER, 0000
PATRICIA L. VANDENBROEKE, 0000
ROBERT G. VITOLO, 0000
LINDA S. WADDELL, 0000
KAREN S. WAGENHALS, 0000
PATRICIA B. WALEGIR, 0000
JAMES L. WALRAVEN, 0000
RUTH M. W. WARREN, 0000
WILLIAM T. WATKINS, 0000
DENNIS D. WEAVER, 0000
JOSEPH G. WEBSTER, 0000
ROBERT G. WEST, 0000
DANIEL P. WHALEN, 0000
PAUL W. WHALEY, 0000
GREGORY B. WHITE, 0000
MICHAEL N. WILSON, 0000
JANICE M. WINKLEPLECK, 0000
JOHN T. WINTERS, JR., 0000
ARTHUR P. ZAPOLSKI, 0000
CHRISTINA M. K. ZIENO, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK(*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 531:

To be colonel

ROBERT C. ALLEN, 0000
MICHAEL J. ATWOOD, 0000
DOUGLAS E. BEAKES, 0000
ALAN B. BERG, 0000
DANIEL K. BERRY, 0000
ERIC J. BRENDLINGER, 0000

ROBERT R. BURNETT, 0000
 JAY A. CLEMENS, 0000
 *JAMES E. COX, JR., 0000
 DOMINIC A. DEFRANCIS, 0000
 RAYMOND S. DOUGHERTY, 0000
 *THOMAS M. DYKES, 0000
 RUSSELL W. EGGERT, 0000
 CARLOS ESQUIVEL, 0000
 KAREN A. FOX, 0000
 MELISSA H. FRIES, 0000
 JOHN W. FUCHS, 0000
 RUSSELL G. GELORMINI, 0000
 DAVID A. GONZALES, 0000
 THOMAS W. GRACE, JR., 0000
 STEVEN D. GULBRANSON, 0000
 STEPHEN R. HOLT, 0000
 *JAMES E. HOUGAS, JR., 0000
 LEO D. HURLEY, 0000
 TERENCE A. IMBERY, 0000
 *VIRGIL S. JEFFERSON, 0000
 DAVID M. JENKINS, 0000
 TIMOTHY T. JEX, 0000
 ROBERT JOHNSON, 0000
 DENNIS W. KELLY, JR., 0000
 JAMES R. KNOWLES, 0000
 *EVERETTE D. LAFON, 0000
 JAMES S. LINDEMUTH, 0000
 FRANK J. LORUSSO, 0000
 JEFF R. MACPHERSON, 0000
 *THOMAS J. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER C. MEDLEY, 0000
 THEODORE A. MICKLE, JR., 0000
 *JOHN P. MITCHELL, 0000
 PAUL F. MONTANY, 0000
 *VERBA A. MOORE, 0000
 KENT R. MURPHY, 0000
 PETER C. MUSKAT, 0000
 JAMES S. NEVILLE, 0000
 KEITH J. ODEGARD, 0000
 REED G. PANOS, 0000
 BRIAN B. PARSA, 0000
 PAUL A. PHILLIPS, 0000
 MARK S. RASCH, 0000
 *MARK K. REED, 0000
 TIMOTHY G. SANDERS, 0000
 MICHAEL G. SCHAFFRINNA, 0000
 DONALD C. SEDBERRY, 0000
 KIMBERLY A. SLAWINSKI, 0000
 RANDALL W. SMART, 0000
 JOHN J. TAPPEL, 0000
 WALTER L. THOMAS, 0000
 DALE R. TIDABACK, 0000
 ANDREW TONG, 0000
 *JOHN R. TORRENT, 0000
 JULIA H. TOWNSEND, 0000
 *RICHARD J. TUBB, 0000
 *ROBERT C. VANDERGRAAF, 0000
 KRAIG S. VANDEWALLE, 0000
 ROBERT P. VOGT, 0000
 DOUGLAS C. WARREN, 0000
 LON J. WARREN, 0000

To be lieutenant colonel

BRIAN D. AFFLECK, 0000
 DALE R. AGNER, 0000
 MARK K. ARNESS, 0000
 *CHAD J. AULTMAN, 0000
 *ERIKA V. BARGER, 0000
 *MICHAEL T. BASHFORD, 0000
 *DAVID M. BENDER, 0000
 GARY E. BENEDETTI, 0000
 JAMES R. BENNION, 0000
 *ROBERT T. BENTS, 0000
 *BRIAN E. BECKERON, 0000
 *JOHN J. BOMALASKI, 0000
 JAMES P. BONAR, 0000
 JOHN P. BOUFFARD, 0000
 DEBORAH K. BRADLEY, 0000
 *KEITH E. BRANDT, 0000
 *DIRK C. BRINKHURST, 0000
 *MARK J. BRINKMAN, 0000
 *ROBERT P. BUTCHER, 0000
 *KEVIN J. CULLERAME, 0000
 *JOHN F. CAUDILL, II, 0000
 *ROGER W. CHILDRESS, 0000
 ANNA S. CLAYTON, 0000
 *TIMOTHY PATRICK CONNALL, 0000
 *LAWSON A. B. COPLEY, 0000
 MICHAEL P. CURRISTON, 0000
 *DOUGLAS B. CURRY, 0000
 *ERNEST L. DABREO, 0000
 *KEITH F. DAHLHAUSER, 0000
 JEFFREY N. DAVILA, 0000
 *RAJIV H. DESAI, 0000
 MARK E. DIDIER, 0000
 *ALDO J. DOMENICHINI, 0000
 *JON M. DOSSETT, 0000
 SCOTT A. DRAPER, 0000
 *THOMAS J. EILTON, 0000
 *BRUCE G. ENSIGN, 0000
 STEVEN D. FILARDO, 0000
 *DANIEL K. FLOOD, 0000
 *DOUGLAS E. FORD, 0000
 PAUL A. FRIEDRICH, 0000
 *LEE A. FULSAAS, 0000
 *MATTHEW R. GEE, 0000
 ROBERT B. GOOD, 0000
 JANET T. GOODWIN, 0000
 MARK D. GOODWIN, 0000
 *WILLIAM K. GRAHAM, 0000
 *JAY D. GRAVER, 0000
 *SCOTT R. GREENING, 0000
 DOUGLAS J. GRIDEL, 0000
 *MICHAEL D. GRINKEMEYER, 0000
 *SAMUEL HAKIM, 0000
 *BRIAN H. HALL, 0000

JOHN F. HAMILTON, JR., 0000
 MARY F. HART, 0000
 *TIMOTHY N. HICKMAN, 0000
 *BARBARA A. HILGENBERG, 0000
 *THOMAS S. HOFFMAN, 0000
 *EDWARD G. JOHNSON, 0000
 ROBERT C. JONES, 0000
 *WOODSON S. JONES, 0000
 *VIKRAM S. KASHYAP, 0000
 *PATRICK J. KEARNEY, 0000
 BRIAN S. KENDALL, 0000
 BRYAN C. KING, 0000
 *TIMOTHY C. KIRKPATRICK, 0000
 STEVEN L. KLYN, 0000
 *JOHN O. KRAUSE, 0000
 *KARL P. LACKLER, 0000
 JOSEPH J. LEGAN, 0000
 *JOHN T. MANSFIELD, 0000
 KEITH E. MCCOY, 0000
 *RANDALL J. MCDANIEL, 0000
 ELIZABETH L. MCDONNELL, 0000
 *DAVID S. MCKENNA, 0000
 *JEFFREY D. MEDLAND, 0000
 GARY A. MELLICK, 0000
 *MATTHEW E. MITCHELL, 0000
 NICOLE N. MOORE, 0000
 ANDREW M. M. MORAN, 0000
 *KEITH H. MORITA, 0000
 *MICHAEL J. MOULTON, 0000
 *MARSHALL J. MURPHY, 0000
 *ROGER K. MUSE, 0000
 *RANDALL H. NEAL, 0000
 *RORY G. OWEN, 0000
 *RAFAEL A. PAGAN, 0000
 *ALLAN S. PARKE, 0000
 *JOHN K. PAUL III, 0000
 *WILLIAM B. PERRY, 0000
 *MICHAEL E. POTH, 0000
 JOHN B. REED, 0000
 *ROBERT V. REINHART, JR., 0000
 CRAIG R. RUDER, 0000
 TOD S. RUSSELL, 0000
 ROBERT A. SCHMITZ, 0000
 *ANNE H. SHOLES, 0000
 *MARIO A. SILVA, 0000
 BRETT D. SKIDMORE, 0000
 *ANDREW C. STEELE, 0000
 *KEVIN T. STEPHAN, 0000
 *KENTON E. STEPHENS, JR., 0000
 GARY N. STOKES, 0000
 ALAN B. STONE, 0000
 *RICHARD W. SUMRALL, 0000
 *RALPH M. SUTHERLIN, 0000
 *JANINE D. TAYLOR, 0000
 CHARLES S. TEDDER, 0000
 *GLENN L. TERRY, 0000
 *WILLIAM A. THOMAS, JR., 0000
 *JORGE TOBAR, 0000
 MARK Y. UYEHARA, 0000
 *JAMES P. VANDECAR, 0000
 *FRANCESCA VASTAFALLDORF, 0000
 *ELIZABETH A. WALTER, 0000
 *KEVIN T. WATKINS, 0000
 DANIEL C. WEAVER, 0000
 RANDON S. WELTON, 0000
 *LORNA A. WESTFALL, 0000
 *THOMAS C. WHITE, 0000
 *JAMES A. WIMSATT III, 0000
 *LOLO WONG, 0000
 JOHN M. YACCINO, 0000

To be major

KENT D. ABBOTT, 0000
 JAYE E. ADAMS, 0000
 BRIAN K. AGAN, 0000
 SENTHIL ALAGARSAMY, 0000
 PER K. AMUNDSON, 0000
 LOY LANE ANDERSON, 0000
 MARJORIE P. ANDERSON, 0000
 DINA M. ANDREOTTI, 0000
 CHARLES ARIZ, 0000
 MARK E. AUGSPURGER, 0000
 ANTHONY R. AVENTA, 0000
 JEFFREY M. BABUSCHAK, 0000
 WILLIAM R. BAEZ, 0000
 WAYNE B. BAREFIELD, 0000
 CHESTER P. BARTON III, 0000
 JANET L. BERENHOFF, 0000
 JOHN C. BENNETT, 0000
 VICTOR D. BENTINGANAN, JR., 0000
 JEFFREY M. BENZICK, 0000
 JONATHAN W. BERRY, 0000
 MICHAEL P. BERRY, 0000
 SEAN E. BEYER, 0000
 ARTHUR A. BLAIN, 0000
 DAVID E. BLOCKER, 0000
 TIMOTHY B. BONINE, 0000
 TIMOTHY D. BONNELL, 0000
 KENNETH J. BOOMGAARD, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER J. BORCHARDT, 0000
 STEVEN P. BOWERS, JR., 0000
 LINDA R. BOYD, 0000
 KIMBERLY R. BRADLEY, 0000
 JOHN L. BRIDGES, JR., 0000
 MATTHEW J. BROOK, 0000
 JOSEPH V. BROWNE, 0000
 KEVIN BRYAN, 0000
 ANGELA M. BULLOCK, 0000
 DANIEL F. BURIAN, 0000
 GEOFFREY M. BURNS, 0000
 DAVID S. BUSH, 0000
 TODD R. CALLISTER, 0000
 CHARLES L. CAMPBELL, 0000
 JOHN T. CAMPBELL II, 0000
 MARK E. CAMPBELL, 0000
 DAMARIS CANDELARIO SOTO, 0000
 CLAY D. CANNON, 0000
 MICHAEL K. CAO, 0000
 RENEE D. CARLSON, 0000
 JAYSON C. CARR, 0000
 JOHN S. CARRICK, 0000
 ALESIA C. CARRIZALES, 0000
 SCOTT C. CARRIZALES, 0000
 MATTHEW B. CARROLL, 0000
 JAMES A. CHAMBERS, 0000
 LI ING CHANG, 0000
 ARTEMIO C. CHAPA, 0000
 MOLINDA M. CHARTRAND, 0000
 THOMAS F. CHEATLE, 0000
 BETTY CHEN, 0000
 RAJA S. CHERUVU, 0000
 WILLIE T. CHI, 0000
 JOHN H. CHOE, 0000
 DIXON L. CHRISTIAN, 0000
 MARCUS CHRISTOPHER, 0000
 VALERIE J. CLEGG, 0000
 CATHERINE E. COGLEY, 0000
 ROBERT V. COLEMAN, 0000
 ROBERT T. COLLIER JR., 0000
 EVE A. CONNOLLY, 0000
 RACHEL S. CONRAD, 0000
 JUNE M. COOK, 0000
 LYNETTE CORBETT, 0000
 JOHN J. COTTON, 0000
 JACQUELINE COUNTRYMAN, 0000
 MITCHELL W. COX, 0000
 GLEN H. CRAWFORD, 0000
 JENNIFER L. CRUISE, 0000
 MARGARET A. CURRY, 0000
 STEVEN J. CYR, 0000
 SCOTT J. DARBYY, 0000
 JEFFREY T. DARDINGER, 0000
 PIERRE ALAIN L. DAUBY, 0000
 EDWIN P. DAVIS JR., 0000
 KEENAN M. DAVIS, 0000
 WILLIAM E. DECKER, 0000
 JOAN N. DIXON, 0000
 REYNOLD RODNEY MARK DLIMA, 0000
 JOHN LEO DOLAN III, 0000
 JAMES A. DOMBROWSKI, 0000
 TERRANCE E. DONNAL JR., 0000
 PETER G. DREWES, 0000
 CASEY E. DUNCAN, 0000
 DAVID T. DUNN, 0000
 JULES R. DUVAL, 0000
 NATHAN L. EASTMAN, 0000
 DAVID F. EDWARDS, 0000
 JOHN C. EGAN, 0000
 SONIA S. ELLISOR, 0000
 CHRISTINE R. ERDIHALAENA, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER A. ETTTRICH, 0000
 STACY N. EVANS, 0000
 ANTHONY T. EVERHART, 0000
 BLAIR W. FADEM, 0000
 ROBERT A. FAIZON, 0000
 STEVEN S. FARKAS, 0000
 SCOTT E. FAULKNER, 0000
 STEPHEN R. FEAGINS, 0000
 DONNA B. FICO, 0000
 DANIEL J. FLEMING, 0000
 NICOLE J. FLISS, 0000
 MICHAEL A. FORGIONE, 0000
 ROBERT A. FORINASH, 0000
 SUSAN M. FRANSEN, 0000
 TODD W. FRIEZE, 0000
 LORRAINE C. GALLAGHER, 0000
 MICHAEL L. GALLANTINE, 0000
 CATHY GANEY, 0000
 KATHLEEN A. GATES, 0000
 BRUCE E. GEARHART, 0000
 FLORIN C. GEORGESCU, 0000
 VINOD K. GHIVANDIAZ, 0000
 STEPHEN A. GILL, 0000
 TED F. GINGRICH JR., 0000
 HOWARD R. GIVENS, 0000
 SHERI L. GLADISH, 0000
 PAUL D. GLEASON II, 0000
 DAQOBERTO I. GONZALEZ JR., 0000
 HEIDI S. H. GOO, 0000
 RANDALL LANE GOODMAN, 0000
 STEVEN W. GORDON, 0000
 ROBERT A. GRAVES, 0000
 KERVIL J. GREEN, 0000
 PATRICK M. GROCAN, 0000
 JULIE A. GRONK, 0000
 DOUGLAS P. GUENTER, 0000
 ANTHONY J. GULDE, 0000
 SHERYL A. HAGGERTY, 0000
 JOHN C. HALL, 0000
 GREGG M. HALLBAUER, 0000
 SHANNON P. HANCOCK, 0000
 SHARON L. HARWELL, 0000
 THOMAS A. HAWKINS, 0000
 CRAIG L. HEINS, 0000
 MELINDA B. HENNE, 0000
 PATRICK E. HILL, 0000
 KHAI LINH V. HO, 0000
 NHUE ANH HO, 0000
 DOUGLAS G. HOFF, 0000
 FRANCIS T. HOLLAND, 0000
 GEORGE F. HOLMES, 0000
 DAVID T. HOLT, 0000
 YU H. HONG, 0000
 SANDRA GRAVES HOOKER, 0000
 BRADFORD T. HSU, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER L. HUGH, 0000
 DUNCAN G. HUGHES, 0000
 KATHRYN G. HUGHES, 0000
 JAMES E. HUIZENGA, 0000
 KARAR HUSAIN, 0000
 JAVED H. HUSSAIN, 0000
 KRISTEN J. INGLIS, 0000
 GRILL NOANA ISSAR, 0000

THOMAS A. JACOBSON, 0000
 JOHN F. JAMES, 0000
 RIMAS V. JANUSONIS, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER J. JAYNE, 0000
 DENISE A. JOHNSON, 0000
 GREGORY L. JOHNSON, 0000
 ROBERT G. JOHNSON, JR., 0000
 WILLIAM T. JOHNSTON, 0000
 DAVID M. JONES, 0000
 LADONNA R. JONES, 0000
 SAMUEL O. JONES IV, 0000
 SARAH S. JONES, 0000
 ROBERT F. KACPROWICZ, 0000
 WARREN R. KADRMAS, 0000
 LISA B. KAMERLING, 0000
 DONALD L. KANE, 0000
 JOHN CHOONGWHA KANG, 0000
 LEONID M. KATKOVSKY, 0000
 JULIE L. KELLEY, 0000
 PATRICK S. KELLEY, 0000
 GREGORY A. KENNEBECK, 0000
 JOHN P. KENNEDY, 0000
 ROBERT S. KENT, 0000
 CHETAN U. KHAROD, 0000
 JASMIN A. KILAYKO, 0000
 JOHN K. KIM, 0000
 STEVEN M. KINDSVATER, 0000
 DAVID L. KING, 0000
 JOSHUA A. KING, 0000
 MICHELLE L. KNIGHT, 0000
 RODNEY R. KNIGHT, 0000
 BRIAN R. KNOPF, 0000
 JAMES F. KNOWLES, 0000
 TODD T. KOBAYASHI, 0000
 PETER J. KOBES, 0000
 THOMAS D. KOHL, 0000
 DENNIS E. KOSELAK, 0000
 CHARLES J. KOVALCHICK, 0000
 MARK D. KRISKOVICH, 0000
 NATHAN P. KWON, 0000
 LIBBY A. LAKE, 0000
 DARI A. LANE, 0000
 DONALD J. LANE, 0000
 JANICE M. LANGER, 0000
 LAURA B. LANNING, 0000
 HENRY K.K. LAU, 0000
 DAVID P. LAUGHLIN, 0000
 LAWRENCE G. LAWTON, 0000
 MINH QUANG LE, 0000
 CARLA B. LEE, 0000
 ERNEST C. LEE, 0000
 ROY E. LEE, 0000
 MARK A. LEIBEL, 0000
 MARK A. LEPAGE, 0000
 JAMES G. LIENEN, 0000
 MICHAEL C. LILLY, 0000
 GREGG A. LINDSEY, 0000
 DAVID C. LINN, 0000
 DIANE M. LOVELL, 0000
 RODOLFO M. LOZANO, 0000
 GERALD D. LUCIANI, 0000
 PATRICK J. MAIRAH, 0000
 JOHN P. MARSHALL, 0000
 JOHN B. MARTINIE, 0000
 WALTER M. MATTHEWS, 0000
 JOHN D. MCARTHUR, 0000
 RICHARD A. MCCLURE, 0000
 MARK E. MCDANIEL, 0000
 LESLIE G. MCDONALD, 0000
 DAVID P. MCNABNEY, 0000
 JEFFREY D. MCNEIL, 0000
 CHARLES M. MCRAINEY, 0000
 MONICA A. MEDYNSKI, 0000
 EVAN R. MEEKS, 0000
 PAUL J. MEGEHEE, 0000
 DEVI L. MERCHANT, 0000
 CATHERINE A. METTIVIER, 0000
 LANE M. MEYER, 0000
 JULIE M. MILLER, 0000
 MICHAEL L. MILLER, 0000
 JOHN W. B. MILLSPAUGH, 0000
 DANIEL I. MIRSKI, 0000
 TERENCE B. MITCHELL, 0000
 JON M. MOORE, 0000
 TERRALL N. MOORE, 0000
 MARILYN J. MORA, 0000
 SCOTT F. MORRISON, 0000
 ANDREW T. MUELLER, 0000
 ENEVA H. MULAGHA, 0000
 DAVID W. MUNITZ, 0000
 CABOT S. MURDOCK, 0000
 JEFFREY G. NALESNIK, 0000
 SALLY W. NALESNIK, 0000
 RAMANN NALLAMALA, 0000
 JUSTIN B. NAST, 0000
 DOUGLAS A. NELSON, 0000
 ERIC W. NELSON, 0000
 STEPHEN L. NELSON, JR., 0000
 THOMAS C. NEWTON, 0000
 WILFREDO J. NIEVES, 0000
 TOMMY S. NOGGLE, 0000
 DAVID P. OHMSTEDTE, 0000
 NEIL M. OLSEN, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER E. OLSON, 0000
 DONALD T. OSBORN, 0000
 JEANNE P. OSBORN, 0000
 BENJAMIN W. OSBORNE, 0000
 JOSEPH A. OUMA, 0000
 PAMELA A. OVERMYER, 0000
 RAJESH S. PADMANABHAN, 0000
 JOE A. PASTRANO, 0000
 ROBERT G. PATTERSON, 0000
 ROBYN T. K. PATTON, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER P. PAULSON, 0000
 GREG M. PAVICH, 0000
 BARAK PERAHIA, 0000
 STEVEN D. PERRY, 0000

ANN JERRY PETERS, 0000
 KENNY J. PETERSON, 0000
 LINDA K. PETERSON, 0000
 ALLAN S. PHILP, JR., 0000
 KIMBERLY D. PIETSZAK, 0000
 RAUL A. PINON, JR., 0000
 AMIR PIROUZIAN, 0000
 TAMARA T. PISTORIA, 0000
 JOSEPH A. POCREVA, 0000
 LAURA E. POLITO, 0000
 BRIAN N. PORTER, 0000
 JOSEPH P. PUENTE, 0000
 TIMOTHY F. RAGSDALE, 0000
 KARIN E. RAINEY, 0000
 DANIEL S. RASKIND, 0000
 MANOJ RAVI, 0000
 DAVID J. RAWSON, 0000
 TODD R. REULBACH, 0000
 ANDREW J. REYNOLDS, 0000
 KAREN C. RICHARDS, 0000
 RANDY R. RICHARDSON, 0000
 ADRIANNE M. RIDLEY, 0000
 MARK R. ROBBINS, 0000
 STACEY J. ROBINSON, 0000
 JOY A. N. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
 RAYMOND M. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
 DAVID M. ROGERS, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER S. ROHDE, 0000
 MARK ROSENBERG, 0000
 ERICK M. SANTOS, 0000
 BRIAN S. SARACINO, 0000
 ROBERT J. SCHIMMEL, 0000
 KEITH E. SCHLECHTE, 0000
 JAMES M. SCHMITT, 0000
 ALBERT B. SCHRANER, 0000
 CHRISTIE L. SCHROLL, 0000
 GREGORY L. SCHUMACHER, 0000
 DAREN A. SCROGGIE, 0000
 FRED G. SEALE IV, 0000
 NEIL E. SEETHALER, 0000
 PETER H. SEIDENBERG, 0000
 JO A. SHARMA, 0000
 DONALD SHEETS, JR., 0000
 JESSE C. SHICK, 0000
 TRACY C. SHUMAN, 0000
 KYLE E. SIMMERS, 0000
 SCOTT A. SIMMS, 0000
 PETER T. SIPOS, 0000
 MARCA A. SISK, 0000
 JAMES A. SKROCKI, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER L. SLACK, 0000
 NANCY J. SMILEY, 0000
 DARRELL S. SMITH, 0000
 JAMES P. SMITH, 0000
 JOHN T. SMITH, 0000
 MICHAEL J. SMITH, 0000
 PAMELA D. SMITH, 0000
 BRANDON T. SNOOK, 0000
 BRENT A. SONDAY, 0000
 JAMES E. SPILCHAL, 0000
 MARIA L. STAMP, 0000
 COREY M. STANLEY, 0000
 ERIC S. STANSEY, 0000
 STACIE LYNN STAPLETON, 0000
 GREGORY E. STEPICKY, 0000
 JOHN B. STETSON, 0000
 STEVEN W. STETSON, 0000
 MICHAEL J. STONER, 0000
 SEAN S. STOUT, 0000
 DAVID L. STRUBLE, 0000
 SREEKUMAR SUBRAMANIAN, 0000
 KRISTIN M. SUFKA, 0000
 ROBERT T. SULLIVAN, 0000
 PARISA A. SUTHUN, 0000
 SUSAN M. SWAYNE, 0000
 EFFREY C. SWEENEY, 0000
 GREGORY B. SWEITZER, 0000
 MICHAEL A. TALL, 0000
 BRYAN E. TALLENT, 0000
 LOWELL O. TAN, 0000
 NATHAN L. TAYLOR, 0000
 STEVEN B. TAYLOR, 0000
 PETER J. TERRY, 0000
 ROBERT E. THAXTON, 0000
 ABRAHAM K. THOMAS, 0000
 JOHN W. THOMAS, 0000
 NICOLE M. THOMAS, 0000
 KATHLEEN L. TODD, 0000
 JOHN M. TOKISH, 0000
 MICHAEL F. TREXLER, 0000
 ERIC J. TRUEBLOOD, 0000
 ALICIA L. TSCHIRHART, 0000
 DANIEL R. TUCKEY, 0000
 GARY T. UNDERHILL, 0000
 RICHARD A. VANDERWEELE, 0000
 JAMES E. VANGILDEWEE IV, 0000
 RAMON E. VARGAS, 0000
 JANET L. VEESART, 0000
 JOANNE RUTH VOGEL, 0000
 JOHN L. VOGH, 0000
 STEPHEN J. VREEKE, 0000
 JOHN K. WALTON, 0000
 CRAIG A. WARDELL, 0000
 DANIEL J. WATTENDORF, 0000
 DESIREE M. WEBB, 0000
 MICHAEL D. WEBB, 0000
 KATHLEEN A. WEBER, 0000
 KATHRYN A. WEESNER, 0000
 MICHAEL J. WELSH, 0000
 MARK K. WIDSTROM, 0000
 LEE D. WILLIAMS, 0000
 ALAN L. WILLIAMS, 0000
 JONATHAN W. WILLIAMS, 0000
 PAMELA M. WILLIAMS, 0000
 JOHN E. WILLIAMSON, 0000
 ALAN P. WIMMER, 0000
 WILLIAM E. WINTER III, 0000

CHARLES P. WOOD, 0000
 DAVID A. WOOD, 0000
 DEBORAH S. WOODARD, 0000
 BRUCE A. WOODFORD, 0000
 DONALD R. WOOLEVER, 0000
 BENJAMIN D. WRIGHT, 0000
 FRANK K. YOUNG, 0000
 JEFFREY M. YOUNG, 0000
 MICHAEL R. YOUNKER, 0000
 MARK A. YUSPA, 0000
 RODOLFO H. ZARAGOZA, 0000
 SHAWN P. ZARR, 0000
 SOLOMON F. ZEWDU, 0000
 RYAN J. ZUCKER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK(*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 512:

To be Lieutenant Colonel

FREDERICK H. ABBOTT III, 0000
 THOMAS G. ABBOTT, 0000
 JOHN T. ACKERMAN, 0000
 TIMOTHY A. ADAM, 0000
 BRYAN C. ADAMS, 0000
 LINDA M. ADAMS, 0000
 MARCELLA F. ADAMS, 0000
 KATHERINE A. ADAMSON, 0000
 EDWARD J. ADELMAN, 0000
 MERRILL E. ADKISON, 0000
 MARK A. AICHER, 0000
 JAMES J. ALBRECHT, 0000
 CHERYL D. ALLEN, 0000
 MICHAEL J. ALLSHOUSE, 0000
 JUAN ALVAREZ, 0000
 BRIAN D. AMOS, 0000
 KENNETH E. ANDERSEN, 0000
 BRIAN K. ANDERSON, 0000
 DOUGLAS P. ANDERSON, 0000
 RICHARD D. ANDERSON, 0000
 STANLEY ANDRAY, 0000
 EMILY B. ANDREW, 0000
 CAROL ANN BARCLAY ANDREWS, 0000
 WESLEY R. ANDRES, 0000
 JOHN J. ANDUAGAARIAS, 0000
 DAVID W. ANGLE, 0000
 JOHANN J. ANTLEFINGER, 0000
 TIMOTHY G. APPL, 0000
 MELISSA J. APPEGATE, 0000
 ANDREW L. ARACE, 0000
 LORENZO C. ARACHE, 0000
 STUART K. ARCHER, 0000
 GARY A. ARDES, 0000
 MARK R. ARLINGHAUS, 0000
 CHARLES P. ARMENTROUT, 0000
 DENNIS M. ARMSTRONG, 0000
 TERRY W. ARMSTRONG, 0000
 DEAN M. ARNDORFER, 0000
 MARILYN A. ARNOLD, 0000
 MATTHEW J. ARTH, 0000
 BLAINE A. ASATO, 0000
 DUSTIN G. ASHTON, 0000
 WILLIAM J. ASTORE, 0000
 JANET C. AUGUSTINE, 0000
 TIMOTHY A. AVEY, 0000
 PETER D. AXELSON, 0000
 JAMES B. AYERS, 0000
 THOMAS P. AZAR, 0000
 STEVEN L. BABCOCK, 0000
 BRIAN J. BABIN, 0000
 AMY K. BACHELOR, 0000
 STEVEN E. BACHMANN, 0000
 BERNARD BADAMI, 0000
 ROBERT S. BAERST, 0000
 BRENT G. BAILEY, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER J. BAIN, 0000
 ANDREW B. BAKER, 0000
 JAMES H. BAKER, 0000
 LONNY P. BAKER, 0000
 SCOTT A. BAKER, 0000
 ROBERT E. BAMBERG, 0000
 JON P. BANKS, 0000
 RONALD L. BANNER, 0000
 ARTHUR M. BANNER III, 0000
 RENEE A. BARALLINMAN, 0000
 DONALD J. BARNES, 0000
 MICHAEL J. BARNES, 0000
 SHAWN J. BARNES, 0000
 ALAN BARTHOLOMEW, 0000
 MATTHEW R. BARTLETT, 0000
 STEVEN L. BASHAM, 0000
 ROGER W. BASL, 0000
 JEFFERY S. BATEMAN, 0000
 LAWRENCE J. BATES, 0000
 ERIC J. BATWAY, 0000
 KAREN M. BAUGH, 0000
 CHARLES R. BAUMGARDNER, 0000
 JAY A. BAUMGARTNER, 0000
 JAMES R. BAXTER, 0000
 KERRY L. BEAGHAN, 0000
 DEBRA F. BEAN, 0000
 DEBORAH S. BEATTY, 0000
 PHILLIP J. BEAUDOIN, 0000
 DIANE L. BECK, 0000
 NIKOLAUS W. BEHNER, 0000
 ARTHUR T. BEISNER II, 0000
 DAVID L. BELL, 0000
 KEVIN T. BELL, 0000
 BRIAN C. BELLAICCO, 0000
 ROBERT P. BENDER, JR., 0000
 DAVID M. BENNETT, JR., 0000
 JANET BENT, 0000
 SCOTT D. BERGER, 0000
 RODNEY K. BERK, 0000
 CRAIG A. BERLETTE, 0000

TIMOTHY P. BERRY, 0000
 GREGORY D. BEST, 0000
 MICHAEL R. BEST, 0000
 TOM J. BIANCO, 0000
 MARK D. BIBLER, 0000
 GREGORY W. BICE, 0000
 CHARLES S. BIEVER, 0000
 MICHAEL A. BIEWEND, 0000
 JEFFREY B. BIGELOW, 0000
 NEIL R. BILLINGS, 0000
 RICHARD S. BINGER, 0000
 MATTHEW W. BIRCH, 0000
 DAVID P. BIROS, 0000
 TIMOTHY C. BISCHOFF, 0000
 JOHN W. BLACK, 0000
 MICHAEL B. BLACK, 0000
 BRENDA J. BLACKMAN, 0000
 JODY L. BLANCHFIELD, 0000
 CLIFTON D. BLANKS, 0000
 LAWRENCE K. BLAVOS, 0000
 BRIAN A. BLAZICKO, 0000
 STEPHEN M. BLIZZARD, 0000
 PETER G. BLOCK, 0000
 MARK A. BLUME, 0000
 JOHN D. BOBBITT, 0000
 LEE W. BODENHAUSEN, 0000
 JOSEPH BOLTERSDORF, 0000
 CRAIG A. BOND, 0000
 MARK D. BONTRAGER, 0000
 STEPHEN R. BOOTH, 0000
 LYNN L. BORLAND, 0000
 DAVID E. BOSSERT, 0000
 KATHLEEN E. BOWMAN, 0000
 TODD A. BOYD, 0000
 VICKI M. BOYD, 0000
 CHARLES R. BRACKENHOFF, 0000
 ALAN E. BRADY, 0000
 STEPHAN P. BRADY, 0000
 JAMES R. BRANDT, 0000
 WALTER BRECEVIC, 0000
 JEAN J. BRENNAN, 0000
 SETH P. BRETSCHER, 0000
 MICHAEL T. BREWER, 0000
 PETER G. BREWER, 0000
 MICHAEL P. BRIGNOLA, 0000
 RODNEY K. BRITTENHAM, 0000
 JEFFREY A. BROCK, 0000
 BRAD T. BROEMMEL, 0000
 LEONARD L. BROSEKER, 0000
 TODD M. BROSZ, 0000
 CHARLES P. BROTHERS, JR., 0000
 GARY D. BROWN, 0000
 GERALD Q. BROWN, 0000
 GLENN E. BROWN, 0000
 MICHAEL A. BROWN, 0000
 ROBERT B. BROWN, 0000
 MARK ANTHONY BROWN, 0000
 THOMAS J. BROWNING, 0000
 TINA M. BROYLES, 0000
 KAREN L. BRUCE, 0000
 ROBERT A. BRUCE, 0000
 JOSEPH R. BRYAN, 0000
 EMILY ANN BUCKMAN, 0000
 WILLIAM J. BUECHEL, 0000
 BRIAN D. BUELL, 0000
 JOHN M. BUKOWINSKI, 0000
 DOUGLAS L. BULLOCK, 0000
 HEIDI H. BULLOCK, 0000
 KENT T. BURKHARDT, 0000
 ANGELA C. BURNS, 0000
 DOUGLAS H. BURNS, 0000
 KELLY D. BURNS, 0000
 LESLIE C. BURNS, 0000
 LINDA F. W. BUSCH, 0000
 THOMAS A. BUSSIÈRE, 0000
 MICHAEL G. BUTEL, 0000
 MITCHEL H. BUTIKOFER, 0000
 LAWRENCE M. BUTKUS, 0000
 DEBORAH C. BUTLER, 0000
 ROBERT J. BUTLER, 0000
 STEPHEN D. BUTLER, 0000
 ANTHONY M. BUTTIS, 0000
 ANDREW L. BUTTS, 0000
 FORREST F. BUTTS III, 0000
 BRADLEY G. BUTZ, 0000
 THOMAS A. BYRGE, JR., 0000
 WILLIAM F. CAIN, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL G. CALDWELL, 0000
 KEVIN P. CALLAHAN, 0000
 KATHERINE M. CALLIES, 0000
 PETER P. CAMIT, 0000
 GORDON S. CAMPBELL, 0000
 MICHAEL A. CANNA, 0000
 JAMES V. CANNIZZO, 0000
 PATRICIA A. CAPLE, 0000
 CHARLES G. CAPPS, 0000
 RENEE M. CAREY, 0000
 SEAN K. CAREY, 0000
 KENNETH D. CARLSON, 0000
 LAURIE R. CARPENTIER, 0000
 DENNIS L. CARL, 0000
 MICHAEL J. CARR, 0000
 DAVID J. CARRELL, 0000
 MICHAEL W. CARRELL, 0000
 JEFFREY A. CARROthers, 0000
 BRENT CARTAGENA, 0000
 CURTIS R. CARTER, 0000
 JOHN F. CARTER, 0000
 PAUL L. CARTER III, 0000
 GREGORY WARREN CARTER, 0000
 TED E. CARTER, JR., 0000
 RICKY W. CARVER, 0000
 LYLE W. CARVY, 0000
 LOUIS A. CASALE, 0000
 BRIAN K. CASSIDAY, 0000
 GERARD A. CASTELLI, 0000
 DAVID A. CASTILLO, 0000

EDGAR S. CASTOR, 0000
 JOSEPH E. CASTRO, 0000
 CHARLES E. CATOE, 0000
 FRANK M. CAVUOTI, 0000
 SYLVIA E. CAYETANO, 0000
 BILLY P. CECIL II, 0000
 JACK J. CELIE, 0000
 JUANITA M. CELIE, 0000
 ANTHONY J. CERVENY, JR., 0000
 DAVID B. CHANDLER, 0000
 JOHN T. CHANDLER, 0000
 STEVEN R. CHARBONNEAU, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER W. CHARLES, 0000
 JACQUELINE N. CHARSAGUA, 0000
 JOHN E. CHERRY, 0000
 GARY D. CHESLEY, 0000
 PHILIP C. CHEVALLARD, 0000
 MICHAEL L. CHING, 0000
 DALE R. CHRISTENSEN, 0000
 DELBERT G. CHRISTMAN, 0000
 ALLAN J. CHROMY, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER M. CICERE, 0000
 ROBERT D. CLAMPITT, 0000
 CECIL J. CLARK, JR., 0000
 DOUGLAS L. CLARK, 0000
 JOHN B. CLARKE, 0000
 MAX A. CLAYTON, JR., 0000
 ROBERT M. CLEARY, 0000
 CHEVALIER P. CLEAVES, 0000
 MARK L. CLIFFORD, 0000
 PATRICIA R. CLOUD, 0000
 JAY S. CLOUTIER, 0000
 STEVEN A. COFFIN, 0000
 KERRI A. COLE, 0000
 KEVIN J. COLE, 0000
 RONALD A. COLEMAN, 0000
 CARY A. COLLINS, 0000
 DALE K. COLTER, 0000
 RONALD C. COMEAU, 0000
 JAMES L. COMFORT, 0000
 DONALD J. COMI, 0000
 PAUL M. COMMEAU, 0000
 THOMAS W. CONNELLY, 0000
 KIMERLEE L. CONNER, 0000
 MICHAEL P. CONNOLLY, 0000
 WILLIAM D. CONNORS, 0000
 JULIE A. CONSTABLE, 0000
 CREIGHTON W. COOK, JR., 0000
 JAMES L. COOK, 0000
 WILLIAM S. COOKE, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER M. COOMBS, 0000
 DAVID B. COOMER, 0000
 MARK A. COOTER, 0000
 SHAUN P. COPELAN, 0000
 CRAIG R. COREY, 0000
 DONALD M. CORLEY, 0000
 RICKY J. CORNELIO, 0000
 JEFFREY S. CORNELL, 0000
 JAY A. COSSENTINE, 0000
 JOHN A. COTE, 0000
 TIMOTHY J. COTHREL, 0000
 ANTHONY J. COTTON, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER D. COTTS, 0000
 JAMES D. COUCH, 0000
 JOHN P. COULTER, 0000
 MAUREEN J. COUNTER, 0000
 PETER J. COURTNEY, 0000
 LAWRENCE J. COX, 0000
 SAMUEL E. COX, 0000
 DOUGLAS M. CRABB, 0000
 BRIAN J. CRAMER, 0000
 ROBERT P. CRANAGE, 0000
 ROBERT J. CRAVEN, 0000
 DAN S. CRAWFORD, 0000
 GEORGE R. CROUSE, 0000
 JAMES W. CROWHURST, 0000
 JOHN S. CROWN, 0000
 ROBERT L. CUMMINGS, JR., 0000
 ANN CUNNINGHAM, 0000
 HAROLD J. CUNNINGHAM, JR., 0000
 BRETT M. CUPP, 0000
 THOMAS F. CURRAN, JR., 0000
 TOM P. CURRIE, JR., 0000
 ANDRE K. CURRY, 0000
 DANNY R. CURTIS, 0000
 ROBERT L. CURTIS, 0000
 JAMES R. CVANCARA, 0000
 MARGARET J. CZAPIEWSKI, 0000
 THERESA A. DALYHANGER, 0000
 JAMES C. DAMOUR, 0000
 DARREN R. DANIELS, 0000
 WILLIAM B. DANSKINE, 0000
 ROBERT G. DANTONIO, 0000
 JOHN L. DARGAN, 0000
 KEITH A. DARLINGTON, 0000
 DANN D. DAVIS, 0000
 DANNY L. DAVIS, 0000
 DIANNE C. DAVIS, 0000
 HOWARD C. DAVIS, 0000
 GEORGE E. DAY, JR., 0000
 DANIEL R. DEBREE, 0000
 ANTHONY K. DECKARD, 0000
 JOHN C. DEEMS, 0000
 BUDDY E. DEES, JR., 0000
 PATRICIA W. J. DEES, 0000
 DOUGLAS W. DEHART, 0000
 WILLIAM P. DELANEY, 0000
 CORDELL A. DELAPENA, JR., 0000
 JOSEPH M. DELGRANDE, 0000
 SEBASTIANO DELISIO, 0000
 JANET M. DELTUVA, 0000
 MARK E. DELUCA, 0000
 RICHARD C. DEMARS, 0000
 WILLIAM C. DEMASO, 0000
 STEPHEN R. DEMERS, 0000
 DANIEL L. DEMOTT, 0000
 MICHAEL H. DEMOULLY, 0000

DONALD T. R. DERRY, 0000
 MARIO V. DESANTIS, 0000
 BRUCE T. DESAUTELS, 0000
 VIRGINIA B. DESIMONE, 0000
 JOHN A. DEWITT II, 0000
 MARK E. DEYSHER, 0000
 NANCY A. DEZELL, 0000
 JOSEPH E. DIANA, 0000
 MILTON E. DIAZ, 0000
 MARC DICOCO, 0000
 THERESA L. DIFATO, 0000
 STEPHEN A. DIFONZO, 0000
 KATHRYN A. DILLOW, 0000
 GREGORY E. DITZLER, 0000
 LAURENCE A. DOBROT, 0000
 KRISTEN J. DOLAN, 0000
 RAMONA L. DOLSON, 0000
 TIMOTHY M. DOMEK, 0000
 THOMAS J. DONALDS, 0000
 EDWIN F. DONALDSON III, 0000
 STEVEN G. DONATUCCI, 0000
 DAVID L. DONLEY, JR., 0000
 BRIAN P. DONNELLY, 0000
 STEVE DONOVAN, 0000
 ROBERT C. DOOLEY, 0000
 RODERICK E. DORSEY, JR., 0000
 MARK E. DOTSON, 0000
 DEBRA L. DOTY, 0000
 DEBRA J. DOUCETTE, 0000
 JOSEPH T. DOUGHERTY, 0000
 CLIFTON DOUGLAS, JR., 0000
 DWAYNE E. DOVER, 0000
 JACK R. DOWNEY, 0000
 BRIAN J. DUDDY, 0000
 GEOFFREY V. DUDLEY, 0000
 ALFRED U. DUENAS, 0000
 RALPH W. DUESTERHOEFT, 0000
 VALENTINE J. DUGIE, 0000
 ROBERT J. DUKAT, 0000
 ANTHONY D. DUNBAR, 0000
 CHARLES A. DUNN II, 0000
 RICHARD DUNN, 0000
 SCOTT L. DUNN, 0000
 JOHN H. DYCK, 0000
 STEVEN C. DYE, 0000
 DAVID J. DZARAN, 0000
 GARY J. DZUBILO, 0000
 CHARLES W. EASTMAN, 0000
 LINDA LEE EATON, 0000
 TROY A. EDGELL, 0000
 JON D. EDWARDS, 0000
 KENNETH A. EDWARDS, 0000
 MARTIN L. EDWARDS, 0000
 ROBERT P. EGAN, 0000
 DANIEL L. EICKMEIER, 0000
 DARREN J. ELDRIDGE, 0000
 MICHAEL G. ELLIOTT, 0000
 STEPHEN M. ELLIOTT, 0000
 DAVID F. ELLIS, 0000
 LAURENCE E. ELLIS, 0000
 LEON E. ELSARELLI, 0000
 GEORGE A. EMILIO, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER T. EMMERT, 0000
 BRUCE A. ENSOR, 0000
 SCOTT B. ERICKSON, 0000
 SCOTT J. ERICKSON, 0000
 ELVIRA R. ESPINOZA, 0000
 TERESA L. ETHEN, 0000
 JOYCE A. EVANS, 0000
 MYRA L. EVANS-MANYWEATHER, 0000
 ROYCE E. EVES, 0000
 MARK S. EWART, 0000
 JAMES A. FABER, 0000
 KAROLEN KAY FAHRNI, 0000
 ELLIOT T. FAIR II, 0000
 JAMES E. FAIRCHILD, 0000
 MARK R. FAIRCHILD, 0000
 MARK B. FALKE, 0000
 MICHAEL A. FANTINI, 0000
 JEFFREY L. FANTO, 0000
 JOHN H. FARELL, 0000
 RAYMOND E. FARELL, JR., 0000
 BRIDGET I. FATH, 0000
 FRANCIS J. FAUPEL, 0000
 SUZANNE F. FELD, 0000
 THOMAS J. FELDHAUSEN, 0000
 ROLAND D. FENTON, JR., 0000
 GLENN A. FERGUSON, 0000
 TIMOTHY G. FERNER, 0000
 SYLVIA E.D. FERRY, 0000
 SUZANNE FILION, 0000
 EDWARD M. FINCKE, 0000
 TIMOTHY J. FINNEGAN, 0000
 GREG A. FINNEY, 0000
 MARK E. FISCHER, 0000
 SCOTT A. FISCHER, 0000
 RICHARD N. FISH, 0000
 CAROL A. FISHER, 0000
 SUSAN D. FISK, 0000
 ANNE F. FITCH, 0000
 THOMAS A. FITCH, 0000
 JAY S. FITZGERLD, 0000
 KEVIN J. FLEMING, 0000
 MICHAEL J. FLERI, 0000
 GARY D. FLINCHBAUGH, 0000
 PHILIP J. FLUHR, 0000
 CHARLES P. FLYNN, 0000
 ROGER B. FOGLEMAN, 0000
 JAMES M. FOLEY, 0000
 SAMMY J. FONG, 0000
 TERRIE D. FORD, 0000
 LESLIE A. FORMOLO, 0000
 JOHN D. FORZATO, 0000
 LYNNE A. FOSS, 0000
 DAVID I. FOSTER, 0000
 MICHAEL W. FOSTER, 0000
 KEVIN L. FOX, 0000

GABRIEL S. FRANCO, 0000
 ANTHONY R. FREDERICK, 0000
 DAVID EUGENE FREEMAN, 0000
 THOMAS A. FRANK FREESE, 0000
 KEVIN R. FRISBIE, 0000
 DAVID B. FRYE, 0000
 ALGENE FRYER, 0000
 KEVIN G. GABOS, 0000
 STEPHEN O. GAINES II, 0000
 SHERRI S. GALANTE, 0000
 PHILLIP GALES, 0000
 FRANK P. GALLAGHER, 0000
 TODD A. GANGER, 0000
 JOHN W. GARDNER, 0000
 INGE GEDO, 0000
 CEDRIC D. GEORGE, 0000
 PETER E. GERSTEN, 0000
 RICHARD B. GERTZ, 0000
 JEFFREY I. GETTLE, 0000
 BRUCE E. GIESIGE, 0000
 JOHN E. GILMOUR, 0000
 MARTIN T. GIMBUS, 0000
 RICHARD T. GINDHART, JR., 0000
 JEFFREY L. GINGRAS, 0000
 DOUGLAS S. GLEISSNER, 0000
 JOHN R. GLOCK, 0000
 DERRILL T. GOLDIZEN, 0000
 GARY P. GOLDSTONE, 0000
 MELISSA K. GONZALEZ, 0000
 RICHARD A. GONZALUDO, 0000
 MARK W. GOOCH, 0000
 DAVID M. GOODE III, 0000
 CARL C. GOODISON, 0000
 PAULA J. GOODMAN, 0000
 MICHAEL S. GOODWIN, 0000
 REID M. GOODWYN, 0000
 SCOTT R. GORDON, 0000
 MICHAEL A. GOYETTE, 0000
 JOHN K. GRAHAM, 0000
 CARL S. GRAMLICK, 0000
 JAMES F. GRANT, JR., 0000
 MARTIN E. GRANUM, 0000
 PATRICIA A. GRAVELLE, 0000
 TIMOTHY G. GRAVELLE, 0000
 LAWRENCE C. GRAY II, 0000
 RUTH E. GRAYSON, 0000
 GARRY M. GREEN, 0000
 ROBERT T. GREEN, 0000
 SCOTT B. GREENE, 0000
 STEVEN K. GREGORCYK, 0000
 CYNTHIA J. GREY, 0000
 JOSEPH N. GRIFFIN, 0000
 PAUL A. GRIFFITH, JR., 0000
 MATTHEW P. GROOVER, 0000
 MAURICE G. GROSSO, 0000
 TRACI D. GUARINIELLO, 0000
 PAUL H. GUEMMER, 0000
 THOMAS A. GUINN, 0000
 JAMES C. GUNN, 0000
 ERIC G. GUNZELMAN, 0000
 JEFFREY H. GUSTAFSON, 0000
 MICHAEL E. GUY, 0000
 RYAN K. HAALAND, 0000
 RENEE M. HAAS, 0000
 RICHARD S. HAAS, 0000
 ROBERT D. HACKETT III, 0000
 WADE E. HADER, 0000
 LANCE C. HAFELI, 0000
 JOHN W. HAGEN, 0000
 DANIEL E. HAGMAIER, 0000
 DAVID G. HAGSTROM, 0000
 KATHERINE M. HAHN, 0000
 TAMMY M. HAIGHT, 0000
 CRAIG W. HALL, 0000
 JAMES R. HALL, 0000
 KURT D. HALL, 0000
 MARK C. HALLISEY, 0000
 JAMES R. HAM, 0000
 PAUL J. HAMACHER, 0000
 JAMES D. HAMILTON, 0000
 STEPHEN F. HAMILTON, 0000
 JACQUELINE S. HAMLIN, 0000
 JAMES E. HAMMETT, JR., 0000
 RICHARD A. HANDY, 0000
 WILLIAM S. HANDY, 0000
 RONALD B. HANKES, 0000
 GREGORY M. HANNOON, 0000
 GARY R. HANSON, 0000
 CHARLENE J. HARDING, 0000
 PAUL R. HARDY, 0000
 CHARLES M. HARMON, 0000
 STEVEN M. HARMON, 0000
 DANE E. HARREL, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER A. HARRINGTON, 0000
 JERRY S.G. HARRINGTON, 0000
 KEITH D. HARRIS, 0000
 KEVEN E. HARSHBARGER, 0000
 MARK E. HARTER, 0000
 QUINTIN H. HARTT, JR., 0000
 JAMES F. HARVELL, 0000
 JOSEPH M. HASTINGS, 0000
 BERLAIN HATFIELD, JR., 0000
 STEPHEN C. HATLEY, 0000
 DARYL J. HAUCK, 0000
 ROBERT D. HAUGHIAN, 0000
 JEFFREY A. HAUSMANN, 0000
 DAVID P. HAWKINS, 0000
 MARK J. HAWLEY, 0000
 MONIA L. HAYES, 0000
 JANET A. HAYHURST, 0000
 JEFFREY A. HAYS, 0000
 MICHAEL T. HEALY, 0000
 FRANKLIN P. HEATH, JR., 0000
 JAMES B. HECKER, 0000
 RICHARD L. HEDGPETH, 0000
 VICTOR L. HEDGPETH, 0000
 *SHARON M. HEFFNER, 0000

BRIAN K. HEFLIN, 0000
 STEPHEN L. HEFLIN, 0000
 JANET C. HEGARTY, 0000
 FRANK R. HEINSOHN, 0000
 DONNA C. HEINZ, 0000
 JOSEPH S. HEIRIGS, 0000
 GARLAND S. HENDERSON, 0000
 GORDON B. HENDRICKSON, 0000
 MICHAEL D. HENNESSY, 0000
 JOHN M. HENNIGAN, 0000
 STEPHEN E. HENNING, 0000
 CURTIS E. HENRY, 0000
 RICHARD I. HERMANSEN, 0000
 MICHAEL D. HERNDON, 0000
 CLIFTON G. HERTEL, 0000
 KENNETH P. HESSON, 0000
 GORDON S. HETHERINGTON, 0000
 JOHN R. HICKMAN, 0000
 WILLIAM S. HICKMAN, 0000
 DANIEL K. HICKS, 0000
 KERRY D. HICKS, 0000
 PATRICK C. HIGBY, 0000
 JOHN F. HILBING, 0000
 STEPHEN C. HILL, 0000
 SCOTT WILLIAM HILL, 0000
 JAMES B. HILLER, 0000
 HAROLD D. HINCKS, 0000
 LAWRENCE W. HINKIN, 0000
 ELLWOOD P. HINMAN IV, 0000
 JAMES A. HIRD, 0000
 YVETTE P. HIRD, 0000
 DAVID A. HLATKY, 0000
 MARK A. HOBSON, 0000
 GENE L. HODGE, 0000
 WILLIAM R. HODGKISS, 0000
 GREG J. HOFFMAN, 0000
 LINDA K. HOGAN, 0000
 DOROTHY A. HOGG, 0000
 SUSAN M. HOGG, 0000
 KARLAN B. HOGGAN, 0000
 RICHARD L. HOLBROOK, 0000
 ALAN R. HOLCK, 0000
 RODNEY L. HOLDER, 0000
 TAMARA S. HOLDER, 0000
 BLAINE D. HOLT, 0000
 CHRISTIAN D. HONKANEN, 0000
 ROBERT G. HONTZ, 0000
 LYSA P. HOPSON, 0000
 MARK D. HORN, 0000
 MICHAEL J. HORNITSCHEK, 0000
 MICHAEL R. HORST, JR., 0000
 KIRK G. HORTON, 0000
 GLENN R. HOVER, 0000
 DOUGLAS C. HOWARD, JR., 0000
 ROBERT S. HOWARD, 0000
 JOHN T. HRUBY, 0000
 CAROL L. HUBBARD, 0000
 LLOYD F. HUBBARD, 0000
 ROBERT B. HUBER, 0000
 SAMUEL HUDSPATH, 0000
 JOHN D. HUFFSTUTTER, 0000
 MONTGOMERY C. HUGHSON, 0000
 DONALD L. HUGULEY, JR., 0000
 DALE R. HUHMANN, 0000
 ERIC N. HUMMER, 0000
 DAVID A. HUNI, 0000
 BRIAN E. HUNT, 0000
 RONALD L. HUNTLEY, 0000
 JEFFREY L. HUPY, 0000
 RICHARD D. HURLEY, 0000
 JOHN W. HURSEY, 0000
 MARK L. HUSON, 0000
 DIRK M. HUTCHISON, 0000
 TIMOTHY D. HUTCHISON, 0000
 ROBERT D. HYDE, 0000
 WINTHROP C. IDLE, 0000
 BRETT L. INDERMILL, 0000
 GERARDO INUMERABLE, JR., 0000
 SUSAN L. IRONS, 0000
 PAUL E. IRWIN JR., 0000
 WILLIAM P. ISLER JR., 0000
 DAWN G. JACKSON, 0000
 JEFFREY A. JACKSON, 0000
 BRETT L. JAMES, 0000
 TERRY C. JAMES, 0000
 GARY E. JANDZINSKI, 0000
 SHAWN J. JANSEN, 0000
 STACEY L. JANSEN, 0000
 BARBARA A. JARRETT, 0000
 RICHARD S. JARVIS, 0000
 VINCENT E. JEFFERSON, 0000
 BENJAMIN W. JENKINS, 0000
 JAY R. JENNINGS, 0000
 CARL V. JERRETT, 0000
 DANIEL R. JODER, 0000
 VINCENT J. JODOIN, 0000
 BRUCE G. JOHNSON, 0000
 CHARLES D. JOHNSON, 0000
 DAVID C. JOHNSON, 0000
 DONALD B. JOHNSON, 0000
 JAMES C. JOHNSON, 0000
 JAMES L. JOHNSON, 0000
 OSWALD L. JOHNSON, 0000
 RENEE M. JOHNSON, 0000
 ROBERT N. JOHNSON, JR., 0000
 STEPHEN S. JOHNSON, 0000
 ANGELA V. JOHNSON-HUGHES, 0000
 BRUCE W. JONES, 0000
 CHARLES E. JONES, JR., 0000
 DIMITRI K. JONES, 0000
 DONALD R. JONES, 0000
 GEORGE E. JONES, JR., 0000
 HOWARD G. JONES, III, 0000
 WESTON W. JONES, 0000
 JODI S. JORDAN, 0000
 LAURIE A. JORDAN, 0000

LEWIS E. JORDAN JR., 0000
 MICHAEL J. JORDAN, 0000
 JOSHUA JOSE, 0000
 VINCENT T. JOVENE, JR., 0000
 DOUGLAS W. JUBACK, 0000
 WARD F. JUEDEMAN, 0000
 JOEL B. JUNKER, 0000
 CHERYL ANN JUNKER, 0000
 THOMAS Z. JUNYSZEK, 0000
 JUDSON J. JUSELL, 0000
 JOHN H. KAFFER, 0000
 RANDEE B. KAISER, 0000
 JOHN J. KAPLAN, 0000
 PATRICIA A. KARABA, 0000
 HANS R. KASPAR, 0000
 CHARLES V. KASTENHOLZ, 0000
 MICHAEL D. KEATON, 0000
 HAROLD W. KECK, JR., 0000
 RICKY L. KEELING, 0000
 EDWARD N. KEEN, 0000
 MICHAEL H. KEIFER, 0000
 CHAN W. KEITH, 0000
 KEITH R. KELLER, 0000
 DAVID H. KELLEY, 0000
 ELIZABETH KELLY, 0000
 PATRICK M. KELLY, 0000
 POLLY S. KENNY, 0000
 DAVID A. KENSINGER, 0000
 ELIZABETH B. KERR, 0000
 DAVID A. KERSEY, 0000
 RANDALL T. KERSEY, 0000
 GREGORY L. KESLER, 0000
 RICHARD B. KEYES, 0000
 MOHAMMED A. KHAN, JR., 0000
 BRENDA M. KHOURY, 0000
 DAVID A. KILCHER, 0000
 KEVIN L. KILPATRICK, 0000
 HARRY R. KIMBERLY III, 0000
 DONALD FRANCIS KIMMINAU, 0000
 GREGORY R. KINCAID, 0000
 CRAIG K. KING, 0000
 DALE G. KING, 0000
 RALPH F. KING III, 0000
 WALTER J. KING, 0000
 GALEN P. KIRCHMEIER, 0000
 DONALD E. KIRKLAND, 0000
 SCOTT ALAN KISER, 0000
 JEFFERY T. KLAY, 0000
 JERRY G. KLINE, 0000
 STEVEN V. KNUTSON, 0000
 JEFFREY A. KOCH, 0000
 LURA J. KOCH, 0000
 DONALD J. KOCHANSKI, 0000
 DONALD A. KOEHLER, 0000
 KEVIN P. KOEHLER, 0000
 STEVEN S. KOEHLER, 0000
 FREDERICK M. KOENNECKE, 0000
 JOHN T. KONOPKA, 0000
 STEPHEN W. KORN, 0000
 KEITH J. KOSAN, 0000
 EDWARD J. KOSLOW, 0000
 DAVID J. KOSSLER, 0000
 EDWARD A. KOSTELNIK, JR., 0000
 MARLYN H. KOTT, 0000
 KATHLEEN A. KOURY, 0000
 JOHN A. KOVALCIN, 0000
 STEPHEN R. KOWALSKI, 0000
 EDWARD C. KRAFT III, 0000
 BARBARA A. KRAUSE, 0000
 MICHAEL V. KRUEGER, 0000
 ROBERT W. KUHN, JR., 0000
 EDWARD J. KULAS, JR., 0000
 DAVID A. KULESH, 0000
 DAVID R. KUNSELMAN, 0000
 WILLIAM A. KURLANDER, 0000
 DAVID W. KYGER, 0000
 JAMES D. LABOMBARD, 0000
 STUART L. LABOVITZ, 0000
 FRANKLIN D. LADSON, 0000
 JOHN S. LAING, 0000
 LARRY LAIRD, 0000
 ALAN T. LAKE, 0000
 STEVEN L. LAMBERT, 0000
 JEFFERY H. LAMOTHE, 0000
 DAVID G. LANDFAIR, 0000
 CYNTHIA M. LANDRUMTSU, 0000
 CAROL L. LANE, 0000
 STEPHEN A. LANGFORD, 0000
 CHARLES R. LANGLAIS, 0000
 BART W. LANGLAND, 0000
 LOUIS E. LAPORTE, 0000
 GARY W. LARBERG, 0000
 SCOTT C. LARRIMORE, 0000
 WAYNE A. LARSEN, 0000
 DONALD M. LARSON, 0000
 JAMES R. LASCHB, 0000
 JOHN A. LASLEY, 0000
 KELLY J. LATIMER, 0000
 SHARON MARY LATOUR, 0000
 JOHN A. LAUB, JR., 0000
 PHILIP J. LAWLOR, 0000
 ARDENE M. LAWRENCE, 0000
 WILLIAM G. LAWRENCE, JR., 0000
 STUART P. LAY, 0000
 ANN K. LEE, 0000
 ARNOLD E. M. LEE, 0000
 EUGENE K. LEE II, 0000
 JILL H. LEE, 0000
 JONI R. LEE, 0000
 KEVIN A. LEE, 0000
 KEVIN A. LEEK, 0000
 PAUL J. LEGENDRE III, 0000
 DAVID A. LEGGE, 0000
 CEDRIC E. LEIGHTON, 0000
 STEVEN G. LEONARD, 0000
 ANTHONY D. LEPELLERE, 0000
 PAUL W. LESSAINT, 0000

ANDREW R. LESNICK, 0000
 JAMES B. LESSEL, 0000
 LEE K. LEVY II, 0000
 MARK LEWANDOWSKI, 0000
 RONALD F. LEWANDOWSKI, 0000
 JAMES A. LEWIS III, 0000
 JERRY D. LEWIS, 0000
 ROBERT A. LEWIT, 0000
 DARWINA M. LIGUORI, 0000
 DENNIS E. LILEIKIS, 0000
 MICHAEL L. LINDAUER, 0000
 STEPHEN T. LING, 0000
 TAMARA L. LINK, 0000
 LISA M. LIPSCOMB, 0000
 DENNIS W. LISHERNES, 0000
 MARK J. LITTLE, 0000
 ROBERT A. LITTELL, 0000
 RICKY J. LOCASTRO, 0000
 DAVID M. LOFTUS, 0000
 ANTHONY M. LOGUE, 0000
 ANTHONY S. LOMBARDO, 0000
 JOHN W. LONG, 0000
 RANDY R. LONG, 0000
 STEVEN R. LOOTENS, 0000
 IVAN LOPEZ, 0000
 JAMES R. LORRAINE, 0000
 PHILIP E. LOUDEN, JR., 0000
 IRENE T. LOVATO, 0000
 JEFFREY S. LOWDERMILK, 0000
 MICHAEL T. LUFT, 0000
 JAMES P. LUKE, 0000
 THOMAS P. LUKENIC, 0000
 KEVIN M. LYNCH, 0000
 JOHN M. LYONS, 0000
 LORI A. MACIAS, 0000
 NINA D. MACK, 0000
 CRAIG S. MACLEOD, 0000
 STEPHEN D. MACLEOD, 0000
 SCOTT A. MACQUEEN, 0000
 BRIAN J. MAGERS, 0000
 ROBERT P. MAGGARD, 0000
 JOSEPH B. MAGUIRE, 0000
 THOMAS O. MAJOR, 0000
 VICTOR J. MAKEL, 0000
 PATRICK C. MALACKOWSKI, 0000
 CHERYL L. MALONE, 0000
 DAVID M. MALONEY, 0000
 DENNIS M. MALONEY, 0000
 ROSA M. MANCHA, 0000
 KEVIN J. MANION, 0000
 MICHAEL A. MANKUS, 0000
 MICHAEL A. MANNING, 0000
 CHAD T. MANSKE, 0000
 RAYMOND G. MAPLE, 0000
 STEVEN G. MARCH, 0000
 EDWARD G. MARCHAND, 0000
 RONALD MARCHIONI, 0000
 RICHARD S. MARKS, 0000
 ROBERT E. MARMELESTEIN, 0000
 RONALD L. MARSELLE, 0000
 SONDR A. MARSTON, 0000
 KIRK MARTIN, 0000
 PAUL F. MARTIN, 0000
 TODD A. MARTIN, 0000
 RICHARD A. MARTINEZ, 0000
 JEFFREY K. MASON, 0000
 MAUREEN E. MASSEY, 0000
 STEPHEN G. MASTERS, 0000
 MICHAEL J. MASUCCI, 0000
 JOSE A. MATA, 0000
 TODD H. MATHES, 0000
 MARK D. MATTHEWSON, 0000
 KEVIN L. MATTOCH, 0000
 MARY E. MATUSIEWICZ, 0000
 GARY A. MAUSOLF, 0000
 SCOTT G. MAW, 0000
 KAREN E. MAYBERRY, 0000
 OILLOUS R. MAYS II, 0000
 LAUREL MAZIK, 0000
 RICHARD H. MCBRIDE, JR., 0000
 JACKIE L. MCCARTHY, 0000
 DOUGLAS A. MCCARTY, 0000
 ROBERT A. MCCAGHAN, 0000
 PATRICK A. MCCLELLAND, 0000
 EDWARD R. MCCLESKEY, 0000
 DAVID C. MCCORMACK, 0000
 KIMBERLEY A. MCCRAE, 0000
 PATRICK J. MCCREA, 0000
 JAMES D. MCCULLOUGH, 0000
 JOHN F. MCCUNE, 0000
 AMY K. MCDANIELS, 0000
 KEVIN J. MCELROY, 0000
 MARY F. MCFAIDEN, 0000
 MICHAEL L. MCGEE, 0000
 PATRICIA L. MCGINNIS, 0000
 JAMES J. MCGOVERN, 0000
 MATTHEW M. MCGOVERN, 0000
 MICHAEL J. MCINERNEY, 0000
 PAUL S. MCINTYRE, 0000
 KENNETH A. MCKELLAR, 0000
 EDWARD L. MCKINZIE, 0000
 CALLIS L. MCLAIN, 0000
 JAMES MCLEAN, JR., 0000
 MARK A. MCLEAN, 0000
 LAURIE J. McMULLAN, 0000
 JOSEPH W. MCNAMEE, 0000
 MARGARET M. MCNEILL, 0000
 KENNETH E. MCNULTY II, 0000
 JOANNIE P. MCPHERSON, 0000
 SHARYN N. MCWHORTER, 0000
 JOHN S. MEADOR, 0000
 DARREN D. MEDLIN, 0000
 MARCIA R. MEEKSEURE, 0000
 JAMES J. MEERSMAN, 0000
 RICHARD MELLO, 0000
 LAWRENCE J. MELLON, 0000
 LIONEL S. MELLOTT, 0000

BRIAN S. MELTON, 0000
 MICHAEL E. MENNING, 0000
 DWIGHT M. MENTZER, JR., 0000
 IVAN L. MERRITT, 0000
 ALAN R. METZLER, 0000
 JOHN H. MEYER III, 0000
 KIMBERLY A. MEYER, 0000
 VICKI D. MICHETTI, 0000
 DAVID A. MILLER, 0000
 EVAN M. MILLER, 0000
 GREGORY A. MILLER, 0000
 JOSEPH C. MILLER, 0000
 MICHAEL D. MILLER, 0000
 MICHELLE C. MILLER, 0000
 PATRICK J. S. MILLER, 0000
 RAYMARD G. MILLER, 0000
 RICHARD R. MILLER, 0000
 STEVEN L. MILLER, 0000
 TIMOTHY D. MILLER, 0000
 PRESTON R. MILLIKAN, 0000
 RICHARD C. MILLS, 0000
 JAMES W. MILROY, 0000
 GREGORY R. MINKIEWICZ, 0000
 JEFFERY G. MINTZLAFF, 0000
 M. J. MITCHELL, 0000
 MICHAEL A. MITCHELL, 0000
 ROBERT M. MITCHELL, 0000
 SCOTT E. MITCHELL, 0000
 KATHRYN M. MOENE, 0000
 MARK H. MOL, 0000
 CHRISTOPHE P. MONAHAN, 0000
 DAVID R. MONISMITH, 0000
 SAM H. MONTGOMERY, JR., 0000
 MANUEL R. MONTOYA, 0000
 JAY H. MONTROSS, 0000
 JAMES W. MOORE, 0000
 KEVIN R. MOORE, 0000
 WINFRED G. MOORE, 0000
 LUIS O. MORALES, 0000
 ERIC G. MORAN, 0000
 MICHAEL JOHN MORAN, 0000
 SUSAN N. MORELAND, 0000
 GEORGE G. MORETTI, 0000
 JAMES A. MORGAN, 0000
 KEITH W. MORGAN, 0000
 MARTIN S. MORGAN, JR., 0000
 MARYDARLENE MORGAN, 0000
 MATTHEW E. MORGAN, 0000
 MICHAEL B. MORGAN, 0000
 ROBERT K. MORING, 0000
 JOHN C. MORLEY, 0000
 PATRICK D. MORONEY, 0000
 BRETT E. MORRIS, 0000
 CHARLES R. MORRISON, 0000
 MARSHALL T. MORRISON, 0000
 WILLIAM J. MORROW, JR., 0000
 BARBARA I. MOSSL, 0000
 JOSEPH R. MOTTSA, 0000
 STEPHEN K. MOULTON, 0000
 MARIO N. MOYA, 0000
 DANIEL V. B. MULLEN, 0000
 KEVIN M. MULVILL, 0000
 DOUGLAS G. MURDOCK, 0000
 KEVIN M. MURNANE, 0000
 ANTHONY R. MURPHY, 0000
 MONTE J. MURPHY, 0000
 PAUL R. MURPHY, 0000
 JAMES E. MURRAY, 0000
 GREGORY J. MYERS, 0000
 EDWARD P. MYGLER, 0000
 MARK K. NAKANISHI, 0000
 KENT L. NAMIKAS, 0000
 JUAN C. NARON, 0000
 EARL R. NASON, 0000
 CONRADO E. NAVARRO, 0000
 GUY C. NEDDO, 0000
 MARIA K. NEFF, 0000
 BRIAN K. NELSON, 0000
 ERIC L. NELSON, 0000
 ERIC T. NELSON, 0000
 JEFFREY E. NELSON, 0000
 KENNETH L. NELSON, 0000
 PAUL F. NELSON, 0000
 ROGER W. NELSON, 0000
 KURT M. NEUMAN, 0000
 SCOTT A. NEUMANN, 0000
 DALLAS N. NEWSOME, 0000
 HARRY N. NEWTON, 0000
 HIAWATHA K. NEWTON, 0000
 KEITH E. NICKLES, 0000
 STEVEN P. NIEHOFF, 0000
 CRAIG K. NIYA, 0000
 PERRY L. NOUIS, 0000
 WILLIAM K. NUGENT JR., 0000
 CRAIG M. NYGAARD, 0000
 PERRY R. OAKS, 0000
 JAMES W. O'BRIEN, 0000
 JOHN L. O'BRIEN, 0000
 MARY F. O'BRIEN, 0000
 TIMOTHY J. O'BRIEN, 0000
 BRIAN E. O'CONNOR, 0000
 MARY K. ODAHL, 0000
 RICHARD A. ODDO, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER J. ODELL, 0000
 JAMES R. OELGOETZ JR., 0000
 THOMAS R. O'HARA, 0000
 MICHAEL J. O'KEEFE, 0000
 ROSALINDA C. OLIVER, 0000
 STEPHEN W. OLIVER JR., 0000
 WESLEY A. OLSON, 0000
 LISA A. H. ONAGA, 0000
 MICHAEL F. O'NEAL, 0000
 STEPHEN E. OREAR, 0000
 BRIAN V. ORTMAN, 0000
 KATHLEEN O'SULLIVAN, 0000
 GREGORY S. OTEY, 0000
 CHARLES A. OWEN, 0000

JONATHAN M. OWENS, 0000
 SCOTT A. OWENS, 0000
 BRETT C. OXMAN, 0000
 RANDOLPH A. PAGAN, 0000
 FREDERIC C. PAGE, 0000
 JILL S. PAGE, 0000
 JESS D. PALMER, 0000
 STEVEN C. PANGER, 0000
 JEAN PAPROCKI JR., 0000
 CHRISTOPHER L. PARKER, 0000
 LAMAR D. PARKER, 0000
 RANDALL C. PARKER, 0000
 TIMOTHY H. PARMER, 0000
 TERRY W. PARROTT, 0000
 JAMES B. PARSONS, 0000
 TERRY A. PARSONS, 0000
 WILLIAM C. PASZKIEWICZ, 0000
 ERIC J. PAUL, 0000
 NANCY J. PAUL, 0000
 DALE L. PAYNE, 0000
 ERIC R. PAYNE, 0000
 ANDREW H. PEAR, 0000
 FRANK C. PEARSON II, 0000
 JANICE C. PEGRAM, 0000
 MICHAEL E. PELLETTIER, 0000
 THOMAS PEPPARD, 0000
 MICHAEL H. PERALES, 0000
 STEVEN J. PERENCHIO, 0000
 CARMEN F. PERONE JR., 0000
 MELVYN T. J. PERREIRA JR., 0000
 CATHERINE M. PERRO, 0000
 CLIFTON PERRY, 0000
 WANDA C. PERRY, 0000
 MITCHELL A. PETERSEN, 0000
 JAMES P. PETERSON, 0000
 MARY E. PETERSON, 0000
 PATRICIA J. PETNICKI, 0000
 GREGORY J. PETREQUIN, 0000
 HERBERT PHILLIPS JR., 0000
 JAMES M. PHILLIPS JR., 0000
 JOHN M. PHILLIPS, 0000
 PAUL E. PHILLIPS, 0000
 JAMES A. PICKLE, 0000
 DAVID R. PIERCE, 0000
 MARLENE R. PIETROCOLA, 0000
 MEGHAN R. PILGER, 0000
 ANN M. PINC, 0000
 MICHAEL A. PIPAN, 0000
 JOHN F. PISTOLESSI, 0000
 JERRY P. PITTS, 0000
 PHILIP A. PLATT, 0000
 JOHN A. PLAZA, 0000
 BRIAN S. PLETCHER, 0000
 JOHN M. PLETCHER, 0000
 PRESTON M. PLOUS, 0000
 MICHAEL R. PLUMMER, 0000
 CLAUDE J. POITRAS, 0000
 MARK S. FONTI, 0000
 ROBERT B. POST, 0000
 GREGORY L. POTTER, 0000
 TONY POUNDS, 0000
 GEORGE M. PRASCSAK JR., 0000
 *JERRY A. PRASS, 0000
 WILLIAM D. PREASKORN, 0000
 STEVEN J. PRESTON, 0000
 ROGER B. PRICE, 0000
 JEFFREY W. PRICHARD, 0000
 JOHN W. PROBST, 0000
 KAREN A. PULLEN, 0000
 KRISTIN M. PURDY, 0000
 RUSSELL J. QUINN, 0000
 STEVEN E. RADEMAN, 0000
 STEVEN G. RAFFERTY, 0000
 JON V. RAMER, 0000
 ROSE A. RAMIREZ, 0000
 RONALD R. RATTON, 0000
 JOHN T. RAUCH, JR., 0000
 CHRISTIAN P. RAUSCHENBACH, 0000
 CYNTHIA K. RAUSOBOTKA, 0000
 *REDMOND M. RAUX, 0000
 GREGORY C. RAY, 0000
 PHILIP C. REAMY, 0000
 REID D. REASON, 0000
 JAMES D. REAVIS, 0000
 NIMA D. REAVIS, 0000
 JOSEPH L. RECTON, 0000
 GREGORY M. REDICK, 0000
 FRANK J. REDNER, JR., 0000
 DARREN J. REED, 0000
 JAMES F. REED, 0000
 GLENN C. REDDY, 0000
 REX W. REES, 0000
 ROBERT M. REESE, 0000
 KURT L. REESMAN, 0000
 MARY E. REGISTER, 0000
 G. D. REICHARD, 0000
 CALVIN E. REID, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL J. REIN, 0000
 JEFFREY S. RENNER, 0000
 STELLA R. RENNER, 0000
 ROBERT A. RENNICKER, 0000
 DAVID A. RETH, 0000
 ROBERT C. REVILLE, 0000
 LEONIDAS D. REYES, 0000
 BART R. RHODES, 0000
 ALAN G. RIBA, 0000
 ROBERT B. RICARTE, 0000
 JOHN F. RICHARDS, JR., 0000
 JAMES P. RICHTER, 0000
 DOUGLAS B. RIDER, 0000
 GEORGE E. RIEBLING, 0000
 JAMES G. RIEMENS-VAN LAARE, 0000
 DARRELL L. RIGGS, 0000
 KEVIN F. RILEY, 0000
 JAMES P. RIORDAN, 0000
 GEORGE A. RISSE, 0000
 MICHAEL P. RITS, 0000

ROBERT G. RITTER, 0000
 STEPHEN B. RITTER, 0000
 JOSE A. RIVERAGAUD, 0000
 JAMES C. RIX, 0000
 ANTHONY D. ROAKE, 0000
 RICHARD F. ROBEL, JR., 0000
 ALBERT E. ROBERTSON, JR., 0000
 ERICA ROBERTSON, 0000
 JEFFREY K. ROBINSON, 0000
 JOSEPH H. ROBINSON, 0000
 KATHRYN L. ROBINSON, 0000
 PHILLIP L. ROBINSON, 0000
 KEVIN E. ROBITAILLE, 0000
 RICHARD K. ROCKWELL, 0000
 EVAN G. ROELOFS, 0000
 JAMES G. ROLLINS, 0000
 ANTHONY ROMANO, 0000
 CRAIG W. ROMERO, 0000
 JUDITH I. ROSEN, 0000
 THOMAS F. ROSHETKO, 0000
 AUTUMN K. ROSS, 0000
 GEORGE H. ROSS III, 0000
 JOSEPH J. ROSSACCI, 0000
 FRANK J. ROSSI, 0000
 GLENN G. ROUSSEAU, 0000
 JAMES A. ROUSSEAU, 0000
 RONALD C. ROUX, 0000
 DAVID B. ROYAL, 0000
 ARTHUR E. ROZIER, 0000
 WILLIAM R. RUCK II, 0000
 STANLEY RUFF, 0000
 RICHARD J. RUGGIERO, 0000
 MARK H. RUMPH, 0000
 JANE E. RUSSELL, 0000
 JOHN A. RUTKOWSKI, 0000
 CRAIG A. RUTLAND, 0000
 KATHLEEN D. RYAN, 0000
 MARK R. RYDELL, 0000
 LINDA MAUREEN RYSEK, 0000
 RAYMOND A. SABLE, 0000
 JOHN M. SAGRERA, 0000
 KATHLEEN C. SAKURA, 0000
 LORI S. SALGADO, 0000
 JEFFREY M. SALLING, 0000
 RONALD L. SAMIC, 0000
 DANIEL SANCHEZ, 0000
 RAUL N. SANCHEZ, 0000
 JOHN C. SANDERS, 0000
 RONALD J. SANDERS, 0000
 MICHAEL D. SANDQUIST, 0000
 CLAUDIA L. SANDS, 0000
 JOHN P. SANTACROCE, 0000
 ORAZIO F. SANTULLO, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL D. SARCHET, 0000
 JOHN D. SCARBOROUGH, 0000
 BRIAN M. SCHAAF, 0000
 SCOTT A. SCHAEFFLER, 0000
 JEFFREY L. SCHAFF, 0000
 DIRK D. SCHALCH, 0000
 JOSEPHINE F. SCHANTZ, 0000
 GREGORY J. SCHILLER, 0000
 JOSEPH V. SCHMIDT, 0000
 PAUL C. SCHMIDT, 0000
 JOSEPH P. SCHMITZ, 0000
 ERIC W. SCHNAIBLE, 0000
 STEVEN M. SCHNEIDER, 0000
 THOMAS A. SCHNEIDER, 0000
 THOMAS M. SCHORSCH, 0000
 MARIA L. SCHREFFLER, 0000
 LISA M. SCHULZATTS, 0000
 GREGORY E. SCHWAB, 0000
 JAMES E. SCHWENK, 0000
 ALTON J. SCOTT, 0000
 BRYAN E. SCOTT, 0000
 JOHN P. SCOTT, 0000
 TOI V. SCRENCI, 0000
 KENNETH E. SCRITCHFIELD, 0000
 THOMAS B. SCRUGGS, 0000
 KEITH A. SEAMAN, 0000
 BRIAN G. SEARCY, 0000
 PATRICIA K. F. SEARCY, 0000
 BARRE R. SEGUIN, 0000
 PAUL S. SEKETA, 0000
 JOHN SELLERS, 0000
 DANIEL J. SETTERGREN, 0000
 GEORGE H. SEWELL III, 0000
 THOMAS J. SEXTON, 0000
 DONALD L. SHAFFER, 0000
 MARTHA T. SHAFFER, 0000
 SHARON A. SHAFFER, 0000
 BRUCE G. SHAPIRO, 0000
 JOHN S. SHAPLAND, 0000
 ANDRE G. SHAPPELL, 0000
 ROBERT B. SHARP, JR., 0000
 THOMAS J. SHARPY, 0000
 PETRA L. SHARRITT, 0000
 GARY L. SHAW, 0000
 ROBERT S. H. SHAW, 0000
 RUSSELL J. SHAW, JR., 0000
 STUART J. SHAW, 0000
 STEPHEN E. SHEA, 0000
 STEVEN C. SHEPARD, 0000
 JIMMY SHEPPARD, JR., 0000
 JOHN T. SHEPPARD, 0000
 GARY D. SHERWOOD, 0000
 JOSEPH T. SHINNICK, 0000
 MICHAEL D. SHIRLEY, 0000
 THOMAS P. SHOAF, 0000
 EDWARD F. SHOCK, 0000
 DOUGLAS G. SHRYOCK, 0000
 DENNIS W. SHUMAKER, 0000
 ROBERT B. SHUMATE, 0000
 SANDRA J. SHURMAN, 0000
 BRADFORD J. SHWEDO, 0000
 RODNEY S. SIBILA, 0000
 LANCE B. SIGMON, 0000
 JAMES K. SIKES, 0000

DOROTHY A. SILVANIC, 0000
 JOHN C. SIMMONS, 0000
 OLGA B. SIMONS, 0000
 DENNIS J. SIMPSON, 0000
 JON T. SIMS, JR., 0000
 ROBERT W. SINGLETON, 0000
 KENNETH G. SIPPERLY, JR., 0000
 DAVID G. SIZOO, 0000
 PAUL A. SJOBERG, 0000
 TRACEY S. SKELTON, 0000
 MICHAEL R. SKIDMORE, 0000
 JADE A. SKINNER, 0000
 JOHN A. SKINNER, 0000
 ROBERT J. SKINNER, 0000
 PAUL J. SKOWRONEK, 0000
 JAMES C. SLIFE, 0000
 BOBBY J. SMALL, JR., 0000
 TRACY A. SMIEDENDORF, 0000
 ALLAN J. SMITH, 0000
 DANIEL L. SMITH, 0000
 DAVID C. SMITH, 0000
 DAVID R. SMITH, 0000
 DOREEN A. SMITH, 0000
 DOUGLAS F. SMITH, 0000
 GEORGE M. SMITH, 0000
 JURGEN W. SMITH, 0000
 KATHLEEN A. SMITH, 0000
 MICHAEL S. SMITH, 0000
 MONICA R. SMITH, 0000
 PAUL L. SMITH, 0000
 SCOTT F. SMITH, 0000
 STEVEN A. SMITH, 0000
 SUZANNE L. SMITH, 0000
 FRANK T. SMOLINSKY, 0000
 ERICK A. SNELLMAN, 0000
 DAVID E. SNYDER, 0000
 GREGORY D. SNYDER, 0000
 JEFFREY A. SNYDER, 0000
 DAVID I. S. SOBRINO, 0000
 JANET L. SOMLYAY, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER T. SORRENTINO, 0000
 ROBIN G. SOULE, 0000
 JAMES A. SPALDING, 0000
 JEFFREY S. SPEAR, 0000
 MICHAEL W. SPENCER, 0000
 WILLIAM J. SPENDLEY, JR., 0000
 JOHN M. SPILKER, 0000
 MARK S. SPILLMAN, 0000
 MICHAEL J. SPITZ, 0000
 SCOTT A. SPRENGER, 0000
 BRUCE E. SPRINGS, 0000
 STEVEN W. STAGNER, 0000
 STEVEN R. STALLINGS, 0000
 ROBERT F. STAMMLER, 0000
 STEPHEN W. STARKS, 0000
 JON K. STATON, 0000
 LYNDSEY A. STAUFFER, 0000
 SCOTT A. STEPANOV, 0000
 JOHN H. STEIN, 0000
 MARCY A. STEINKE-PIKE, 0000
 JON R. STEPHENS, 0000
 NICOLE S. STERMER, 0000
 JAYNE E. STETTO, 0000
 DAVID F. STEWART, 0000
 GREGORY A. STEWART, 0000
 MICHAEL H. STICKNEY, 0000
 EDWARD S. STINCHCOMB, 0000
 CHARLES K. TITTT, JR., 0000
 MARY A. STOCKDALE, 0000
 GEORGE R. STOLKER, JR., 0000
 ERIC J. STONE, 0000
 PATRICK M. STONEHAM, 0000
 JEFFREY N. STOUT, 0000
 LESLIE STOUTE, 0000
 TYRONE A. STRACHAN, 0000
 GERALD E. STREFF, 0000
 STEPHEN B. STREHLE, 0000
 STEPHEN L. STROM, 0000
 MICHAEL B. STROUD, 0000
 ROBERT C. STROUD, 0000
 SCOTT A. STURGILL, 0000
 SHARON K. SUGHRU, 0000
 JOHN J. SULLIVAN, 0000
 DAVID B. SUMRELL, 0000
 JON M. SUTTERFIELD, 0000
 RICKY E. SWARD, 0000
 JAMES A. SWEENEY III, 0000
 KEITH A. SWENSEN, 0000
 THOMAS J. SWIDEREK, 0000
 SHANNON W. SWITTS, 0000
 RICHARD J. TAGLANG, JR., 0000
 EDWARD J. TANNER, 0000
 JOSE C. TAURO III, 0000
 JANET T. TAYLOR, 0000
 JON M. TAYLOR, 0000
 THOMAS J. TENPENNY, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER I. TERRY, 0000
 THOMAS J. THIBODEAU, 0000
 EDWIN R. THOELE, 0000
 EVAN C. THOMAS, 0000
 JON T. THOMAS, 0000
 WILLIAM L. THOMAS, JR., 0000
 CAREY S. THOMPSON, 0000
 CHARLES F. THOMPSON, 0000
 CHERYL H. THOMPSON, 0000
 STEVEN B. THOMPSON, 0000
 STEVEN L. THOMPSON, 0000
 TERRACE B. THOMPSON, 0000
 PATRICIA F. THON, 0000
 THOMAS R. TIGHE, 0000
 THERESA C. TILLOCK, 0000
 TIMOTHY A. TIPPETT, 0000
 ROBERT W. TOMASINO, 0000
 JAMES J. TOMASZEWSKI, 0000
 EDWARD B. TOMME, 0000
 WILLIAM L. TONGUE, 0000
 DAVID F. TOOMEY III, 0000

CAMERON W. TORRENS, 0000
 KEVIN L. TOY, 0000
 LAURA L. TRENT, 0000
 PHILLIP C. TRIPLETT, JR., 0000
 RANDALL C. TRITT, 0000
 HARRY A. TRUHN, 0000
 ERIC P. TRUMBLE, 0000
 MARC TRUUMES, 0000
 JAMES M. TUCCI, 0000
 CAREY F. TUCKER, 0000
 DAVID L. TURNER, 0000
 RANDY B. TYMOFICHUK, 0000
 CONSTANTINE TZAVARAS, 0000
 MICHAEL ULISSE, 0000
 STEPHEN G. UYEHATA, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER R. VALLE, 0000
 ROBIN P. VANDERBERRY, 0000
 DAVID G. VANDERVEER, JR., 0000
 DEBORAH L. VANDEVEN, 0000
 WENDY P. VANDYKE, 0000
 SCOTT M. VANNESS, 0000
 WILLIAM J. VAUGHT, JR., 0000
 JOSEPH A. VENEZIANO, 0000
 EDUARDO L. VICENCIO, 0000
 JAMES G. VICK, 0000
 ANGELA M. VINCENT, 0000
 STEPHEN MICHAEL VINICA, 0000
 JEAN N. VITE, 0000
 TAMMY A. VON BUSCH, 0000
 SCOTT R. VOSKOVIICH, 0000
 *STEPHEN ALLEN VOYT, 0000
 JAMES B. WAGER JR., 0000
 ROBERT S. WAINNER, 0000
 FRANKLIN S. WALDEN, 0000
 ROBERT M. WALKER, 0000
 ROBERT M. WALKER, 0000
 GERALD B. WALKINGTON, 0000
 JANICE D. WALLACE, 0000
 JON D. WALZ, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER A. WARACK, 0000
 BRIAN K. WARD, 0000
 CHARLES E. WARD, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL P. WARD, 0000
 THOMAS B. WARD, 0000
 WARREN G. WARD, 0000
 RICHARD E. WARREN, 0000
 JAY J. WARWICK, 0000
 ROBERT A. WASHBURN II, 0000
 ROBERT A. WASSERMAN, 0000
 HAROLD E. WATERS, JR., 0000
 BARBARA K. WATKINS, 0000
 TERRY WATKINS, 0000
 CHARY F. WATTERTON, 0000
 WILLIAM A. WAUGHMAN, 0000
 BRADLEY A. WAYLAND, 0000
 PAUL A. WEBB, 0000
 REBECCA E. WEIRICK, 0000
 JERRY K. WELDON II, 0000
 SUZANNE O'REILLY WELLS, 0000
 JAMES A. WENTWORTH, 0000
 JAY M. WENTZELL, 0000
 JOSEPH D. WERGINSKI, 0000
 PHILIP V. WESTERFIELD, 0000
 PHILIP T. WHEELER, 0000
 MATTHEW T. WHELAN, 0000
 PETER A. WHELAN, 0000
 JOHN W. WHISENHUNT, 0000
 DOUGLAS A. WHITE, 0000
 DOUGLAS R. WHITE, 0000
 STEVEN C. WHITE, 0000
 OVETA M. WHITE-ABISOGUN, 0000
 STEPHEN N. WHITTING, 0000
 JAMES R. WHITTON, 0000
 SCOTT G. WIERSCHKE, 0000
 KARL J. WIERSUM, 0000
 DAVID A. WILKINS, 0000
 ALBERT H. WILLIAMS, JR., 0000
 FRANK Q. WILLIAMS, 0000
 JOSEPH S. WILLIAMS, 0000
 RICHARD K. WILLIAMS, 0000
 DAVID L. WILLIAMS, 0000
 MARY A. WILLMON, 0000
 HENRY T. WILSON, 0000
 MICHAEL R. WILSON, 0000
 PATRICK A. WILSON, 0000
 STEVEN P. WINKLMANN, 0000
 MICHAEL F. WINTERS, 0000
 JEFFREY A. WITKO, 0000
 BRIAN K. WITT, 0000
 ELIZABETH A. WOISH, 0000
 GARY M. WOLBERT, 0000
 MICHAEL K. WOLF, 0000
 ANITA R. WOLFE, 0000
 DALLAS A. WOLFE, 0000
 FRED L. WOOD, 0000
 JOHNNY L. WOOD, 0000
 TIMOTHY S. WOODRUFF, 0000
 TYRONE M. WOODYARD, 0000
 RICHARD A. WOOLEY, 0000
 GUY T. WORTHINGTON, 0000
 LORI A. WORTMAN, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER F. WRENN, 0000
 BROOKS D. WRIGHT, 0000
 JOHN D. WRIGHT, 0000
 RICHARD N. WRIGHT, 0000
 ERIC J. WYDRA, 0000
 ROBERT T. WYNN, 0000
 DAVID L. YANG, 0000
 LAURIE L. YANKOSKY, 0000
 EDWARD K. YANKSON, 0000
 KENNETH L. YAPHE, 0000
 DOUGELL E. YOST, 0000
 DOUGLAS E. YOUNG, 0000
 HARRIET E. YOUNG, 0000
 MICHAEL V. YUILL, 0000
 PAUL J. ZABBO, 0000
 TODD M. ZACHARY, 0000

DANIEL R. ZAHIRNIAK, 0000
 ROBERT J. ZALESKE, 0000
 NOEL ZAMOT, 0000
 JOHN L. ZAWASKY, 0000
 EDWARD C. ZICK, 0000
 DONALD M. ZIMMERMAN, 0000
 GARY R. ZIMMERMAN, 0000
 PAUL J. ZOLLMANN, 0000
 DANIEL C. ZOOK, 0000
 KIMBERLEE B. ZORICH, 0000
 LOUIS V. ZUCCARELLO, 0000
 MICHAEL F. ZUPAN, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MARK DICKENS, 0000
 EDWARD TIMMONS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE MEDICAL CORPS (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

*JOSEPH N. DANIEL, 0000 MC

To be major

LESLIE W. SMITH, 0000 MC
 GEORGINA YOUNG, 0000 MC
 PHILLIP HOLMES, 0000 MC

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

JOE R. BEHUNIN, 0000
 COMMODORE L. MANN, 0000
 DONALD P. MCMAHON, 0000
 JAMES A. OBRIEN, 0000
 ROBERT L. PETRONE, 0000
 LINWOOD M. SAWYER, 0000
 RANDALL E. SMITH, 0000

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

To be colonel

ROBERT G. CARMICHAEL, JR., 0000
 DABNEY T. GILLIAM, JR., 0000
 LARRY R. JONES, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES P. CONTRERAS, 0000
 RUSSELL K. PRICE, 0000
 LORENZO RIDDICK, 0000
 ROBERT D. WILLIAMS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS (AN) AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHERYL E. CARROLL, 0000 AN

To be major

*SUSAN R. MEILER, 0000 AN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 531, AND 3064:

To be major

*JEFFREY A. ARNOLD, 0000 JA
 PHILIP B. BANDY, 0000 JA
 PATRICK A. BARNETT, 0000 JA
 *SHANE E. BARTEE, 0000 JA
 *CHERYL E. BOONE, 0000 JA
 *GREGORY L. BOWMAN, 0000 JA
 *DANIEL G. BROOKHART, 0000 JA
 *KRISTA K. BUSH, 0000 JA
 KAREN H. CARLISLE, 0000 JA
 *LAURA L. CASULLI, 0000 JA
 *GARY P. CORN, 0000 JA
 *MICHELLE E. CRAWFORD, 0000 JA
 *PAUL T. CYGNAROWICZ, 0000 JA
 *WENDY P. DAKNIS, 0000 JA
 JOHN C. DEHN, 0000 JA
 *DEVON L. DONAHUE, 0000 JA
 KATHRYN A. DONNELLY, 0000 JA

*JAMES M. DORN, 0000 JA
 *STACY E. FLIPPIN, 0000 JA
 *JAMES J. GIBSON, 0000 JA
 *CHRISTIAN M. GIFFORD, 0000 JA
 *ALTON L. GWALTNEY III, 0000 JA
 JEFFREY C. HAGLER, 0000 JA
 *STEVEN P. HAIGHT, 0000 JA
 *AMILCAR A. HERNANDEZ, 0000 JA
 *NEWTON W. HILL, 0000 JA
 *SEAN K. HOWE, 0000 JA
 *MARC A. HOWZE, 0000 JA
 ROBERT P. HUSTON, 0000 JA
 *BRADLEY J. JAN, 0000 JA
 *TRACY A. JANKE, 0000 JA
 *LAURA K. KLEIN, 0000 JA
 MICHAEL L. KRAMER, 0000 JA
 *ARDEN B. LEVY, 0000 JA
 *DONALD G. LOBEDA, JR., 0000 JA
 *CHARLES D. LOZANO, 0000 JA
 *JOSEPH L. MARSHALL, 0000 JA
 JENNIFER H. MCGEE, 0000 JA
 *JAMES R. MCKEE, JR., 0000 JA
 *CRAIG E. MERUTKA, 0000 JA
 *RICHARD V. MEYER, 0000 JA
 *TODD S. MILLIARD, 0000 JA
 *SUZANNE G. MITCHEM, 0000 JA
 *SAMUEL W. MORRIS, 0000 JA
 *MICHAEL L. NORRIS, 0000 JA
 *JOEL A. NOVAK, 0000 JA
 *JOHN N. OHLWEILER, 0000 JA
 *CYNTHIA G. OLSEN, 0000 JA
 *PAUL J. PERRONE, JR., 0000 JA
 *JOSEPH A. PIXLEY, 0000 JA
 *JUAN A. PYFROM, 0000 JA
 *MICHAEL L. ROBERTS, 0000 JA
 KEVIN K. ROBITAILLE, 0000 JA
 *LORRAINE ROWBO, 0000 JA
 *MATTHEW P. RUZICKA, 0000 JA
 MALCOLM G. SCHAEFER, 0000 JA
 PAULA I. SCHASBERGER, 0000 JA
 *WILLIAM A. SCHMITTEL, 0000 JA
 THOMAS R. SERRANO, 0000 JA
 *JEFFREY L. SPEARS, 0000 JA
 *JUSTIN S. TADE, 0000 JA
 *STACEY J. TERWILLIGER, 0000 JA
 *VINCE T. VANEK, 0000 JA
 *KATHERINE A. VARNEY, 0000 JA
 *JERIA M. WARD, 0000 JA
 CHARLES L. YOUNG, 0000 JA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN THE NURSE CORPS (AN), MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS (MS), MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS (SP) AND VETERINARY CORPS (VC) AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 531, AND 3064:

To be major

*CARA M. ALEXANDER, 0000 MS
 *PATRICIA J. ALLEN, 0000 MS
 BRIAN ALMQUIST, 0000 MS
 CARLOS C. AMAYA, 0000 AN
 *SHARON M. AMAYA, 0000 AN
 *CAROLYN ANDERSEN, 0000 AN
 *RICHARD D. ARES, 0000 SP
 *GARRETT R. BAER, 0000 SP
 SHAUN M. BAILEY, 0000 MS
 TRACY L. BAKER, 0000 AN
 *JOHN E. BALSER, 0000 SP
 *DANIEL T. BARNES, 0000 MS
 *MARQUETTA A. BARNES, 0000 AN
 STEPHEN A. BARNES, 0000 MS
 *CORINA M. BARROW, 0000 AN
 *BRIAN E. BARTHELME, 0000 MS
 *RENE M. BATTISTA, 0000 SP
 BEVERLY A. BEAVERS, 0000 MS
 *DONNA E. BEED, 0000 MS
 *ROGER L. BEHRMAN, 0000 SP
 *DEBORAH L. BELANGER, 0000 AN
 BRIAN E. BENHAM, 0000 AN
 *GRETA L. BENNETT, 0000 MS
 *EARL G. BENSON, 0000 SP
 *RACHELLE M. BESEMAN, 0000 MS
 WILLIAM J. BETTIN, 0000 MS
 *LEE W. BEWLEY, 0000 MS
 *MELVIN F. BISHOP, 0000 MS
 *KEVIN M. BONDS, 0000 MS
 JOSE A. BONILLA, 0000 MS
 *BRIAN E. BOUTILIER, 0000 SP
 CHADWICK A. BOWERS, 0000 MS
 LAURA E. BOWERS, 0000 MS
 *CORRINA A. BRADFORD, 0000 MS
 *RICKY W. BRETTHAUER, 0000 SP
 *WILLIAM T. BRISCOE, 0000 MS
 *SONYA R. BROWN, 0000 MS
 TERRY J. BROWN, 0000 AN
 DAVID J. BROYHILL, 0000 MS
 *WESLEY E. BURNETT, 0000 MS
 *JENNIFER B. CACI, 0000 MS
 *CHERYL Y. CAMERON, 0000 MS
 *WEYMAN E. CANNINGTON, 0000 MS
 *GAVIN H. CARMICHAEL, 0000 MS
 *JOHN J. CASEY III, 0000 MS
 RONALD M. CASHION, 0000 AN
 *RANDEL C. CASSELS, 0000 AN
 *DAVID A. CERVANTES, 0000 AN
 JOSEPH B. CHAPMAN, 0000 AN
 *JOSE L. CHAVEZ, 0000 MS
 *THOMAS R. COE, 0000 AN
 CHRISTOPHER P. COLEY, 0000 MS
 *MARY L. CONNELL, 0000 MS
 *VICKIE L. CONNOLLY, 0000 SP
 JENIFER M. CONSTANTIAN, 0000 AN
 *JERRY A. COOK, 0000 MS
 DEREK C. COOPER, 0000 MS
 *ANTONIO E. COPELAND, 0000 MS
 *OLIVERIO CORCHADOMEDINA, 0000 SP
 *ROBERT S. CORNES, 0000 MS
 *BRIAN D. CRANDALL, 0000 MS
 KATHLEEN F. CURRAN, 0000 AN
 ELLEN S. DALY, 0000 MS
 *ALAN M. DAUS, 0000 MS
 *GWENDOLYN L. DAVIS, 0000 AN
 *MARY B. DAVIS, 0000 AN
 *PAUL J. DEAN, 0000 MS
 RALPH W. DEATHERAGE, 0000 MS
 DAVID H. DENNEY, 0000 MS
 *VIRGINIA M. DESWARTE, 0000 MS
 *KARL M. DEVLIN, 0000 MS
 *MARK W. DICK, 0000 MS
 *DIANE S. DIEHL, 0000 AN
 MARK J. DOLE, 0000 MS
 *PROSPERO C. DONAN, 0000 AN
 *JOHN E. DULAVERIS, 0000 AN
 *MICHAEL L. DUPREE, 0000 MS
 *JOSEPH C. DUPUIS, 0000 MS
 *SUSAN C. EASLEY, 0000 MS
 *JOHN P. EDDY, 0000 MS
 *BONNIE B. ELIAT, 0000 SP
 *AUSTIN W. ELLIOTT, 0000 MS
 LAURA M. ELLIOTT, 0000 MS
 *ANNE M. EMSHOFF, 0000 VC
 *KATHLEEN M. FEELY, 0000 AN
 LAURA L. FEIDER, 0000 AN
 *STEPHEN A. FELT, 0000 VC
 *WILLIAM R. FINNEARTY II, 0000 MS
 *SARAH L. FLASH, 0000 SP
 *DERRICK W. FLOWERS, 0000 MS
 *RONALD S. FOLEY, 0000 MS
 DAVID J. FUGAZZOTTO, JR., 0000 MS
 *JOSEPH F. GALL, 0000 AN
 YVETTE L. GAMBREL, 0000 AN
 *MATTHEW B. GARBER, 0000 SP
 *KIMBERLY S. GARCIA, 0000 AN
 *JUANITA GAUSS, 0000 AN
 *HAROLD J. GEOLINGO, 0000 MS
 *CHARLINE GEREPKA, 0000 AN
 DAVID R. GIBSON, 0000 MS
 STEPHEN L. GOFFAR, 0000 SP
 *CHERYL B. GOGGINS, 0000 MS
 *ROBERT A. GOODMAN, 0000 VC
 *MONTEZ GORRELLGOODE, 0000 AN
 *JOHN H. GOURLEY, 0000 AN
 *MARJORIE A. GRANTHAM, 0000 MS
 *ANTHONY L. GREEN, 0000 MS
 *JERRY L. GREEN, JR., 0000 AN
 *LISA GREEN, JR., 0000 AN
 *MICHELLE S. GREENE, 0000 MS
 *CHRISTOPHER A. GRUBER, 0000 MS
 *HEATHER B. GUESS, 0000 AN
 KURT A. GUSTAFSON, 0000 MS
 SAM E. HADDAD JR., 0000 MS
 *HERMAN HAGGRAY, JR., 0000 MS
 *THOMAS F. HAIGLER, 0000 SP
 *GARY L. HALL, 0000 SP
 KELLY M. HALVERSON, 0000 MS
 *MICHAEL M. HAMMEL, 0000 MS
 MARY E. HARGROVE, 0000 AN
 *CHERYL R. HARRIS, 0000 AN
 *ELLIS HARRIS, 0000 MS
 *EULYNNE HARRISON, 0000 AN
 *JAMES A. HAWKINS, JR., 0000 MS
 *JUDITH M. HAWKINS, 0000 AN
 *MICHAEL D. HEATH, 0000 MS
 *CHRISTINE J. HELD, 0000 SP
 *DIANNE T. HELINSKI, 0000 SP
 *VERNELL J. HENDERSON, 0000 AN
 *JUDITH A. HIGGINBOTHAM, 0000 AN
 *CRISTL E. HIGHTOWER, 0000 AN
 *THOMAS M. HILL, 0000 MS
 *MARK L. HOHSTADT, 0000 MS
 *HENRY E. HOLLIDAY III, 0000 MS
 *TERRI J. HOLLOWAYPETTY, 0000 AN
 WILLIAM G. HOWARD, 0000 MS
 *ROBERT F. HOWE, 0000 MS
 *JAMES N. HOWELL, 0000 AN
 *TIMOTHY D. HOWER, 0000 MS
 *JULIE K. HUDSON, 0000 SP
 *CHARLES C. HUNGER, 0000 SP
 *MICHAEL HURTADO, 0000 AN
 *KAREN A. HUTCHINS, 0000 AN
 *LEONICIA O. ICAYAN, 0000 AN
 *MARK A. IRELAND, 0000 MS
 *JENNIE M. IRIZARRY, 0000 AN
 *ANDREA R. JACKSON, 0000 AN
 *SHELLEY B. JAMES, 0000 AN
 *SUPING JIANG, 0000 MS
 *WILLIAM D. JUDD, 0000 MS
 DARLENE M. JULKOWSKI, 0000 AN
 *BRADLEY J. KAMROWSKIOPPEN, 0000 MS
 *NINA A. KAPLAN, 0000 VC
 *HEIDI C. KAUFMAN, 0000 SP
 *CHRISTOPHER E. KELLER, 0000 VC
 NICOLE L. KERKENBUSH, 0000 AN

MARIALORNA P. KERL, 0000 AN
 GREGORY L. KIMM, 0000 MS
 *LELA C. KING, 0000 MS
 KRIESTIN L. KLEINSCHMIDT, 0000 AN
 *ROBERT A. KNEELAND, 0000 MS
 JANET L. KUBAS, 0000 AN
 *ELLEN M. KURT, 0000 MS
 *YVETTE J. LANDRUM, 0000 MS
 *FELICIA D. LANGE, 0000 VC
 *CHRISTOPHER J. LANIER, 0000 VC
 *BRUCE R. LANUM, 0000 AN
 *LINDA A. LAPOINTE, 0000 AN
 *ABRAHAM A. LEDOUX, 0000 MS
 *JANET A. LESLIE, 0000 VC
 *JOHN F. LESO, 0000 MS
 *ROBERT A. LETIZIO, 0000 MS
 *STEVE J. LEWIS, 0000 MS
 *BRADLEY A. LIEURANCE, 0000 MS
 *ALAN D. LINDSLEY, 0000 SP
 *KENNETH R. LOPEZ, 0000 VC
 *WILLIAM H. LOVELL, 0000 MS
 *MICHAEL W. LUCE, 0000 AN
 *DARYL J. MAGOULICK, 0000 AN
 ERIC M. MAROYKA, 0000 MS
 *THOMAS M. MARTIN, 0000 MS
 *LEONARDO M. MARTINEZ, 0000 AN
 *MACY F. MCGINTY, 0000 AN
 LEIGH K. MCGRAW, 0000 AN
 *LINDA J. MCKINNEYWILSON, 0000 AN
 *SANDRA N. MCNAUGHTON, 0000 AN
 *ANTHONY L. MCQUEEN, 0000 MS
 *SUSAN R. MEILER, 0000 AN
 *DAVID MENDOZA, 0000 AN
 *ANTHONY C. MONTELEONE, 0000 VC
 *JULIO C. MONTERO, 0000 VC
 *TROY E. MOSLEY, 0000 MS
 STEPHEN C. MOSS II, 0000 MS
 ELIZABETH A. MURRAY, 0000 AN
 *MARGARET S. NEIDERT, 0000 VC
 *CHUNG C. NELSON, 0000 MS
 *ANTHONY R. NESBITT, 0000 MS
 *MALETA J. NOVAK, 0000 AN
 *STEVEN J. NOVAK, 0000 AN
 *ROBIN L. ODELL, 0000 AN
 *GERMAINE D. OLIVER, 0000 MS
 *MACK C. OQUINN, JR., 0000 MS
 JOHN M. ORSINGER, 0000 MS
 *PAUL H. OWEN, 0000 SP
 *HANNAH S. PARK, 0000 AN
 *LARRY R. PATTERSON, 0000 MS
 DIANE L. PAULSON, 0000 AN
 *TIMOTHY L. PENDERGRASS, 0000 SP
 *KENNETH B. PERKINS, 0000 SP
 *JAMES L. PERRINE, 0000 AN
 *LILLIAN M. PETERSON, 0000 AN
 *BETH J. PETTITWILLIS, 0000 AN
 *SHANA L. PHILLIPS, 0000 VC
 *PATRICK J. PIANALTO, 0000 MS
 PATRICK W. PICARDO, 0000 MS
 *JASON G. PIKE, 0000 MS
 *DEBORAH M. PINATHOMAS, 0000 AN
 *ANDRE R. PIPPEN, 0000 MS
 *NOEL G. POINDEXTER, 0000 AN
 *PATRICK B. POLK, 0000 AN
 *JOSEPH A. PONCE, 0000 MS
 *RICHARD M. PRIOR, 0000 AN
 *ANGELA C. QUINTANILLA, 0000 AN
 RONALD R. RAGIN, 0000 MS
 *CHRISTOPHER W. RICHARDS, 0000 MS
 *ROBERT S. RICHARDS, 0000 MS
 *PEDRO J. RICO, 0000 VC
 KEITH A. RIGDON, 0000 MS
 JEFFERY F. RIMMER, 0000 MS
 *DAVID C. RINALDI, 0000 AN
 *OSCAR RIVERA, 0000 AN
 *BRADLEY L. ROBINSON, 0000 MS
 CHERYL L. ROBINSON, 0000 AN
 *JENNIFER L. ROBISON, 0000 AN
 *THOMAS R. RYLANDER, JR., 0000 MS
 NANCY A. SADDLER, 0000 AN
 MAUREEN A. SALAFAI, 0000 AN
 *WILLIE E. SALLIS, 0000 SP
 *HELEN A. SANTIAGO, 0000 SP
 MICHAEL P. SASSANO, 0000 MS
 JANE F. SCHILLACI, 0000 MS
 CLINTON W. SCHRECKHISE, 0000 MS
 *LOUIS J. SCHWARTZ, 0000 MS
 *KRYSTAL R. SCOFIELDJOHNSON, 0000 AN
 *SHAWN J. SCOTT, 0000 SP
 *CARLOS SEGURA, JR., 0000 SP
 *CHAD M. SEKUTERA, 0000 AN
 SHONNELL W. SEVERNS, 0000 MS
 *SCOTT W. SHAFFER, 0000 SP
 *SONYA C. SHAW, 0000 AN
 DAVID R. SHOEMAKER, 0000 MS
 *MAURICE L. SIPOS, 0000 MS
 *WAYNE R. SLICTON, 0000 SP
 *DARIA J. SMITH, 0000 MS
 JOHN V. SMITH, 0000 MS
 MICHAEL W. SMITH, 0000 MS
 *MARGARET S. SOBIECH, 0000 AN
 *CHERYL D. SOFALY, 0000 VC
 *MATTHEW D. SOMMER, 0000 AN
 ERIC B. SONES, 0000 MS
 *PORTIA C. SORRELLS, 0000 MS
 *MIAN S. SPRAGUE, 0000 AN
 *DENISE L. SQUIRE, 0000 MS
 *JOYCE E. SQUIRES, 0000 AN
 *BREW M. STANFA, 0000 MS
 DANIEL L. STARMAND, 0000 AN
 WILLIAM F. STARNES, 0000 MS
 *THOMAS J. STEINBACH, 0000 VC
 CARMEN A. STELLA, 0000 AN
 *MARK STEVENS, 0000 SP
 DANIEL C. STEWART, 0000 MS
 *ELIZABETH STORY, 0000 SP
 *LOUIS R. STOUT, 0000 AN

*MICHAEL W. SUMMERS, 0000 SP
 *NANCY L. SWEET, 0000 AN
 *BRUCE C. SYVINSKI, 0000 MS
 KATHERINE E. TAYLORBAKER, 0000 AN
 *MARTIN E. TENNEY, 0000 MS
 *LAURA A. THOMAS, 0000 MS
 *ROSALIND E. THOMAS, 0000 AN
 *TODD M. THOMAS, 0000 VC
 *DAVID M. THOMPSON, 0000 MS
 *TONY N. TIDWELL, 0000 MS
 MARGA TOILLIONSTEFFENSMEIE, 0000 MS
 *ROBER TORRESCARTAGENA, 0000 MS
 *CLIFTON M. TRINIDAD, 0000 SP
 *LAURA R. TRINKLE, 0000 MS
 *KARLOW V. TUTT, 0000 AN
 *ALAN K. UEOKA, 0000 MS
 *JOAN E. ULSHER, 0000 MS
 *COMBS D. UPSHAW, 0000 AN
 *RONALD C. VANROEKEL, 0000 MS
 VERONICA A. VILLAFRANCA, 0000 AN
 KEITH A. WAGNER, 0000 MS
 RONALD D. WALKER, 0000 MS
 *THOMPSON E. WALL, 0000 AN
 *TRACY S. WALLACE, 0000 AN
 *TRAVIS W. WATSON, 0000 MS
 RICHARD M. WEBB, 0000 MS
 *KARL A. WERBOVETZ, 0000 MS
 *WILLIAM C. WERLING, 0000 SP
 DAVID A. WESTON, 0000 AN
 ROBIN M. WHITACRE, 0000 MS
 *KIMBERLY A. WHITTEN, 0000 VC
 *KENDRA P. WHYATT, 0000 AN
 *THOMAS S. WIECZOREK, 0000 MS
 *PATRICIA M. WILLIAMS, 0000 SP
 *YVETTE WOODS, 0000 SP
 *KRISTIN K. WOOLLEY, 0000 MS

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

To be colonel

DONALD M. ADKINS, 0000
 FRANCISCO ALICEA, JR., 0000
 CHARLES D. ALLEN, 0000
 PERRY D. ALLMENDINGER, 0000
 THOMAS A. ALLMON, 0000
 DAVID L. ANDERSON, 0000
 DONNIE P. ANDERSON, 0000
 GUSTAF E. ANDERSON, III, 0000
 JOSEPH ANDERSON III, 0000
 NICHOLAS J. ANDERSON, 0000
 JAMES A. ANGELOSANTE, 0000
 BILLY W. ANTLEY, JR., 0000
 WILLIAM R. APPLEATE, 0000
 JEFFREY A. APPEGETT, 0000
 KEITH A. ARMSTRONG, 0000
 STEPHEN D. AUSTIN, 0000
 JAMES P. BABBITT, 0000
 DOUGLAS S. BAKER, III, 0000
 THOMAS P. BALTAZAR, 0000
 MARK F. BARNETTE, 0000
 DANIEL BARRETO, 0000
 PATRICIA A. BAXTER, 0000
 WILLIAM D. BEATTY III, 0000
 WADE B. BECNEL, 0000
 DAVID F. BEDEY, 0000
 JAMES D. BEIRNE, 0000
 ROBERT M. BELL, 0000
 THOMAS B. BENNETT, 0000
 JANICE M. BERRY, 0000
 PAUL A. BETHKE, 0000
 MICHAEL G. BETTEZ, 0000
 DAMAN P. BIANCA, 0000
 STEPHEN G. BIANCO, 0000
 ROY C. BIERWIRTH, 0000
 DONALD A. BIRD, 0000
 MICHAEL D. BISACE, 0000
 JOHN M. BLAINE, JR., 0000
 ALBERT M. BLEAKLEY JR., 0000
 MICHAEL E. BOATNER, 0000
 JOHN M. BOLCHOZ, 0000
 JOHN H. BONE, JR., 0000
 DAVID J. BONI, 0000
 DOUGLAS C. BONNER, 0000
 JOHN A. BONSELL, 0000
 STEVEN R. BOSHEARS, 0000
 MICHAEL BOWMAN, 0000
 DARRYL M. BRADLEY, 0000
 THOMAS L. BRANZ, 0000
 CHARLES B. BRESLIN, 0000
 MARC P. BRODEUR, 0000
 RICHARD W. BROOKS, 0000
 DAVID W. BROWN, 0000
 HEIDI V. BROWN, 0000
 MATTHEW J. BROWN, 0000
 ROBERT B. BROWN, 0000
 WILFRED F. BROWN, JR., 0000
 STEPHEN D. BUCK, 0000
 RONALD M. BUEFKIN, 0000
 VICTOR A. BUNDE, 0000
 JOHN D. BURKE, 0000
 RONALD B. BYRNES, JR., 0000
 MARK J. CAIN, 0000
 STEPHEN T. CAMPBELL, 0000
 MICHAEL L. CARDARELLI, 0000
 GARY B. CARNEY, 0000
 ROBERT L. CARNEY, 0000
 SHERRY L. CARPENTER, 0000
 DOUGLAS E. CARROLL, 0000
 LANCE S. CARROLL, 0000
 FREDERICK L. CARTER, 0000
 MICHAEL B. CERVONE, 0000
 JIMMY J. CHANDLER, 0000
 GARY H. CHEEK, 0000
 JOHN A. CHRISTENSEN III, 0000
 BENJAMIN R. CLARK, 0000
 MICHAEL D. CLAY, 0000
 JAMES D. CLEGG, 0000
 DONALD A. COE, 0000
 JACK COLLINS, 0000
 LYNN A. COLLYAR, 0000
 JOE E. CONLEY, 0000
 ARTHUR W. CONNOR, JR., 0000
 ROBERT T. COOK, JR., 0000
 RANDALL G. CONWAY, 0000
 STEVEN R. CORBETT, 0000
 MICHAEL A. CORDES, 0000
 MICHAEL J. CORLEY, 0000
 KENDALL P. COX, 0000
 STEVEN J. COX, 0000
 WILLIAM T. CROSBY, 0000
 JESSE R. CROSS, 0000
 BRENDA F. CRUTCHFIELD, 0000
 WINFRED S. CUMMINGS, 0000
 ERICKSON D. CYPHER, 0000
 STEVEN M. CZEPIGA, 0000
 DENISE F. DAILEY, 0000
 HENRY J. DAVIS, 0000
 KEVIN A. DAVIS, 0000
 LAUREN S. DAVIS, JR., 0000
 MARK J. DAVIS, 0000
 RICHARD A. DAVIS, 0000
 DONALD W. DAWSON III, 0000
 RICHARD P. DEFATTA, 0000
 WILLIAM M. DEKANICH, 0000
 SERGIO DELAPENA, 0000
 JAMES F. DEMING, 0000
 ROBERT J. DEVLIN, 0000
 MICHAEL W. DEYOUNG, 0000
 MANUEL A. DIEMER, 0000
 KEVIN M. DIETRICK, 0000
 PHILIP J. DISALVO, 0000
 GERALD A. DOLINISH, 0000
 WILLIAM F. DONAHER, 0000
 GOODE G. DORMAN III, 0000
 RANDAL A. DRAGON, 0000
 WAYNE DRAKE, 0000
 SHARON R. DUFFY, 0000
 RAYMOND J. DUNCAN, JR., 0000
 PETER P. DURR, 0000
 TIMOTHY E. EAYRE, 0000
 SCOTT A. EHRLMANTRAUT, 0000
 JERRY B. ELLIOTT, 0000
 BRYAN W. ELLIS, 0000
 DAVID R. ELLIS, 0000
 RICHARD T. ELIS, 0000
 MARVIN A. ENGLERT, 0000
 ADOLPH H. ERNST III, 0000
 MARK J. ESHELMAN, 0000
 ALLEN C. ESTES, 0000
 PHILIP M. EVANS, 0000
 ROBERT C. FAILLE, JR., 0000
 MARK D. FIEBERSTEIN, 0000
 DONALD M. FERRELL, 0000
 JON E. FINKE, 0000
 MICHAEL S. FLANAGAN, 0000
 DOUGLAS L. FLETCHER, 0000
 MICHAEL T. FLYNN, 0000
 MICHAEL D. FORMICA, 0000
 MICHAEL E. FOX, 0000
 STEVEN G. FOX, 0000
 BERNARD F. GABRIEL, 0000
 WAYNE L. GARCIA, 0000
 JOHN P. GARNER, 0000
 WILLIAM B. GARRETT III, 0000
 DANIEL L. GARVEY, 0000
 GREGORY P. GASS, 0000
 FRANCIS K. GATES III, 0000
 WILLIAM M. GAYORA, 0000
 MARK D. GELHARDT SR, 0000
 HOA GENERATION SR, 0000
 CHARLES L. GIBSON SR, 0000
 TIMOTHY J. GIBSON, 0000
 CECIL D. GIDDENS, 0000
 JOHN H. GILL, 0000
 TROY E. GILLELAND, JR., 0000
 AARON P. GILSON, 0000
 DOUGLAS GILVER, 0000
 MARK V. GLYNN, 0000
 RUSSELL D. GOLD, 0000
 WALTER M. GOLDEN, JR., 0000
 FELIX O. GONZALES, SR, 0000
 ROBERT L. GORDON III, 0000
 CLIFFORD P. GRAHAM, 0000
 JAMES E. GRANGER, 0000
 GUS E. GREENE, 0000
 DANIEL G. GREY, 0000
 WILLIAM F. GRIMSLEY, 0000
 ROBERT L. GROLLER, 0000
 MARK L. GROTKE, 0000
 JOSE A. GUADALUPE, 0000
 ROBERT T. GUGLIEMI, 0000
 GABRIEL GULOTTI, 0000
 DAVID D. HALE, 0000
 MATTHEW T. HALE, 0000
 JOHN C. HAMILTON, 0000
 WILLIAM W. HAMILTON, JR., 0000
 KIRT T. HARDY, 0000
 FRANK L. HARMAN III, 0000
 JAMES H. HARPER, 0000
 THELMA F. HARPER, 0000
 GARY R. HARTER, 0000
 AARON C. HARVEY III, 0000
 DEREK J. HAUGHS, 0000
 MARK T. HAUGHS, 0000
 ROBERT B. HAVERTY, 0000
 THOMAS A. HEANEY, JR., 0000
 KURT M. HEINE, 0000
 MICHAEL R. HELMICK, 0000
 EMORY R. HELTON, 0000
 JAMES M. HEVERIN III, 0000
 JAMES R. HICKEY, 0000
 BRADFORD C. HILDRETH, 0000

RICHARD W. HOBERNIGHT, 0000
 FREDERICK B. HODGES, 0000
 MICHAEL J. HOFF, 0000
 SAMUEL A. HOLLOWAY, 0000
 CHARLES W. HOOPER, 0000
 RUSSELL J. HRDY, 0000
 JAMES H. HUGGINS II, 0000
 SUSAN L. HUGGLER, 0000
 JACK D. HUMPHREY JR., 0000
 BRIAN R. HURLEY, 0000
 MARK S. HURLEY, 0000
 ANTHONY R. IERARDI, 0000
 RONALD G. ISOM, 0000
 JAN P. ITHIER, 0000
 JOHN W. IVES, 0000
 KOREY V. JACKSON, 0000
 MARTIN A. JACOBY, 0000
 LARRY W. JAMESON, 0000
 PETER S. JANKER, 0000
 LESTER C. JAURON, 0000
 RICHARD B. JENKINS, 0000
 DOROTHY T. JOHNSON, 0000
 MARK H. JOHNSON, 0000
 RODNEY E. JOHNSON, 0000
 FREEMAN E. JONES, 0000
 JON M. JONES, 0000
 WILLIE C. JORDAN, 0000
 JAMES M. JOYNER, 0000
 JOSEPH JUDGE III, 0000
 RICHARD G. JUNG, SR., 0000
 WILLIAM E. KAISER, JR., 0000
 CHARLES T. KALLAM, 0000
 JOHN A. KARDOS, 0000
 ANTHONY B. KAZMIERSKI, 0000
 WILLIAM T. KEEGAN, 0000
 WILLIAM D. KENDRICK, 0000
 RICHARD P. KENNEY, 0000
 WILLIAM G. KIDD, 0000
 THOMAS S. KIDWELL, 0000
 CHARLES H. KING III, 0000
 ROGER L. KING, 0000
 ROBERT T. KLEPPINGER, 0000
 WILLIAM K. KLIMACK, 0000
 JARED A. KLINE, 0000
 JOHN C. KNIE, 0000
 DALE A. KNIEREMEN, 0000
 CHRISTINE B. KNIGHTON, 0000
 THOMAS L. KONING, 0000
 FRANCIS X. KOSICH, 0000
 KELLY D. KRUGER, 0000
 LINDA L. KRUGER, 0000
 MARCUS A. KUIPER, 0000
 CHARLES M. KUYK, 0000
 THOMAS L. LACROSSE, 0000
 HOWARD D. LAINE, 0000
 KEVIN T. LAMAR, 0000
 JEFFREY P. LAMOUE, 0000
 COREY R. LANGENWALTER, 0000
 JAMES P. LARSEN, 0000
 ROBERT K. LAWRENCE, 0000
 GARY A. LEE, 0000
 JEAN M. LEE, 0000
 MARY A. LEGERE, 0000
 VICTORIA A. LEIGNADIER, 0000
 JUDITH K. LEMIRE, 0000
 STEVEN M. LEMONS, 0000
 JAMES L. LEONARD, 0000
 FRANK G. LESTER III, 0000
 GABRIEL F. LEYVA, 0000
 JAMES A. LIEN, 0000
 ANTHONY S. LIETO, 0000
 MARILYNN K. LIETZ, 0000
 MICHAEL S. LINNINGTON, 0000
 MARK T. LITTLE, 0000
 MARK K. LITTLEJOHN, 0000
 GARY A. LONGHANY, 0000
 JOHN R. LUCH, 0000
 ALAN R. LYNN, 0000
 KENNETH A. MADDOX, 0000
 MARK W. MAIERS, 0000
 JANE F. MALISZEWSKI, 0000
 AUGUST R. MANCUSO III, 0000
 HENRY MANNING III, 0000
 ELTON R. MANSKE, 0000
 JULIE T. MANTA, 0000
 EDWIN H. MARTIN, 0000
 JAMES N. MARTIN, 0000
 ALEX MASCELLI, 0000
 MARY J. MASON, 0000
 FREDERICK J. MAXWELL, 0000
 THEODORE M. MAYER, 0000
 WILLIAM C. MAYVILLE, 0000
 LARRY D. MCCALLISTER, 0000
 HARRY W. MCCLELLAN, JR., 0000
 JAMES C. MCCONVILLE, 0000
 THOMAS L. MCCOOL, 0000
 CURTIS L. MCCOY, 0000
 MATTHEW P. MCGUINNESS, 0000
 COLLEEN L. MCGUIRE, 0000
 DAVID J. MCKENNA, 0000
 DONALD G. MCMILLIAN, 0000
 JAMES R. MEREDITH, 0000
 PAUL D. MEREDITH, 0000
 DAN C. MEYER, 0000
 JEFFREY C. MEYER, 0000
 ROBERT W. MILFORD, 0000
 RICHARD D. MILLER, JR., 0000
 WILLIAM J. MILLER, 0000
 MARK A. MILLEY, 0000
 AINSWORTH B. MILLS, 0000
 JOHN R. MINAHAN, 0000
 ANITA R. MINNIEFIELD, 0000
 JOHNNY F. MITCHELL, 0000
 STEPHEN D. MITCHELL, 0000
 JAMES E. MOENTMANN, 0000
 MICHAEL E. MOODY, 0000
 JOSEPH A. MOORE JR., 0000

CHRISTOPHER P. MOOSMANN, 0000
 CHERYL A. MORGAN, 0000
 JAMES R. MULVENNA, 0000
 JOSEPH V. MUSCARELLA, 0000
 RICHARD P. MUSTION, 0000
 WILLIAM P. NARRY, 0000
 ANTHONY D. NEAL, 0000
 ROBERT S. NELSON, 0000
 RONALD A. NEWTON, 0000
 THOMAS E. NICKERSON, 0000
 JAMES C. NIXON, 0000
 KEVIN S. NOONAN, 0000
 WILLIAM B. NORMAN, 0000
 KEITH S. NORRIS, 0000
 DOUGLAS J. NORTON, 0000
 HENRY J. NOWAK, 0000
 DEAN A. NOWOWIEJSKI, 0000
 DONALD C. OLSON, 0000
 JUAN L. ORAMA, 0000
 CHARLES C. OTTERSTEDT, 0000
 PHILLIP B. OWENS, 0000
 MICHAEL G. PADGETT, 0000
 RALPH G. PALLOTTA, 0000
 JAMES PALSHA, 0000
 RAYMOND P. PALUMBO, 0000
 JAMES P. PARKER, 0000
 GARY S. PATTON, 0000
 JOSEPH E. PECORARO, 0000
 RICHARD N. PEDERSEN, 0000
 JOSEPH E. PEDONE, 0000
 DAVID R. PELIZZON, 0000
 JOHN M. PEPPERS, 0000
 ALVIN A. PERKINS, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER S. PERKINS, 0000
 LARRY D. PERKINS, 0000
 MARK W. PERRIN, 0000
 RALPH J. PERRY, 0000
 STEVEN E. PETERS, 0000
 DAVID D. PHILLIPS, 0000
 ROBERT F. PIDGEON, 0000
 DANA J. PITTARD, 0000
 PATRICK N. PLOURD, 0000
 PETER J. PODBIELSKI, 0000
 LAWRENCE J. PORTOUW, 0000
 TERRRENCE M. POTTER, 0000
 CURTIS D. POTTS, 0000
 MICHAEL A. POWELL, 0000
 JOHN S. PRALL JR., 0000
 STANLEY C. PRECZEWSKI, 0000
 NANCY L. PRICE, 0000
 RICHARD PROETTO, 0000
 DAVID N. PRUITT, 0000
 JEFFREY L. PUTZ, 0000
 JEFFREY A. RARIC, 0000
 VALERIE A. RASMUSSEN, 0000
 WILLIAM RASMUSSEN, 0000
 GEORGE H. RHYNEANCE, 0000
 SHELLEY A. RICHARDSON, 0000
 THOMAS J. RICHARDSON, 0000
 WAYNE P. RICHARDSON, 0000
 WALTER RIEDLE JR., 0000
 JAMES A. ROBARDI, JR., 0000
 RONALD V. ROBINSON, 0000
 MICHAEL E. ROUND, 0000
 PETER J. ROWAN, 0000
 STEVE A. ROWE, 0000
 ROBERT A. ROWLETTE JR., 0000
 DAVID A. ROZELL, 0000
 FREDERICK S. RODESHEIM, 0000
 STEVEN L. RUNDLE, 0000
 DANIEL J. RUSSELL, 0000
 KEVIN D. SADERUP, 0000
 WILLIAM P. SAIA, 0000
 MILLARD V. SALES JR., 0000
 DONALD G. SALO JR., 0000
 SUE A. SANDUSKY, 0000
 EDWARD J. SANWALDT, 0000
 RICHARD G. SCHENCK, 0000
 RODNEY H. SCHMIDT, 0000
 STEPHEN G. SCHMITH, 0000
 DAVID A. SCHNEIDER, 0000
 RANDLE E. SCOTT, 0000
 TEDDY R. SEEL, 0000
 STEVEN P. SEEMENS, 0000
 JOHN E. SEWARD, 0000
 DAVID W. SHAFFER, 0000
 LAWRENCE G. SHATTUCK, 0000
 PATRICK L. SHERMAN, 0000
 KENNETH D. SHIVE, 0000
 STEVEN W. SHIVELY, 0000
 RICHARD C. SHIRANK, 0000
 JOHN A. SIMPSON JR., 0000
 STANLEY L. SIMS, 0000
 NATHAN K. SLATE, 0000
 WILLIAM M. SLAYTON, 0000
 NATHANIEL H. SLEDGE JR., 0000
 ANTOINETTE G. SMART, 0000
 JON P. SMART, 0000
 BILLY R. SMITH, 0000
 EUGENE A. SMITH, 0000
 JEFFREY C. SMITH, 0000
 JOSEPH M. SMITH, 0000
 KEITH A. SMITH, 0000
 MICHAEL SMITH, 0000
 TODD R. SMITH, 0000
 CHARLES T. SNIFFIN, 0000
 DAVID B. SNODGRASS, 0000
 KATHLEEN G. SNOOK, 0000
 THOMAS F. SPELLISSY, 0000
 JOHN J. SPINELLI, 0000
 LEE STAAB, 0000
 MARTIN N. STANTON, 0000
 THOMAS H. STANTON, 0000
 MARK L. STAPLETON, 0000
 KURT J. STEIN, 0000
 CAROLYN A. STEWART, 0000
 KURT S. STORY, 0000

HENRY M. STPIERRE, 0000
 KEVIN P. STRAMARA, 0000
 RICKI L. SULLIVAN, 0000
 THOMAS L. SWAREN, 0000
 RICHARD E. TALLEY, 0000
 GEORGE E. TEAGUE, 0000
 DAVID A. TEEPLES, 0000
 SCOTT E. THEIN, 0000
 FRANK J. THEISING, 0000
 ALBERT P. THOMAS, JR., 0000
 KELLY J. THOMAS, 0000
 RAYMOND A. THOMAS III, 0000
 JERRY D. THOMASON, 0000
 MASON W. THORNAL, 0000
 TERENCE M. TIDLER, 0000
 FRANK P. TODD, 0000
 THOMAS G. TORRANCE, 0000
 KONRAD J. TRAUTMAN, 0000
 KEVIN G. TROLLER, 0000
 STANLEY Q. TUNSTALL, SR., 0000
 LORRAINE E. TYACKE, 0000
 KURT F. UBBELOHDE, 0000
 LEWIS L. VANDYKE, 0000
 GILBERTO VILLAHERMOSA, 0000
 WILLIAM C. VOGT, 0000
 JEFFREY D. VORDERMARK, 0000
 ALLAN R. VOSBURGH, 0000
 PAUL H. VOSTI, 0000
 PATRICK D. VYE, 0000
 SUSAN K. WAGNER, 0000
 GARY R. WALLACE, 0000
 BETTE R. WASHINGTON, 0000
 GEORGE K. WASHINGTON, 0000
 BEN W. WEINER, 0000
 JASON S. WEINTRAUB, 0000
 DAVIS S. WELCH, 0000
 DONALD J. WELCH, JR., 0000
 STEPHEN K. WEST, 0000
 JOHN F. WHARTON, 0000
 GARY W. WHITEHEAD, 0000
 CHARLES K. WILLIAMS, 0000
 KEWYN L. WILLIAMS, 0000
 MARVIN W. WILLIAMS, 0000
 RICHARD A. WILLIAMS, 0000
 DANIEL M. WILSON, JR., 0000
 MARILEE D. WILSON, 0000
 WALTER E. WININGER, JR., 0000
 JOHN W. WISEMAN II, 0000
 PETER V. WOJCIK, 0000
 ROBERTA A. WOODS, 0000
 JEFFREY W. YAEGER, 0000
 BRUCE P. YOST, 0000
 THOMAS W. YOUNG, 0000
 CURT S. ZARGAN, 0000
 PETER J. ZIELINSKI, 0000
 X0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY CHAPLAINS (CH) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

HANSON R. BONEY, 0000 CH
 DAVID H. BRADFORD, 0000 CH
 WILFRED BREWSTER, JR., 0000 CH
 JAMES R. GRIFFITH, 0000 CH
 MICHAEL A. HOYT, 0000 CH
 CLARKE L. MCGRIFF, 0000 CH
 DANIEL A. MILLER, 0000 CH
 DANIEL K. NAGLE, 0000 CH
 REES R. STEVENS, 0000 CH
 REINALDO VELEZ, 0000 CH
 JAMES E. WALKER, 0000 CH
 WILLIAM D. WILLETT, 0000 CH

IN THE MARINE CORPS

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

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH D. APODACA, 0000
 CHARLES A. JOHNSON, JR., 0000

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

To be lieutenant colonel

JOHN A. AHO, 0000
 SCOTT D. AIKEN, 0000
 BENJAMIN F. ALLEGRETTI, 0000
 BERN J. ALTMAN, 0000
 BRIAN J. ANDERSON, 0000
 JOEL D. ANDERSON, 0000
 EUGENE N. APICELLA, 0000
 ROBERT K. ARMSTRONG, JR., 0000
 TIMOTHY T. ARMSTRONG, 0000
 VAUGHN A. ARY, 0000
 JOE D. BAKER II, 0000
 KATHY A. BARNICK, 0000
 DENNIS J. BARNHAM, 0000
 JOHN D. BARTH, 0000
 KEVIN M. BARTH, 0000
 RICHARD W. BAXTER, 0000
 JAMES C. BECKER, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL H. BELDING, 0000
 RONNIE A. BERNAL, 0000
 MONTE G. BERSCHENK, 0000
 MITCHELL S. BIONDICH, 0000
 TRENT BLACKSON, 0000
 GREGORY F. BONDI, 0000
 DAVID H. BOOTH, 0000
 EUGENE N. BOSE, 0000
 ROBERT L. BOWDEN III, 0000

JOSEPH G. BOWE, 0000
 MICHAEL R. BOWERSOX, 0000
 PETER L. BOWLING, 0000
 JEFFRY S. BRADY, 0000
 IRIC B. BRESSLER, 0000
 GARY E. BROWN, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL P. BRUEN, 0000
 ERIC V. BRYANT, 0000
 JAMES E. BUDWAY, 0000
 DAVID L. BURCHINAL, 0000
 ADRIAN W. BURKE, 0000
 GERARD K. BURNS, 0000
 MICHAEL H. BURT, 0000
 BRETT K. BURTIS, 0000
 JOHN M. BUTTERWORTH, 0000
 BRENNAN T. BYRNE, 0000
 BRIAN J. BYRNE, 0000
 GREGORY R. CALDWELL, 0000
 PATRICK J. CAMPBELL, 0000
 JOHN W. CARL, 0000
 CARL W. CARRELL, 0000
 CHARLES K. CARROLL, 0000
 FRANCIS X. CARROLL, 0000
 CARLEN T. CHARLESTON, 0000
 JAMES B. CHARTIER, 0000
 CHARLES G. CHIAROTTI, 0000
 JAMES W. CLARK, JR., 0000
 JAMIE E. CLARK, 0000
 KENNETH W. CLARK, 0000
 ROBERT D. CLARK, 0000
 THOMAS S. CLARK III, 0000
 CRAIG R. CLEMENT, 0000
 ROBERT C. CLEMENTS, 0000
 ROBERT W. COATE, 0000
 DAVID W. COFFMAN, 0000
 RICHARD D. COLEMAN, JR., 0000
 ADAM J. COPP, 0000
 STEPHEN P. CORCORAN, 0000
 GEOFFREY A. CORSON, 0000
 WILLIAM R. COSTANTINI, 0000
 JOHN D. COWLEY, 0000
 EDWIN B. COYLE III, 0000
 DOUGLAS F. CROMWELL, 0000
 KRISTA J. CROSETTI, 0000
 RONALD R. DALTON, 0000
 NEWELL B. DAY II, 0000
 JEFFERY E. DEAROLPH, 0000
 RICHARD A. DEFOREST, 0000
 PATRICK M. DELATTRE, 0000
 PETER L. DELORIEL, 0000
 JAMES G. DERRALL, 0000
 KURT E. DIEHL, 0000
 MARK V. DILLARD, 0000
 WILLIAM L. DOLLEY, 0000
 GREGORY M. DOUQUET, 0000
 ROBERT T. DURKIN, 0000
 DANIEL W. ELZIE, 0000
 CLAYTON O. EVERS, JR., 0000
 JOACHIM W. FACK, 0000
 MARK C. FELSKE, 0000
 PATRICK D. FORD, 0000
 TIMOTHY S. FOSTER, 0000
 STEVEN D. FOX, 0000
 MICHAEL M. FRAZIER, 0000
 BENNETT C. FREEMON, 0000
 SCOTT B. FROSCH, 0000
 STEPHEN J. GABRI, 0000
 JAMES M. GANNON, 0000
 ROBERT L. GARDNER, 0000
 DAVID P. GARNISH, 0000
 KENNETH E. GASKILL, JR., 0000
 ROBERT W. GATES, 0000
 BRAD R. GERSTBERG, 0000
 THOMAS C. GILLESPIE, 0000
 BRENT P. GODDARD, 0000
 ROBERT G. GOLDEN III, 0000
 GILBERTO C. GONZALEZ, 0000
 THOMAS A. GORRY, 0000
 KIMBERLY A. GRAHAM, 0000
 DAVID S. GRANTHAM, 0000
 ANTHONY J. GRECO, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL S. GROCAN, 0000
 KEVIN L. GROSS, 0000
 BRETT J. GROSSHANS, 0000
 MICHAEL A. GROVES, 0000
 ROLANDO GUZMAN, 0000
 GREGG T. HABEL, 0000
 JOHN R. HAHN, 0000
 RONALD D. HAHN, JR., 0000
 JACK Q. HALL, 0000
 JEFFREY W. HANNAY, 0000
 TIMOTHY G. HANSON, 0000
 JOSEPH K. HAVILAND, 0000
 JEFFREY M. HAYNES, 0000
 BRENT HEARN II, 0000
 JEFFREY J. HEDERER, 0000
 KENNETH S. HELFRICH, 0000
 DALE W. HERDEGEN, 0000
 DAN P. HICKEY, 0000
 PATRICK R. HOGAN, 0000
 JAMES A. HOGBERG, 0000
 LARRY J. HOLCOMB, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER B. HOUSER, 0000
 MICHAEL J. HOWER, 0000
 MICHAEL R. HUDSON, 0000
 JAY L. HUSTON, 0000
 STEVEN M. IMMEL, 0000
 JEROME A. JACKSON, 0000
 RUSSELL E. JAMISON, JR., 0000
 HAROLD D. JOHNSON III, 0000
 KIM C. JOHNSON, 0000
 MICHAEL J. JOHNSON, 0000
 WILLIAM A. JOHNSON, 0000
 KEVIN M. JONES, 0000
 MICHAEL S. JONES, 0000
 CHARLES A. KELLY, 0000
 KEVIN M. KELLY, 0000

STEVEN A. KELLY, 0000
 PAUL J. KENNEDY, 0000
 PHILLIP W. KENOYER, 0000
 BRIAN D. KERL, 0000
 ERIC P. KESSLER, 0000
 ASAD A. KHAN, 0000
 ROBERT F. KILLACKEY, JR., 0000
 EARNEST D. KING, 0000
 JAMES C. KING II, 0000
 KEVIN D. KING, 0000
 CHARLES L. KIRKLAND, 0000
 DOUGLAS R. KLEINSMITH, 0000
 DARRIC M. KNIGHT, 0000
 BARRY L. KRAGEL, 0000
 BERNARD J. KRUEGER, 0000
 PAUL A. KUCKUK, 0000
 KEVAN B. KVENLOG, 0000
 JAMES G. KYSER IV, 0000
 MICHAEL E. LANGLEY, 0000
 MICHAEL L. LAWRENCE, 0000
 PAUL J. LEBLANC, 0000
 GARY C. LEHMANN, 0000
 LAWRENCE S. LOCH, 0000
 PATRICK G. LOONEY, 0000
 MATTHEW A. LOPEZ, 0000
 JON K. LOWREY, 0000
 KENNETH D. LOY, 0000
 MARC L. MAGRAM, 0000
 JOAQUIN F. MALAVET, 0000
 JOHN C. MALIK III, 0000
 JOHN P. MANGOLD, 0000
 JOSEPH C. MARELIO, JR., 0000
 RONALD J. MARTIN, 0000
 WAYNE R. MARTIN, 0000
 ANTONIO J. MATTALIANO, JR., 0000
 TERESA F. MCCARTHY, 0000
 ROB B. MCCLARY, 0000
 MARC D. MCCOY, 0000
 MICHAEL V. McDONALD, 0000
 RUSSELL O. MCQUEE, 0000
 MARK D. MCGRAW, 0000
 STEPHEN A. MEDEIROS, 0000
 MARK W. MELORO, 0000
 JEFFREY L. MERCHANT, 0000
 LAWRENCE E. MICCOLIS, 0000
 LAUREN R. MIHLON, 0000
 ROBERT M. MILLER, 0000
 MICHAEL T. MIZE, 0000
 MICHAEL F. MORRIS, 0000
 DONALD C. MORSE, 0000
 CHRISTEN A. NIELSEN, 0000
 JAMES E. NIERLE, 0000
 STEPHEN NITZSCHKE, 0000
 GREGG P. OLSON, 0000
 DAVID P. OLSZOWY, 0000
 JOHN P. OROURKE, 0000
 ROY A. OSBORN, 0000
 DAVID F. OVERTON, 0000
 STEPHEN M. PACE, 0000
 RICK A. PAGEL, 0000
 MICHAEL S. PALERMO, JR., 0000
 HOWARD T. PARKER, JR., 0000
 RUSSELL A. PAULSEN, 0000
 DUANE B. PERRY, 0000
 NORMAN L. PETERS, 0000
 DONNA J. PETTIT, 0000
 ROBERT G. PETTIT, 0000
 DAVID K. PIGMAN, 0000
 JOHN M. POLLACK, 0000
 RICHARD E. POSEY, 0000
 CATHY M. POWALSKI, 0000
 LAULIE S. POWELL, 0000
 JOEL R. POWERS, 0000
 DAVID A. RABABY, 0000
 ROBERT N. RACKHAM, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL R. RAMOS, 0000
 PATRICK L. REDMON, 0000
 TERENCE W. REID, 0000
 CARL A. REYNOSO, 0000
 JOSEPH P. RICHARDS, 0000
 CURTIS M. ROGERS III, 0000
 DAVID S. ROWE, 0000
 JEREMIAH I. RUPERT, 0000
 SPENCER RUTLEDGE III, 0000
 PHILIP G. RYNN, 0000
 STANLEY W. SALAMON, 0000
 STEVE SCHEPS, 0000
 TODD W. SCHLUND, 0000
 ROBERT C. SCHUTZ IV, 0000
 GARRY S. SCHWARTZ, 0000
 RUSSELL W. SCOTT III, 0000
 DOUGLAS L. SEAL, 0000
 SCOT S. SEITZ, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER A. SHARP, 0000
 MARK V. SHIGLEY, 0000
 MATTHEW SHIHADAH, 0000
 MARTIN H. SITLER, 0000
 BARTON S. SLOAT, 0000
 GEORGE W. SMITH, JR., 0000
 JAY C. SMITH, 0000
 RANDALL W. SMITH, 0000
 RUSSELL H. SMITH, 0000
 MATTHEW J. SMITHMECK, 0000
 ANDREW L. SOLGERE, 0000
 MICHAEL R. STAHLMAN, 0000
 RODNEY STATEN, 0000
 RICHARD W. STAUFFER, JR., 0000
 THEODORE J. STOUT, 0000
 DANNY R. STRAND, 0000
 FREDERICK W. STURCKOW, 0000
 ARTHUR T. STURGEON, JR., 0000
 DANIEL J. SULLIVAN, 0000
 DIANNE L. SUMNER, 0000
 SUSAN C. SWANSON, 0000
 JEROME E. SZEWCHYNSKI, 0000
 KATHY L. TATE, 0000
 DAVID M. TAYLOR, 0000

MARK A. TAYLOR, 0000
 DON M. THANARS, 0000
 ALAN L. THOMA, 0000
 GREGORY S. THOMAS, 0000
 JOSEPH J. THOMAS, 0000
 WILBERT E. THOMAS, 0000
 KENNETH G. THOMPSON, 0000
 FRANK D. TOPLEY, JR., 0000
 NORBERT J. TORRES, 0000
 ERIC M. TRANTER, 0000
 ERIC B. TREWORGY, 0000
 BRAD E. VALDYKE, 0000
 ALVIN J. VANSTEENBERGEN, 0000
 JOSE F. VAZQUEZ, 0000
 THOMAS M. VILAS, 0000
 ROBERT E. WALLACE, 0000
 RONALD D. WALLACE, 0000
 JOHN S. WALSH, 0000
 THOMAS W. WARD, 0000
 PAUL J. WEBER, 0000
 ROBERT K. WEINKLE, JR., 0000
 ROBERT F. WENDEL, 0000
 RICHARD M. WERSEL, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL B. WEST, 0000
 KEVIN L. WHITE, 0000
 VICTOR WIGFALL II, 0000
 JAMES M. WILLIAMS, 0000
 ROBERT C. WOMELSDORF, 0000
 MICHAEL K. WOODWARD, 0000
 LLOYD A. WRIGHT, 0000
 DANIEL D. YOO, 0000
 JOHN J. YUHAS, JR., 0000
 JEFFREY R. ZELLER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAME OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MA-
 RINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

WILLIAM S. AITKEN, 0000
 GREGORY S. AKERS, 0000
 JUAN G. AYALA, 0000
 THOMAS B. BAILEY III, 0000
 MARK H. BALBERGER, 0000
 DAVID J. BARILE, 0000
 THOMAS BRAND, 0000
 RAYMOND T. BRIGHT, 0000
 JOSEPH A. BRUDER IV, 0000
 CATKIN M. BURTON, 0000
 WILLIAM H. CALLAHAN, JR., 0000
 THOMAS L. CARIKER, 0000
 JEFFREY L. CASPER, 0000
 JOSEPH D. CASSEL, JR., 0000
 GUY M. CLOSE, 0000
 ARTHUR J. CORBETT, 0000
 MATTHEW A. DAPSON, 0000
 KEVIN J. DELMOUR, 0000
 ROBERT W. DESTAFNEY, 0000
 JOE D. DOWDY, 0000
 ROBERT J. DRUMMOND, 0000
 MICHAEL A. DYER, 0000
 LAURIN P. ECK, 0000
 KEITH B. FERRELL, 0000
 RICHARD J. FINDLEY, 0000
 MICHAEL E. FINNIE, 0000
 GEORGE E. FLEMING III, 0000
 WARREN J. FOERSCH, 0000
 KENNETH P. GARDINER, 0000
 DAVID C. GARZA, 0000
 THOMAS E. GAZER, 0000
 TERRANCE A. GOULD, 0000
 WILLIAM W. GRIFFIN, JR., 0000
 JAMES E. HARBISON, 0000
 WILLIAM J. HARTIG, 0000
 MICHAEL L. HAWKINS, 0000
 DAVID R. HEINZ, 0000
 KEVIN G. HERRMANN, 0000
 JOHN P. HOLDEN, 0000
 GLENN M. HOPPE, 0000
 JAMES R. HOWCROFT, 0000
 WILLIAM D. HUGHES III, 0000
 TIMOTHY L. HUNTER, 0000
 DOUGLAS J. JEROTHE, 0000
 RONALD J. JOHNSON, 0000
 ROBERT E. JOSLIN, 0000
 DAVID P. KARCHER, JR., 0000
 STEVEN M. KEIM, 0000
 KEVIN L. KELLEY, 0000
 LAWRENCE M. KING, JR., 0000
 JOSEPH M. LANCE III, 0000
 JAMES B. LASTER, 0000
 KEITH A. LAWLESS, 0000
 TIMOTHY C. LEARN, 0000
 BEVELY G. LEZE, 0000
 ALAN R. LEWIS, 0000
 MARC C. LIEBER, 0000
 ERIC T. LITAKER, 0000
 STEPHEN P. LYNCH, 0000
 CRAIG A. MARSHALL, 0000
 JEFFREY L. MARSHALL, 0000
 FRANK D. MAZUR, 0000
 EDWARD M. MCCUE III, 0000
 KENNETH F. MCKENZIE, JR., 0000
 DANIEL L. MC MANUS, 0000
 CRAIG M. MC VAY, 0000
 LEO A. MERCADO, JR., 0000
 JONATHAN G. MICLOT, 0000
 DAVID J. MOLLAHAN, 0000
 JOHN E. MONTEMAYOR, 0000
 MEDIO MONTI, 0000
 CHARLES R. MYERS, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER E. O'CONNOR, 0000
 KEITH A. OLIVER, 0000
 ROGER J. OLTMAN, 0000
 BERNARD E. O'NEIL, 0000
 JOHN E. PAGE, 0000
 ANTHONY B. PAIS, 0000

MICHAEL J. PAULOVICH, 0000
 KAREN S. PROKOP, 0000
 JOHN C. PROSS, 0000
 THOMAS F. QUALLS, JR., 0000
 DAVID G. REIST, 0000
 WILLIAM E. RIZZIO, JR., 0000
 ROBERT L. RUSCH, 0000
 MICHAEL L. SAWYERS, 0000
 MICHAEL H. SCHMITT, 0000
 KEITH A. SEIWELL, 0000
 MARK S. SHAFER, 0000
 GARY P. SHAW, 0000
 ROLF A. SIEGEL, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER H. SONNTAG, 0000
 COSMAS R. SPOFFORD, 0000
 BYRON F. STEBBINS, 0000
 MARTIN J. SULLIVAN, 0000
 SUSAN G. SWEATT, 0000
 PETER J. TALLERI, 0000
 JOHN A. TERRELL, 0000
 DWIGHT E. TRAFTON, 0000
 ROBERT S. TROUT, 0000
 PETER T. UNDERWOOD, 0000
 GLENN L. WAGNER, 0000
 ROBERT P. WAGNER III, 0000
 ALAN W. WALLACE, 0000
 ROBERT S. WALSH, 0000
 DAVID L. WALTER, 0000
 GLENN M. WALTERS, 0000
 GARY A. WARNER, 0000
 PATRICIA F. WARREN, 0000
 MICHAEL M. WEBER, 0000
 OTTO W. WEIGL, JR., 0000
 ANTHONY J. WENDEL III, 0000
 GARY L. WILLISON, 0000
 DAVID M. WUNDER, 0000
 LON M. YEARY, 0000
 RONNY L. YOWELL, 0000
 DOUGLAS P. YUROVICH, 0000

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 commander

EDWARD SCHAEFER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY
 APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE
 UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION
 5721.

To be lieutenant commander

TERRY W. BENNETT, 0000
 ANTHONY C. CREGO, 0000
 GREGORY T. ECKERT, 0000
 JOHN C. GROVE, 0000
 MARK A. HOCHSTETLER, 0000
 JAMES W. HUDSON, 0000
 AARON JOHNSON, 0000
 JOHN P. MERLI, 0000
 STEVEN B. MULESKI, 0000
 STEVEN K. SPEIGHT, 0000
 NATHAN B. SUKOLS, 0000
 JON B. WALSH, 0000
 LAWRENCE R. WILSON, 0000

IN THE ARMY

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

To be colonel

KENT W. ABERNATHY, 0000
 CARLO J. ACCARDI, 0000
 FREDERICK AIKENS, 0000
 WILLIAM L. ALDRED, JR., 0000
 BOYD L. ALEXANDER, 0000
 ANTHONY ALFORD, 0000
 CHARLES M. ALLEN, JR., 0000
 JAMES M. ALLEN, 0000
 PATRICK D. ALLEN, 0000
 RONALD C. ALLEN, 0000
 JOHN R. ALVARADO, 0000
 NICHOLAS C. AMODEO, 0000
 ROMA J. AMUNDSON, 0000
 MARCIA L. ANDREWS, 0000
 PERRY E. ANTHONY, 0000
 JAMES F. ARGABRIGHT, 0000
 JAMES W. ATCHISON, 0000
 MICHAEL E. AVAKIAN, 0000
 PETER M. AYWARD, 0000
 JOHN T. BAKER, 0000
 ROBERT K. BASTER, 0000
 PAUL BARABANI, 0000
 LOGAN B. BARBEE, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER R. BARBOUR, 0000
 HUGH G. BARCLAY IV, 0000
 KENNETH P. BARDEN, JR., 0000
 JOHN I. BARNES III, 0000
 WAYNE C. BARR, JR., 0000
 PERRY E. BARTH, 0000
 TIMOTHY L. BARTHOLOMEW, 0000
 DAVID E. BASSETT, JR., 0000
 GARY W. BAUMANN, 0000
 RICHARD A. BAYLOR, 0000
 RICHARD A. BAYSINGER, 0000
 WILLIAM G. BEARD, 0000
 DONALD L. BELANGER, 0000
 THOMAS A. BELLOTTE, 0000
 ROY C. BENNETT, 0000
 RICHARD J. BERESFORD, 0000
 LAWRENCE E. BERGESON, 0000
 MARCELO R. BERGQUIST, 0000
 GEORGE M. BESHENICH, 0000
 VICTORIA A. BETTERTON, 0000
 VICTOR A. BETZOLD, 0000
 LETTIE J. BIEN, 0000
 DONALD J. BILLONI, 0000
 EDWARD J. BINSEEL, 0000
 ERNEST BIO, 0000
 CHARLES D. BLAKENEY, 0000
 ROBERT C. BLIX, 0000
 JOSEPH G. BLUME, JR., 0000
 KEITH J. BOBENMOYER, 0000
 ROBERT C. BOLTON, 0000
 PHILLIP BOOKERT, 0000
 CANFIELD D. BOONE, 0000
 THOMAS P. BOYLE, JR., 0000
 JAMES F. BOYNTON, JR., 0000
 PAMELA J. BRADY, 0000
 ALLEN E. BREWER, 0000
 GORDON M. BREWER, 0000
 PHILIP S. BREWSTER III, 0000
 WILLIAM E. BRITTIN, 0000
 DEBRA A. BROADWATER, 0000
 CURTIS R. BROOKS, 0000
 TILDEN L. BROOKS, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL P. BROWN, 0000
 STEVEN L. BROWN, 0000
 LOUIS J. BRUNE III, 0000
 WILLIAM J. BRUNKHORST, 0000
 RALPH T. BRUNSON, 0000
 RICHARD L. BUCK, 0000
 TERRY L. BULLER, 0000
 ROBERT W. BURNS, 0000
 CHARLES N. BUSICK, 0000
 THOMAS D. BUTLER, JR., 0000
 GLEN CADLE, JR., 0000
 JOHNNIE L. CAHOON, JR., 0000
 SAMUEL E. CANIPE, 0000
 THOMAS W. CAPLES, 0000
 HUBERT D. CAPPS, 0000
 PHILIP R. CARLIN, 0000
 BRUCE W. CARLSON, 0000
 ANTHONY J. CARLUCCI, 0000
 MELVIN J. CARR, 0000
 JOHN D. CARROLL, 0000
 ROOSEVELT CARTER, JR., 0000
 MARK A. CENTRA, 0000
 WALTER B. CHAHANOVICH, 0000
 ROBERT J. CHANDLER JR., 0000
 ROBERT L. CHILCOAT, 0000
 MARK J. CHRISTIAN, 0000
 DONALD L. CHU, 0000
 MICHAEL L. CHURCH, 0000
 ALAN D. CHUTE, 0000
 EUGENE CLARK, 0000
 RICHARD L. CLARK, 0000
 ROBERT G. CLARK, 0000
 WILLIAM J. CLEGG III, 0000
 LESTER L. CLEMENT, 0000
 WILLIAM G. COBB, 0000
 GERALD W. COCHRANE, 0000
 WILLIAM B. COLLINS, 0000
 PETER M. COLLOTON, 0000
 MARTIN D. COMPTON, 0000
 MICHAEL G. COMPTON, 0000
 CHARLES R. CONN, 0000
 JAMES A. CORMAN, 0000
 STEPHEN G. CORRIGAN, 0000
 JAMES W. CORRIVEAU, 0000
 ROBERT O. CORTEZ, 0000
 BILLY J. COSSON, 0000
 HARRY E. COULTER JR., 0000
 BRARRY A. COX, 0000
 WARREN G. CRECY, 0000
 JOSEPH A. CUELLAR, 0000
 WILLIAM N. CULBERTSON, 0000
 WALTER R. CYRUS, 0000
 JEAN L. DABREAU, 0000
 JOHN A. DAROCHA, 0000
 DAVID M. DAVISON, 0000
 MICHAEL E. DEBOLD, 0000
 ROBERT F. DELCAMPO, 0000
 WILLIAM DENEK, 0000
 LYNNE E. DERIE, 0000
 JOSEPH R. DEWITT, 0000
 RONALD F. DIANA, 0000
 JOSEPH B. DIBARTOLOMEO, 0000
 RICHARD R. DILLON, 0000
 THADDEUS A. DMUCHOWSKI, 0000
 JAMES M. DOBBINS, 0000
 HARRY C. DOBSON, 0000
 MICHAEL F. DOSSETT, 0000
 WILLIAM C. DOWD, 0000
 JAMES D. DOYLE, 0000
 JOSEPH H. DOYLE, 0000
 DONALD A. DRISCOLL, 0000
 DEBRA A. DUBOIS, 0000
 ROGER B. DUFF, 0000
 DONALD C. DURANT, 0000
 KENT J. DURING, 0000
 LOUIS R. DURNYA, 0000
 JOHN B. DWYER, 0000
 RONALD J. DYKSTRA, 0000
 MARK M. EARLEY, 0000
 STEVEN D. ECKER, 0000
 MARI K. EDER, 0000
 GREGORY B. EDWARDS, 0000
 KENNETH D. EDWARDS, 0000
 THOMAS R. EICHENBERG, 0000
 DAVID J. ELICERIO, 0000
 DALE G. ELLIS, 0000
 KATHLEEN K. ELLIS, 0000
 ALLAN I. ENRIGHT, 0000
 WILLIAM L. ENYAIRT JR., 0000
 THOMAS P. ERSFELD, 0000
 BEVERLY J. ERTMAN, 0000
 GEORGE C. ESCHER, 0000
 CARL W. EVANS, 0000

WILLIAM C. FALKNER, 0000
 JOHN M. FARENISH, 0000
 JACKIE D. FARR, 0000
 GERALD T. FAVERO, 0000
 PETER S. FEDORKOWICZ, 0000
 DONALD P. FIORINO, 0000
 ROLAND A. FLORES, 0000
 PATSY M. FLOYD, 0000
 DOUGLAS J. FONTENOT, 0000
 GERALD W. FONTENOT, 0000
 ROBERT G. FORD, 0000
 HENRY J. FORESMAN JR., 0000
 BRIAN A. FORZANI, 0000
 FOSTER F. FOUNTAIN, 0000
 WALTER E. FOUNTAIN, 0000
 PETER D. FOX, 0000
 STEPHEN R. FRANK, 0000
 DALE L. FRINK, 0000
 DONALD W. FULLER, 0000
 PAMELA A. FUNK, 0000
 JAMES L. GABRIELLI, 0000
 BERTRAND R. GAGNE, 0000
 RONALD S. GALLIMORE, 0000
 ALBERT J. GARDNER, 0000
 GLENN H. GARDNER, 0000
 JAMES P. GARDNER, 0000
 RICHARD A. GARZA, 0000
 JERRY T. GASKIN, 0000
 REGINALD B. GEARY, 0000
 RICHARD P. GEBHART, 0000
 DAVID L. GERSTENLAUER, 0000
 DANIEL G. GLAQUINTO, 0000
 GERALD G. GIBBONS JR., 0000
 WILLIAM J. GLASSER, 0000
 WILLIAM J. GOTHARD, 0000
 MARTIN L. GRABER, 0000
 ROBERT D. GRAMS, 0000
 ANTHONY J. GRATSON, 0000
 THOMAS R. GREATHOUSE, 0000
 ELLEN P. GREENE, 0000
 TERRY L. GREENWELL, 0000
 DAVID J. GROVUM, 0000
 MICHAEL A. GRUETT, 0000
 RAUL A. GRUMBERG, 0000
 WILLIAM C. HAAS, 0000
 WILLIAM B. HAGOOD, 0000
 JEANETTE G. HALL, 0000
 RICK D. HALL, 0000
 ROBERT E. HAMMEL, 0000
 EMANUEL HAMPTON, 0000
 ROBERT C. HARGREAVES, 0000
 BLAKE L. HARMON, 0000
 LINDA C. HARREL, 0000
 DONALD J. HARRINGTON, 0000
 EARNEST L. HARRINGTON, JR., 0000
 STEPHEN J. HATCH, 0000
 MARK C. HATFIELD, 0000
 FLOYD D. HAUGHT, 0000
 REED T. HAUSER, 0000
 LAWRENCE M. HAYDEN, 0000
 ROBERT W. HAYES, JR., 0000
 WILLIAM J. HAYES, 0000
 HARRY W. HELDRICH IV, 0000
 KARL D. HELLER, 0000
 HOWARD W. HELSER, 0000
 CARY R. HENDERSON, 0000
 KATHY L. HENNES, 0000
 JEFFREY W. HETHERINGTON, 0000
 JAMES D. HOGAN, 0000
 GAROLD D. HOLCOMBE, 0000
 FRANK E. HOLLAND III, 0000
 THOMAS M. HOLLENHORST, 0000
 NOREEN J. HOLTHAUS, 0000
 GREGORY R. HOOS, 0000
 THOMAS F. HOPKINS, 0000
 DEBORAH Y. HOWELS, 0000
 MELVIN A. HOWRY, 0000
 STEPHAN K. HUCAL, 0000
 JOHN C. HUDSON, 0000
 PAUL F. HULSLANDER, 0000
 STEPHEN J. HUMMEL, 0000
 BERNIE R. HUNSTAD, 0000
 CHARLES H. HUNT, JR., 0000
 LIMEL HUNTER, JR., 0000
 PAUL J. HUTTER, 0000
 JAMES G. IVEY, 0000
 ROBERT C. JACKLE, 0000
 MARK H. JACKSON, 0000
 RAYMOND JARDINE, JR., 0000
 STEPHANIE A. JEFFORDS, 0000
 DANIEL J. JENSEN, 0000
 MARK A. JENSEN, 0000
 CRAIG D. JOHNSON, 0000
 DAVID H. JOHNSON, 0000
 ERIC P. JOHNSON, 0000
 FREDERICK J. JOHNSON, 0000
 JEFFREY W. JOHNSON, 0000
 ROBERT W. JOHNSON, 0000
 SCOTT W. JOHNSON, 0000
 GARY L. JONES, 0000
 KAFFIA JONES, 0000
 TESS S. KANAMINE, 0000
 JAMES M. KANE, 0000
 JAMES L. KARPINSKI, 0000
 GUSTAV G. KAUFMANN, 0000
 WILLIAM J. KAUTT III, 0000
 DEMPSEY D. KEE, 0000
 GARY E. KELLY, 0000
 LARRY T. KIMLICH, 0000
 GARY C. KLEIST, 0000
 PETER KOLE, JR., 0000
 GERY W. KOSEL, 0000
 RANDOLPH J. KRANEPUHL, 0000
 DONALD L. KREBS, 0000
 JOHN R. KREYE, 0000
 KIRK M. KRIST, 0000
 NORMA J. KRUEGER, 0000

RANDALL W. LAMBRECHT, 0000
 MARK E. LANDERS, 0000
 WILLIAM H. LANDON, 0000
 LENWOOD A. LANDRUM, 0000
 ROBERT E. LANDSTROM, 0000
 DOUGLAS J. LANGE, 0000
 DAVID E. LECKRONE, 0000
 JERRY G. LEDOUX, 0000
 SCOTT D. LEGWOLD, 0000
 JEFFREY L. LEIBY, 0000
 RICHARD L. LEMMERMAN, 0000
 PETER S. LENNON, 0000
 RICHARD A. LENNON, 0000
 JAMES W. LENOIR, 0000
 GREGORY W. LEONG, 0000
 ROBERT S. LEPIANKA, 0000
 LESTER H. LETTERMAN, 0000
 GLENN R. LEVAR, 0000
 ALBAN LIANG, 0000
 PATRICIA LINDGRENGRICHNIK, 0000
 ELIZABETH J. LIPPMANN, 0000
 DENNIS A. LITTLE, 0000
 DAVID A. LIVELY, 0000
 ROGER A. LIVINGSTON, 0000
 JOHN I. LODEN, 0000
 CORY L. LOFTUS, 0000
 HENRY S. LONG, JR., 0000
 TOM C. LOOMIS, 0000
 FELIPE J. LOPEZ, 0000
 JERRY G. LOVE, 0000
 ROBERT L. LOWERY, JR., 0000
 DAVID M. LOWRY, 0000
 JOHN D. LYBRAND, JR., 0000
 NEIL D. MACKENZIE II, 0000
 CHRISTINE T. MALLOS, 0000
 HENRY M. MARTIN, JR., 0000
 SHIRLEY M. MARTIN, 0000
 HECTOR M. MARTIR, 0000
 MATTHEW G. MASNIK, 0000
 LARRY J. MASSEY, 0000
 ROBERT A. MAST, JR., 0000
 JOHN R. MATHEWS, 0000
 TERRELL W. MATHEWS, 0000
 JEFF W. MATHIS III, 0000
 MICHAEL D. MATZ, 0000
 GEORGE P. MAUGHAN, 0000
 WILLIAM R. MAY, 0000
 ELLSWORTH E. MAYFIELD, 0000
 JOSE S. MAYORGA, JR., 0000
 MICHAEL E. MCCALISTER, 0000
 DENNIS P. MCCANN, 0000
 MATTHEW A. MCCOY, 0000
 WEYMAN W. MCCRANIE, JR., 0000
 JERRY T. MCDANIEL, 0000
 COLONEL Z. MCFADDEN, 0000
 GARY R. MCFADDEN, 0000
 MICHAEL W. MCHENRY, 0000
 BYRON W. MCKINNON, 0000
 GARY A. MCKOWN, 0000
 LESA M. MCMANIGELL, 0000
 KURT M. MCMILLEN, 0000
 KENNETH B. MCNEEL, 0000
 DAVID A. MCPHERSON, 0000
 ADOLPH MCQUEEN, 0000
 KENNETH D. MCRAE, 0000
 ARSENY J. MELNICK, 0000
 GLENN L. MELTON, 0000
 EDWIN MENDEZ, 0000
 JOHN M. MENTER, 0000
 MICHAEL E. MERGENS, 0000
 THOMAS E. MERTENS, 0000
 GERALD L. MEYER, 0000
 EVAN G. MILLER, 0000
 GREGORY R. MILLER, 0000
 RUFUS C. MITCHELL, 0000
 BLAISE S. MO, 0000
 RANDY M. MOATE, 0000
 DOUGLAS MOLLENKOPF, 0000
 CHARLES E. MOORE, 0000
 JOHN D. MOORS, JR., 0000
 WILLIAM J. MORRISSEY, 0000
 RONALD O. MORROW, 0000
 CRAIG H. MORTON, 0000
 BRUCE E. MUNSON, 0000
 PATRICK A. MURPHY, 0000
 ROBERT E. MURPHY, 0000
 STEPHEN T. NAKANO, 0000
 JOSE A. NANEZ, JR., 0000
 DAVID B. NELSON, JR., 0000
 HOMER I. NEWTON, 0000
 CHARLES D. NICHOLS, JR., 0000
 TERRY R. NOACK, 0000

MICHELE H. NOEL, 0000
 RALPH E. NOOKS, JR., 0000
 MARY R. NORRIS, 0000
 PAUL T. NOTTINGHAM III, 0000
 JOHN M. NOWAK, 0000
 CASSEL J. NUTTER, JR., 0000
 WAYNE A. OAKS, 0000
 PATRICK J. O'DONNELL, 0000
 CLIFFORD A. OLIVER, 0000
 KEITH D. OLIVER, 0000
 RICHARD E. OLSON, 0000
 ISAAC G. OSBORNE, JR., 0000
 SHERRY L. OWENBY, 0000
 THOMAS L. PAGE, 0000
 THOMAS PALGUTA, 0000
 RONALD J. PARK, 0000
 WILLIAM H. PATTERSON III, 0000
 ROBERT W. PATTY, 0000
 TOMMY W. PAULK, 0000
 VERNON D. PAYETTE, 0000
 TIMOTHY W. PAYNE, 0000
 STEVEN M. PEACE, 0000
 WILLIAM B. PEARRE, 0000
 JUAN F. PEDRAZACOLON, 0000
 DAVID C. PERKINS, 0000
 DARRYL M. PERRILLOUX, 0000
 THOMAS M. PERRIN, 0000
 FRANCIS P. PETRELL, 0000
 LAWRENCE PEZZA, JR., 0000
 GREGORY W. PHELPS, 0000
 JAMES F. PHILLIPS, 0000
 DONALD W. PIPES, 0000
 STANLEY C. PLUMMER, 0000
 GEORGE W. POGGE, 0000
 BOBBY B. POLK, 0000
 LOUIS T. PONTILLO, 0000
 BARBARA J. POOLE, 0000
 JERRY D. PORTER, 0000
 CARL J. POSEY, 0000
 WAYNE A. PRATT, 0000
 EDWARD H. PREISENDANZ, 0000
 RICHARD J. PREVOST, 0000
 JOHN M. PRICKETT, 0000
 KENNETH H. PRITCHARD, 0000
 DAVID E. PURTEE, 0000
 LARRY E. RAAF, 0000
 CURT M. READ, 0000
 DEBORAH R. READ, 0000
 NORMAN L. REDDING, JR., 0000
 LARRY D. REESE, 0000
 TIMOTHY J. REGAN, 0000
 ROBERT C. REGO, 0000
 PRICE L. REINERT, 0000
 TIMOTHY R. RENSEMA, 0000
 DANIEL M. REYNA, 0000
 BARRY L. REYNOLDS, 0000
 CHARLES W. RHOADS, 0000
 KENNETH W. RIGBY, 0000
 WILLIAM D. ROBERTS, 0000
 JOSEPH L. ROGERS, 0000
 LARRY E. ROGERS, 0000
 KEITH C. ROGERSON, 0000
 CARROLL ROHRICH, 0000
 MICHAEL E. ROPER, 0000
 ALAN E. RUEGEMER, 0000
 JON R. RUIZ, 0000
 JAMES P. RUPPER, 0000
 MILLARD C. RUSHING, 0000
 JOSEPH T. SAFFER, 0000
 RANDALL M. SAFIER, 0000
 CHARLES D. SAFLEY, 0000
 LLOYD F. SAMMONS, 0000
 RAFAEL SANCHEZ, 0000
 GREGORY J. SANDERS, 0000
 RICHARD L. SANDERS, 0000
 JOHN C. SANFORD, 0000
 GUS L. SANKEY, 0000
 ANGEL L. SARRAGA, 0000
 JAMES M. SCHAEFER, 0000
 WESLEY H. SCHERMANN, JR., 0000
 AUSTIN SCHMIDT, 0000
 RONALD M. SCHROCK, 0000
 JAMES A. SCHUSTER, 0000
 BARBARA A. SCHWARTZ, 0000
 BRION L. SCHWEBKE, 0000
 DENNIS E. SCOTT, 0000
 LOUIS J. SCOTTI, 0000
 HENRY P. SCULLY, 0000
 DENNIS S. SEARS, 0000
 THOMAS J. SELLARS, 0000
 KAREN J. SHADDICK, 0000
 ANTHONY S. SHANNON, 0000

LEN D. SHARTZER, 0000
 FREDERICK A. SHAW III, 0000
 DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE, 0000
 DONALD H. SHEETS, 0000
 GARY E. SHEFFER, 0000
 JAMES E. SHEPHERD, 0000
 RICHARD J. SHERLOCK, JR., 0000
 SAMUEL M. SHILLER, 0000
 STANLEY P. SHOPE, 0000
 KING E. SIDWELL, 0000
 KEITH D. SIMMONS, 0000
 CHARLES R. SINGLETON, 0000
 JOHN J. SKOLL, 0000
 BRENDA G. SMITH, 0000
 CHERYL A. SMITH, 0000
 LARRY E. SMITH, 0000
 MICHAEL D. SMITH, 0000
 RONALD B. SMITH, 0000
 SIMS H. SMITH, 0000
 MICHAEL R. SNIPES, 0000
 SHELDON R. SNOW, 0000
 WILLIAM S. SOBOTA, JR., 0000
 GLENN A. SONNEE, 0000
 NORMAN R. SPERO, 0000
 PHILIP W. SPIES, JR., 0000
 REX A. SPITLER, 0000
 EDDY M. SPURGIN, 0000
 ROBERT P. STALL, 0000
 MARCY A. STANTON, 0000
 DAVID E. STARK, 0000
 CHARLES M. STEELMAN, 0000
 THOMAS S. STEFANKO, 0000
 JEANETTE L. STERNER, 0000
 STANLEY M. STRICKLEN, 0000
 GEORGE M. STRIPLING, 0000
 JAMES M. STRYKER, 0000
 JAMES C. STUBBS, 0000
 THOMAS R. SUTTER, 0000
 ANDREW A. SWANSON, 0000
 STANLEY P. SYMAN, 0000
 DENIS H. TAGA, 0000
 FRANCIS B. TAVENNER, JR., 0000
 BENNY M. TERRELL, 0000
 BURTHEL THOMAS, 0000
 KEVIN D. THOMAS, 0000
 NANCY A. THOMAS, 0000
 RANDAL E. THOMAS, 0000
 GEORGE C. THOMPSON, 0000
 KARL C. THOMPSON, 0000
 DOUGLAS R. THOMSON, 0000
 PHILLIP J. THORPE, 0000
 RONALD L. THORSETT, 0000
 TERRY E. THRALL, 0000
 EMELIO K. TIO, 0000
 JAMES B. TODD, 0000
 RICHARD K. TREACY, 0000
 WILLIAM D. TROUT, 0000
 CARL E. TURNER, 0000
 MICHAEL J. ULEKOWSKI, 0000
 THOMAS J. UMBERG, 0000
 ROBERT L. VALENCIA, 0000
 RICHARD C. VINSON, 0000
 RAYMOND D. WADLEY, 0000
 SCOTT D. WAGNER, 0000
 DONALD P. WALKER, 0000
 WILLIAM A. WALSH, 0000
 ANDREW C. WARD, 0000
 ROBERT S. WARREN, 0000
 MARVIN R. WARZECHA, 0000
 ROBERT E. WATSON, 0000
 CRAIG A. WEBBER, 0000
 BILLY H. WELCH, 0000
 CHRIS H. WELLS, 0000
 CAMILLA K. WHITE, 0000
 JAMES R. WHITE, 0000
 NORMAN J. WHITE, 0000
 MICHAEL J. WHITEHEAD, 0000
 THOMAS M. WHITESIDE, JR., 0000
 FRANCIS B. WILLIAMS III, 0000
 JOE D. WILLINGHAM, 0000
 RODNEY E. WILLIS, 0000
 SUZANNE H. WILSON, 0000
 JEFFRY K. WOLFE, 0000
 KENNETH W. WOODARD, 0000
 CLAUDELL WOODS, 0000
 HARLEY K. WOOSTER, JR., 0000
 GLENN R. WORTHINGTON, 0000
 JOHN M. WUTHENOW, 0000
 WILLIAM C. YOUNG, 0000
 DAVID K. YOUNG, 0000
 ROBERT E. YOUNG, 0000